

## SENATE

TUESDAY, January 25, 1927

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

Our heavenly Father, always considerate of our needs and ever ready to bless us with the abundance of Thy grace, we thank Thee for all that Thou has done for us. May we be so truly grateful that in every manner of conversation and in all the work we may undertake it may be with a consciousness of Thy presence and that Thou dost understand us much better than we do ourselves. Lead us in the paths of righteousness and guide our thoughts this day. For Jesus Christ's sake. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chafee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, and 34 to the bill H. R. 2 to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the consolidation of national-banking associations," approved November 7, 1918; to amend section 5136 as amended, section 5137, section 5138 as amended, section 5142, section 5150, section 5155, section 5190, section 5200 as amended, section 5202 as amended, section 5208 as amended, section 5211 as amended, of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and to amend section 9, section 13, section 22, and section 24 of the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes, and concurred therein; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the said bill Nos. 11, 26, 30, 36, 37, 38, 39, and to the amendment of the Senate to the title, and agreed thereto severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; and that the House further insisted on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 35.

## PROHIBITION ENFORCEMENT (S. DOC. NO. 198)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of L. C. Andrews, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and D. H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in response to Senate Resolution No. 325 (submitted by Mr. REED of Missouri and agreed to January 11, 1927), and presenting copies of letters of instruction, orders, and communications, having reference to the subject of undercover work, or the conduct of such activities as are referred to in the resolution, which, with the accompany papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. REED of Missouri subsequently said: Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate passed a resolution (S. Res. 325) calling upon the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and Gen. Lincoln C. Andrews to furnish to the Senate copies of certain correspondence. The correspondence has been sent to the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a public document in order that Senators may have an opportunity to examine it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. CURTIS presented the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, relating to equality for agriculture

Whereas the question of equality for agriculture is a national problem that can never be settled by means of subsidies; and

Whereas the equalization fee would make the tariff effective on farm products, thereby giving agriculture the same relative advantages possessed by manufacturing and industry: Be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States, at its present sitting, be, and the same is urgently petitioned and requested, to enact such legislation that will extend the protective system so that it may apply to American agriculture as well as to manufacturing and industry; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be engrossed by the secretary of the Senate and the chief clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, and signed by the lieutenant governor and speaker of the

house of representatives, and copies thereof transmitted by the secretary of state to President Calvin Coolidge and to the Secretary of Agriculture, William Jardine, and to each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the senate, and passed that body January 19, 1927.

D. A. N. CHASE,  
President of the Senate.  
ARTHUR S. McNAY,  
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house January 10, 1927.

J. M. HAMILTON,  
Speaker of the House.  
O. H. HATFIELD,  
Clerk of the House.

Mr. CURTIS also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Independence, Kans., praying for the early passage of Federal radio control legislation, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Park, Kans., praying for the prompt passage of legislation regulating radio broadcasting, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BROUSSARD presented a petition of sundry citizens of New Orleans, La., praying for the prompt passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Independence, Kans., praying for the early passage of legislation regulating radio broadcasting, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I send to the desk a petition, which I ask that the clerk may read. It is very short. I do not ask that he read the names signed to the petition but merely the body of the petition itself. I call especial attention to it because it represents the educational forces in my State, including the presidents of colleges, and amongst them the men who are most prominent in the thought and spirit of my State. I ask that the names signed to the petition may be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read the body of the petition and, without objection, the names of the petitioners will be printed in the RECORD.

The petition was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

SPARTANBURG, S. C., January 24, 1927.

To the Hon. ELLISON D. SMITH,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned, your constituents in this community, urge you to protest against the presence in Nicaragua of American armed forces not absolutely necessary to the protection of American lives and property, and also urge that you advocate the acceptance by our Government of President Calles's proposal to submit to arbitration our objections to the Mexican oil and land laws. A policy of conciliation is in our own best interest, both in these countries and its repercussion elsewhere.

Respectfully,

The names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

James Kerr, associate professor of Spanish, Converse College; H. N. Snyder, president Wofford College; Frank Evans, superintendent city schools; Weldon T. Myers, professor of English, Converse College; Robert P. Pill, president Converse College; J. A. Tillinghast, professor of economics and social science; Henry Wade DuBois, pastor First Presbyterian Church; D. D. Wallace, professor of history and economics in Wofford College; W. L. Pugh, professor of English, Wofford College; Henry A. Wise, professor of education, Converse College; W. H. K. Pendleton, rector Church of the Advent, Episcopal; Mark L. Carlisle, pastor Central Methodist Episcopal Church, South; Wm. L. Ball, pastor First Baptist Church; J. V. Watkins, pastor emeritus of First Presbyterian Church; A. Vermont, Ph. D., professor of Romance languages, Converse College; John G. Galbraith, past State commander American Legion; Wilson P. Price, Converse College; T. J. McGrath, pastor St. Paul's; H. B. Carlisle, Spartanburg, S. C.; Aug. M. Chreigberg, Spartanburg, S. C.; James F. Byrnes, Spartanburg, S. C.; L. W. Jenkins, Spartanburg, S. C.; A. Mason Orfe, Spartanburg, S. C., dean of Wofford College; A. M. Trawick, professor, Wofford College; Wm. C. Mayforth, dean of School of Music, Converse College; N. Irving Hyatt, professor, Converse College.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I want to say in connection with the petition that I have not expressed my views and will not do so now. I merely wish to say that I was happy to see the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the leader of the Democratic forces in this body, introduce the resolution which he has

submitted. I hope that we will consider it, as it is now proposed, under the unanimous-consent agreement and that this Government of ours will express itself in no uncertain terms as to its relations with its neighbors on this continent.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President, I have a telegram addressed to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. STANFIELD] in the nature of a joint memorial from the Legislature of Oregon, signed by the secretary of state, which I ask may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as suggested.

The Chief Clerk read the memorial, as follows:

SALEM, OREG., January 24, 1927.

HON. ROBERT N. STANFIELD,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Senate Joint Memorial 5

To the honorable Senate of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate of the State of Oregon, the House of Representatives concurring, respectfully represent and petition as follows, to wit:

"Whereas on the 15th day of June, 1923, a contract was entered into by and between the United States Forest Service and one Fred Herrick, of St. Maries, Idaho, for the purchase by said Herrick of approximately 800,000,000 feet of timber situate in the United States forest reserve in Grant County, Oreg., known as the Bear Valley unit, Malheur National Forest; and

"Whereas by the terms of said contract the purchaser agreed within a period of two years from the date of said contract to construct and complete ready for operation approximately 80 miles of common-carrier railroad to a point within said Grant County, Oreg.; and

"Whereas by the terms of said contract the purchaser agreed within a period of two years from the date of said contract to construct and complete ready for operation a sawmill at Burns, Oreg., and to commence logging and milling operations by April 1, 1925; and

"Whereas the citizens of Grant County, Oreg., recommended to and urged upon the United States Forest Service the necessity of entering into such a contract for the purpose of opening up said Grant County and developing a vast district of unlimited material wealth; and

"Whereas it is charged by reliable citizens of Grant and Harney Counties that said Herrick has failed in the performance of his contract and has refused to carry out its terms, although extensions thereof have been granted; and

"Whereas it is further charged by said citizens that further extensions of time will serve only to further delay the completion of said contract and the subsequent development of the natural resources of Grant County, and that prosperity of Grant County is dependent largely upon the cutting of the timber sold under said contract and the operations which will be incidental thereto; and

"Whereas it is further charged by said citizens that an attempt is being made by said Herrick to secure a modification of said contract eliminating the clause therein contained providing that said railroad shall be a common carrier and that the elimination of said clause from said contract will enable said Herrick to bottle up the territory served by said railroad and retard the development thereof, thereby enabling said Herrick to secure an unjustifiable advantage; and

"Whereas it is further charged by said citizens that the United States Forest Service has been negligent in enforcing the terms of said contract and has refused to cancel the same, and has been influenced to grant unwarranted extensions of said contract in so far as performance thereof is incumbent on said Herrick; and

"Whereas it has been openly charged that said delay upon the part of said Forest Service has been due to alleged influence exerted by former employees of said service who are now associated with said Herrick: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon, the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein, That the Senate of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to appoint a special committee to investigate the facts and circumstances surrounding the execution of the aforesaid contract and the granting of any and all extensions of time for compliance with the terms thereof, and particularly as to any modification in said contract concerning the common-carrier clause therein contained; that said committee be authorized to recommend to the Department of Justice the institution of proper legal proceedings fully to protect the interest of the citizens of Grant County, the State of Oregon, and the United States of America if, upon investigation by said committee, it shall develop that said Herrick has failed to comply with the terms of his contract; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be, and he hereby is, instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to each Member of Congress of the United States of America, to the President of the United States Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Oregon delegation in the Congress be, and they hereby are, requested to use their utmost efforts to secure such investigation adopted by the senate January 19, 1927.

"HENRY L. CORBETT,  
President of the Senate.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives January 20, 1927.

"JOHN H. CARLIN,  
"Speaker of the House."

Copies mailed to each Member of Congress to-day.

SAM A. KOZER,  
Secretary of State.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I would like to make an inquiry about the memorial just read. It seems to me it ought to be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so referred.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I present a letter in the form of a memorial which I wish to have read at the desk and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the letter was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

THE BRONX FREE FELLOWSHIP,  
Bronx, New York City, January 24, 1927.

To Senator COPELAND:

At a public meeting of the Bronx Free Fellowship, Sunday evening, January 23, the following resolution was unanimously passed:

Resolved, That we, individuals of different religious faiths and political views, are opposed to intervention in Mexico and to the retention of our marines in Nicaragua. We will not have our fathers, sons, and brothers shed their blood fighting to protect the investments of corporations and a comparatively few of our citizens. Therefore we demand the withdrawal of the United States marines from Nicaragua and the settlement of the present dispute with Mexico by arbitration. Also, that under no circumstances shall war be declared against Mexico.

We call upon you, as our representative in the United States Senate, to do all within your power to have our Government conduct itself in accordance with the sense of this resolution.

Respectfully,

LOCAL STANDING COMMITTEE  
OF THE BRONX FREE FELLOWSHIP,  
By J. G. FRIEDMAN.

MATERNITY AND INFANT HYGIENE

Mr. BAYARD. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a telegram and a letter relating to the Phipps-Parker maternity and infancy extension bill.

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

The telegram and letter are as follows:

BALTIMORE, Md., January 11, 1927.

Senator THOMAS F. BAYARD,

United States Senate:

The National Society United States Daughters of 1812 in Maryland, in session January 10, 1927, passed the following resolution: "We are absolutely opposed to the further exploiting of mothers and children of these United States of America by extension of the maternity act, as proposed in the Phipps-Parker bill, S. 2696, H. R. 7555." Please have this recorded.

FLORENCE P. SÄDTLER,  
President in Maryland.

NASHVILLE, TENN., January 15, 1927.

HON. THOMAS F. BAYARD,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Society of the United States Daughters of 1812 was incorporated many years ago by act of Congress, and among the objects of the society, as stated in the act of incorporation, are the promotion of the spirit of the great leaders of our country in the critical period between the recognition of independence by Great Britain up to and including the War of 1812, and also the promotion of "educational and patriotic progress."

The executive board of the national society, composed of the national officers and the presidents of the State societies, held its regular mid-winter session in Atlanta, Ga., on January 7-8, 1927, and was asked by the national chairman of our loyalty committee to acquaint you with our views as to the Phipps-Parker maternity extension bill now under discussion by the Congress of the United States.

The executive board voted unanimously to go on record as opposing the Phipps-Parker maternity extension bill, and I was directed to advise you of the action taken. We regard the measure as vicious and

dangerous and not at all in line with the American ideals. We urge that you, as a loyal American and thinking gentleman, do all in your power to secure its defeat.

May I not add personally my appreciation of the sturdy stand you took a few years ago on the so-called child labor amendment?

Cordially yours,

Mrs. FREDERICK W. MILLSPAUGH,  
Recording Secretary  
National United States Daughters of 1812.

#### DROUGHT CONDITIONS IN THE CAROLINAS AND GEORGIA

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have received so many letters from my State which might be considered as petitions, in reference to the distressing conditions which prevail throughout the drought-stricken region of the two Carolinas and Georgia, that I am going to submit the communications to the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred a bill which I introduced at the last session for the purpose of giving relief in such circumstances.

I desire to make merely a brief explanation. The bill provides that where, in the opinion of the local land bank, the one situated in Columbia for the region of several States, the collateral—that is, the property that was taken as security for the loan—is sufficient to justify it, they may extend the time of payment of the interest and the amortization, which is included in the interest, for the period of two years, the Government furnishing the money to meet the interest in order not to affect the sale price of the bonds.

This condition has grown more acute this year than it was last year for the reasons set forth in these letters to me. I hope that the committee will take cognizance of the situation and, at least, make some report on the bill. A bill has been introduced and reported favorably from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, appropriating some several million dollars for the purpose of purchasing seed for the western farmers. The condition of the people whom I am now representing is as bad or worse than that contemplated by the bill for their relief. I sincerely hope that the committee to which the bill was referred will make a report.

I shall not ask to have these letters printed in the Record, but will content myself with forwarding them to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I wanted to call attention to this matter during the morning hour so that the committee could be prepared for the reception of the letters, as I desire to appear before the committee.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Patents, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10735) to prevent fraud, deception, or improper practice in connection with business before the United States Patent Office, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1318) thereon.

Mr. METCALF, from the Committee on Patents, to which was referred the bill (S. 4957) to amend section 129 of the Judicial Code, allowing an appeal in a patent suit from a decree which is final except for the ordering of an accounting, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1319) thereon.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Patents, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7563) to amend section 4900 of the United States Revised Statutes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1320) thereon.

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5085) to remove the charge of desertion from and correct the naval record of Louis Nemeck, otherwise known as Louis Nemeck, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1321) thereon.

Mr. TRAMMELL, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2144) for the relief of Tampico Marine Iron Works, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1322) thereon.

Mr. MAYFIELD, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 4746) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1323) thereon.

Mr. MEANS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11325) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, and acts in amendment thereof, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1324) thereon.

#### MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT QUINCY, ILL.

Mr. STEWART. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably two bridge bills. They are unanimously reported and in the usual form.

I report back without amendment the bill (H. R. 15014) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Quincy, State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River, and I submit a report (No. 1316) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

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

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

#### ST. JOSEPH RIVER BRIDGE, MICH.

Mr. STEWART. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 15642) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Michigan and Berrien County, or either of them, to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Joseph River, and I submit a report (No. 1317) thereon. 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 bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 5409) for the relief of Alvin Hovey-King; and  
A bill (S. 5410) for the relief of May Fee, Daniel E. Turbeville, Zenas V. Johnston, Arthur L. Beaman, Cora M. Avery, and Harvey O. Offerdahl; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYSON:

A bill (S. 5411) providing for the promotion of certain non-commissioned officers in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRATTON:

A bill (S. 5412) granting a pension to Cosme Herrera; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 5413) for the relief of Claude J. Neis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FESS:

A bill (S. 5414) granting a pension to John Washington Beardmore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHIPPS:

A bill (S. 5415) for the relief of Roswell H. Bancroft (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 5416) authorizing enrollment as members of the Cherokee Tribe of Indians of Jeffrey Wilson Hamilton and heirs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 5417) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Brading (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5418) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Y. Brandon (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5419) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Butler (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5420) granting a pension to Elizabeth Baker (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5421) granting a pension to Louisa Boehme (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5422) granting an increase of pension to Anna Barrett (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5423) granting an increase of pension to Nannie F. Davenport (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5424) granting an increase of pension to Leah E. Davison (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5425) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Dearen (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5426) granting a pension to Maria Groves (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5427) granting an increase of pension to Cora E. Hotten (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5428) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Kent (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5429) granting an increase of pension to Harriett Larue (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5430) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Naylor (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5431) granting an increase of pension to Edie Nichols (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5432) granting an increase of pension to Parmelia Preston (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 5433) to further amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 5434) to create the Philippine leprosy commission and to provide facilities in the Philippine Islands for the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 5435) to provide for the widening of C Street NE., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DALE:

A bill (S. 5436) granting an increase of pension to Myra Burnham (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 5437) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth D. Fisher (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 5438) to authorize the issuance of patent for lands containing gold, silver, cinnabar, lead, tin, copper, or other valuable deposits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 5439) for the relief of Ellen M. Gholson; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 5440) for the relief of William H. Brown; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SACKETT:

A bill (S. 5441) granting an increase of pension to Sallie J. Slavy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED of Missouri:

A bill (S. 5442) granting a pension to Julia Lamb; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 5443) granting pensions and increase of pensions to widows and former widows of certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 5444) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Hockingberry; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 5445) to provide for the acquisition of a site for a Federal building in Mannington, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JONES of New Mexico:

A bill (S. 5446) granting an increase of pension to Caroline A. Berleth; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### LOANS TO FARMERS IN THE CROP-FAILURE AREAS

Mr. GEORGE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 5082) authorizing an appropriation of \$6,000,000 as a loan to farmers in the crop-failure area of the United States for the purchase of feed and seed grain, said amount to be loaned under the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, which was ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the proper place insert the following: "and the Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized to make loans and advances to farmers in the State of Georgia who suffered crop failures in 1925 and/or 1926, for the purchase of feed, seed, and fertilizer, and for these purposes there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$2,000,000, said loans and advances to be made under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe."

#### OIL LANDS AND CONCESSIONS IN MEXICO

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day, which the Secretary will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 330) submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] on the 31st instant, relative to oil lands and concessions in Mexico.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, there are two or three Senators who wished to consult with me about some proposed amendments to the resolution and I wished to talk with them. We have, however, all been occupied and have not been able to get together. I therefore ask that the resolution may go over another day without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, what is the resolution which the Senator from Nebraska has asked to go over without prejudice?

Mr. NORRIS. It is the resolution submitted by me inquiring for information relative to oil lands in Mexico.

Mr. HEFLIN. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This concludes the morning business.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

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

Mr. MOSES. Can we not proceed with the consideration of the calendar under Rule VIII?

Mr. NORRIS. There is a unanimous-consent order which becomes operative immediately after the routine morning business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a unanimous-consent agreement to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 327.

Mr. MOSES. I did not understand that it was to be proceeded with at the conclusion of the routine business.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Fletcher	Lenroot	Sackett
Bayard	Frazier	McKellar	Schall
Bingham	George	McLean	Sheppard
Blease	Gillett	McMaster	Shipstead
Borah	Glass	McNary	Shortridge
Bratton	Goff	Mayfield	Smith
Bronssard	Gooding	Metcalf	Smoot
Bruce	Gould	Moses	Steck
Cameron	Greene	Neely	Stephens
Capper	Hale	Norbeck	Stewart
Caraway	Harris	Norris	Trammell
Copeland	Harrison	Nye	Tyson
Couzens	Hawes	Oddie	Wadsworth
Curtis	Hefflin	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Howell	Pepper	Walsh, Mont.
Deneen	Johnson	Phlips	Warren
Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Pine	Watson
Edge	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Wheeler
Edwards	Kendrick	Reed, Mo.	Willis
Ernst	Keyes	Reed, Pa.	
Ferris	King	Robinson, Ark.	
Fess	La Follette	Robinson, Ind.	

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I wish to announce the necessary absence of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] on account of illness.

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

#### RELATIONS WITH MEXICO

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution (S. Res. 327) submitted by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] on the 18th instant, relative to relations with Mexico.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas obtained the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I have prepared an amendment to the resolution, and if it be agreeable to the Senator from Arkansas before he begins to deliver his address, I should like to have it read, so that if he desires to discuss the amendment during the time he is addressing the Senate he may do so.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well. The Senator may submit his amendment and have it read.

Mr. NORRIS. I send the amendment to the substitute reported from the committee to the desk and ask that it may be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read as requested.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 22, it is proposed to strike out the period, to insert a comma, and to add the following:

But such protection should not go to the extent of using the armed forces of the United States without the consent of Congress.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution as reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations be read to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the substitute. The CHIEF CLERK. The resolution (S. Res. 327) was reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations on the 18th instant, with an amendment, to strike out all after the word "Resolved" and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That while by virtue of sovereignty, the duty devolves upon this Government to protect the lives and property of its nationals in foreign countries, which duty is not to be neglected or disregarded, it is nevertheless sound policy, consistent with the honor and best interest of the United States and promotive of international peace and good will, to submit to an arbitral tribunal, which shall apply the principles of international law, the controversies with Mexico relating to the alleged confiscation or impairment of the property of American citizens and corporations in Mexico; the arbitration agreement to provide for protection of all American property rights pending the final outcome of the arbitration.

That in good will and friendliness efforts should be made and persisted in to effect arrangements which will commit the two Governments to the policy of abiding by and executing awards that may be made in consequence of such arrangements to arbitrate.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, the property interests in Mexico of nationals of the United States are very large and important. Information said to have been collected by the consular officers representing this Government in Mexico indicates that the aggregate value of such property is approximately \$1,281,161,000. It is stated, upon information which I regard as reliable, that what constituted formerly very large British interests alleged to have been owned by Lord Cowdray and his associates have passed into the ownership of Mr. Mellon, or of what is known in American finance as the "Mellon group."

The items which enter into the very large aggregate already stated as representing the ownership of American nationals in Mexico are said to consist of rural property of the value of \$166,747,000; urban property, \$35,771,000; oil lands, \$319,566,000; refineries, \$50,070,000; mines, \$207,827,000; smelters, \$26,180,000; timber, \$9,935,000; railways, \$248,158,000; manufacturing enterprises, \$27,766,000; merchandising enterprises, \$26,490,000; public utilities, \$30,499,000; concealed interests, \$6,936,000; miscellaneous investments, not included in the items just stated, \$125,242,000; the aggregate being, as stated, \$1,281,161,000.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to know if the figures given include lands owned by our citizens for colonization purposes and lands in individual ownership? I could not hear all the statements of the Senator, my attention being diverted at the moment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. My information is that the statement is intended to include approximately all lands owned by nationals of the United States in the Republic of Mexico.

Let me say in this connection that it does not seem to me probable that any statement of the values of these properties which is obtainable would be accurate beyond question. I submit it at this time solely for the purpose of indicating the extent of the ownership and the importance of the issues which are affected indirectly by the resolution under consideration.

#### PRINCIPLES OF THE RESOLUTION

For some days prior to the introduction in the Senate of this resolution the conviction had been growing stronger every hour that a breach with Mexico was imminent. Numerous mass meetings were held in various cities, and resolutions were adopted indicating the belief on the part of those participating in the meetings that this Government was gradually drifting into a situation from which war with Mexico would result. The subjects matter of the controversies were of long standing and apparently diplomatic efforts were about exhausted. Recent speeches in the Mexican Congress and in both Houses of the Congress of the United States disclosed intense interest and anxiety. Statements by the Secretary of State were resented by the President of Mexico as implied threats of war. From every part of the United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives received letters, telegrams, and other messages appealing for the exercise of patience, and for reference of the disputes to arbitration.

Among the purposes which prompted the introduction of this resolution may be embraced an authoritative expression of opinion by the Senate of the United States that intervention by armed force or war with Mexico should not be resorted to, but that questions involving property or property rights should be determined in accordance with many precedents by some arbitral tribunal.

The diplomatic agencies of the United States appeared discouraged and confronted with failure. The resolution is intended to revive and stimulate these agencies to earnest efforts to effect adjustments in accordance with what is believed to be the well-nigh universal sentiment of the American people and of the Senate of the United States, excepting a very few individuals who have not seen fit to express their views concerning the best methods to be pursued in the further conduct of negotiations relating to these very important controversies.

The pending disagreement with Mexico affords an impressive opportunity for the United States to demonstrate its good faith in the declaration, frequently repeated in treaties during the last 25 years, that our Government, as a fundamental and well-recognized policy, accepts and regards arbitration as an appropriate means for settling disputes between nations, particularly disputes relating to property rights. It is in just such cases as have arisen between this Government and Mexico, cases which involve property rights, that the principle of arbitration may be invoked when diplomatic negotiations fail or are threatened with failure, without sacrifice, without dishonor, without injustice to any citizens of this country or to any interest which this Nation is obligated to safeguard and protect.

The policy implied in the resolution, if acted upon by the Executive and accepted by the Mexican Government, will relax the tension between the two countries, which has become so great as to threaten the continuance of peaceful relations. There seems to be a long-established custom of shrouding diplomatic negotiations in secrecy and mystery, of leaving undefined and indefinite policies relating to our international relations. This is perhaps less true of the United States than of many other countries. This in itself is calculated to arouse suspicion and to fortify misunderstanding. Nothing could be more helpful than the frank and emphatic proposal from our President that the two Governments arrange, or attempt to do so, for the arbitration of the disputes which, if left unsettled by peaceful means, will lead to the quickening of an attitude of hostility on the part of Mexico and the United States toward each other, to the intensification of those feelings which arise from misunderstandings, from which the gravest consequences may result to both nations.

#### SUBSTANCE AND TERMS

The resolution recognizes the obligation upon the Government to protect the lives and property of our nationals in Mexico; declares arbitration of property disputes consistent with that duty; advises submission of the controversies to an arbitral tribunal in accordance with the principles of international law; and suggests arrangements for the protection of American property rights pending decisions. It is also suggested in the resolution that special consideration be given to provision for the payment or execution of the awards when made.

The language employed is not intended to restrict and does not restrict unduly the processes for peaceful settlement which may be found acceptable. The fundamental purpose is to indicate that force should not be resorted to until every practicable, reasonable effort to arbitrate has failed.

#### GENERAL CLAIMS COMMISSION CREATED SEPTEMBER 28, 1923

There already exists an arbitral tribunal, the General Claims Commission, created by the convention between the United States and Mexico, signed September 28, 1923, which the two Governments may resort to, if they agree upon such a course. The General Claims Commission is composed of three eminent persons, one representing the United States, the second representing Mexico, and the third of neutral nationality.

This commission applies, by virtue of the convention which created it, the principles of international law, justice, and equity. Its present jurisdiction is apparently broad enough to adjust controversies which are involved in the disputes now in progress. Its jurisdiction is to settle claims for losses or damage to persons or property accruing to the nationals of the complaining government, and including claims originating from acts by the government complained of.

If this General Claims Commission, which is clearly an arbitral body, should be employed, it would probably be necessary to effect certain additional arrangements, which would not be difficult to arrive at, assuming that the two governments in good faith desire to arbitrate. It would be necessary, perhaps, to effect an extension of the life of the commission. The General Claims Commission expires by limitation three years from the date of its first meeting, and that time of expiration is probably too near at hand to permit consideration and determination by the commission of the numerous claims which it is expected will arise if arbitration be resorted to.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. Has the Senator any information as to whether or not that General Claims Commission is functioning actively now?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The General Claims Commission has functioned. I do not think it is in session just now.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not functioning.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do not know just what the Senator from New York means by "not functioning now"? It is still in existence. It has heard and decided a large number of claims, and it will expire by limitation on the 30th day of August of the present year.

Mr. LENROOT. 1928, I think.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Why does the Senator say 1928?

Mr. LENROOT. Its three years will expire from the date of the organization, namely, in 1928.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I suggest that in order that the Senate might have the advantage or the disadvantage of the discussion that is in progress between Senators and myself, the Senator make his statement, or ask his question, so that I may reply to it.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. In the first place, the special claims commission is not functioning.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I am not speaking of the special claims commission now.

Mr. LENROOT. I know that. The General Claims Commission is functioning.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is my understanding, and that is what I stated.

Mr. LENROOT. And it expires in 1928, instead of 1927, I understand.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I inquired of the State Department the exact date of the first meeting of the General Claims Commission, and my information is, furnished by the State Department, that the commission met for the first time on the 30th day of August, 1924, and by a process of reasoning, which I think the Senator from Wisconsin is fully capable of following, three years from the 30th day of August, 1924, would be the 30th day of August, 1927.

Mr. LENROOT. I stand corrected.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. This arbitral tribunal known as the General Claims Commission is composed of individuals of high renown, of recognized ability and integrity, and they have performed their duties apparently in a manner consistent with the high service which they have been called to render. I do not make the suggestion that if a better and more satisfactory special tribunal, to be created, can perform the functions of arbitrating these differences, resort should be had to the General Claims Commission.

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

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Has the Senator the names of the present commissioners?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. Fred K. Neilsen and Señor L. G. F. MacGregor, representing, respectively, the United States and Mexico, and a distinguished statesman, publicist, and lawyer from the Netherlands, Dr. C. van Vollenhoven, constituting the representative of a neutral nationality.

The Mixed Claims Commission is empowered by the convention under which it was organized to proceed to the determination of claims without regard to the generally accepted principle of international law that legal remedies must be first exhausted. If agreed upon as the tribunal to arbitrate, it could and should apply that principle in the determination of these disputes. That is the usual provision in agreements to arbitrate.

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

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Will the Senator tell us what difference, if any, there is between the character of the claims now being adjudicated by this Mixed Claims Commission and the character of the claims which give rise to these controversies?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. There is no distinction in law that I am able to define, except with reference to limitations. There are two general classes of claims which the General Claims Commission is empowered to consider and determine. The first is those claims relating to injuries to the person or to the property of our nationals which occurred prior to the signing of the convention creating the Mixed Claims Commission, namely, September 28, 1923, and as to those claims they must be presented within one year after the first meeting, and decided within six months after presentation.

As to claims arising after the signing of the convention, they must be presented within the three-year period of the life of the commission; that is to say, if a claim arose after August 30, 1924, the date of the first meeting of the commission, it must be presented to the commission within three years thereafter—that is, before the expiration of August 30, 1927—and as to the claims arising after August 30, 1924, the Governments of Mexico and the United States agree, in the treaty, that they will enter into a new agreement to extend the time for the consideration of such claims, provided there have been filed claims of the character I am now discussing, and such claims have not been heard or determined.

There is another provision in this treaty which is to be considered in this connection. That provision contemplates that all claims of which the General Claims Commission is given jurisdiction which are not filed with the commission within three years from the date of its first meeting—that is, not filed by the 30th of August, 1927—shall be forever barred. So that, according to a treaty now in force, all claims such as are described in defining the jurisdiction of the General Claims Commission—namely, for injuries to the person and for losses to the property of our nationals, including such losses as may have occurred by acts of the Government or the officials of the Government—shall be barred and not considered thereafter.

Let me make clear that it is not my purpose in these references to the General Claims Commission to indicate a conclusion that the Government should of necessity insist upon extending the jurisdiction of that commission. It may be found necessary, if it is decided to employ the General Claims Commission for this arbitration, to make clear the causes and the methods by which disputes shall be submitted to the tribunal, disputes of the nature of those involved in the present controversy with Mexico.

The General Claims Commission is expressly empowered to either find in damages, or to order a restitution of property, where it is apparent that a mere money award will not do complete justice. So that if the life of the General Claims Commission be extended, the controversies defined, and the processes for the preservation of the status quo agreed upon, there would be little difficulty if the two Governments really want to settle these disputes in proceeding with efforts to settle them.

Only two alternatives to arbitration seem probable: First, diplomatic breach and removal of the arms embargo; or second, armed intervention to police areas in Mexico, which means war. Unquestionably the withdrawal of recognition from the Mexican Government by the United States and removal of the embargo on munitions would result in a condition of anarchy throughout Mexico and the final overthrow of the Mexican Government. It would produce a state of guerilla warfare in which thousands of innocent persons would be killed and hundreds of millions of dollars in property, including the very property which the Government owes the duty to protect, would be destroyed or stolen. It would paralyze every industry in Mexico and impoverish every foreigner there, including nationals of the United States. It would solidify the Mexican people in resistance and result in the sacrifice of thousands of our own citizens who are not directly interested in the Mexican imbroglio.

It would call for the supreme sacrifice on the part of many of our citizens who, foreseeing the possibility—not to say the probability—of such a sacrifice, are asking this body to express its advice and opinion as to whether the United States shall be invited and encouraged to do what it said in 31 treaties it would do; to do what has been declared to be the policy of the United States since 1897; to try, in accordance with the principles of international law and justice and equity the questions at issue, and refrain from a course which, if not calculated to produce war, is certain to intensify the suspicion and mistrust which, whether expressed or unexpressed, exists in the hearts of millions of our neighbors to the south, for whom the citizens of this country now entertain, and have always entertained, feelings of friendship and sympathy approximating affection.

Armed intervention in Mexico would not only mean the failure of the ends we seek, but it would mean that the unpopularity of the Government of the United States in Central America and South America would be augmented instead of diminished. We sent troops into Mexico and we withdrew them on two occasions within my memory. If diplomatic negotiations finally fail—and I respectfully submit that the public expression emanating from the State Department indicated that point had about been reached when the Secretary of State appeared before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations—we can pursue the course suggested in the first alternative of withdrawing recognition, of lifting the embargo

on arms, and of permitting and inviting revolution, insurrection, and banditry to overwhelm the Mexican Government. But unless we do intervene with armed force, such a condition inevitably must be attained by the destruction of American property, along with Mexican property, by the defeat of the very end which we here seek. If we intervene in Mexico, take this thought and keep it in your mind: It does not mean that we will be there for a year, but it means that throughout the lifetime of those who listen to me the measured tread and steady step of American soldiers will sound along the Mexican border and resound from Mexican soil. Such action will accomplish the destruction of American property rights far more completely than any confiscation contemplated by the policy of the present Mexican Government. If our Government for the third time in recent years sends its armed forces into Mexico, it will create throughout the Western Hemisphere secret and open schools in which hatred for my flag and yours will be taught to those with whom we should be friendly. It means that alliances will be formed which will endanger or destroy American commerce with Central and Southern American states.

Who will forget the condition that manifested itself when this resolution was presented? Here among us was displayed an intensity of feeling seldom paralleled in the history of the Senate. In the body at the other end of the Capitol there was excitement due to the fear that the Secretary of State would find his patience exhausted and execute the threat which it has been construed he has made.

This is no time for indecision or for timidity. We have the right and, I believe, we owe the duty to take decisive steps in favor of proceeding along the highway of peace and against marching toward war. It is amazing how selfishness manifests itself in great crises. They who are quick to stimulate international animosities, they who are indifferent to appeals for the exercise of prudence and justice, they who are arrogant in the assertion of arbitrary contention, rarely if ever sacrifice themselves or their resources when their country goes to war.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] meant to imply that there had been any secrecy upon the part of the State Department in the conduct of the diplomatic controversies which are here in question. In fact, there has been the fullest publicity. I hold in my hand a document issued by the State Department giving the proceedings of the special commission which met with a like commission in Mexico in 1923 and concluded negotiations upon which the recognition of the existing Government of Mexico was made thereafter. I also have here a Senate document containing all the correspondence had with Mexico relating to these controversies up to April 12 last. I also have a document published by the State Department which contains all of the diplomatic correspondence had between the date of this Senate document and the present time relating to these controversies.

Mr. President, may I, in the beginning, ask leave to insert at the conclusion of my remarks articles 14 and 27 of the present constitution of Mexico?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McLEAN in the chair). Without objection it is so ordered.

[See Exhibit A.]

Mr. LENROOT. May I also say that as I desire to present what I have to say in a connected way I must ask that I be not interrupted, but at the conclusion of my statement I shall be glad to yield for any question.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the pending resolution if the amendments proposed by the Committee on Foreign Relations shall be adopted. As amended the resolution will read as follows:

*Resolved*, That while by virtue of sovereignty the duty devolves upon this Government to protect the lives and property of its nationals in foreign countries, which duty is not to be neglected or disregarded, it is nevertheless sound policy, consistent with the honor and best interests of the United States and promotive of international peace and good will, to submit to an arbitral tribunal, which shall apply the principles of international law, the controversies with Mexico relating to the alleged confiscation or impairment of the property of American nationals and corporations in Mexico; the arbitration agreement to provide for protection of all American property rights pending the final outcome of the arbitration.

That in good will and friendliness efforts should be made and persisted in to effect arrangements which will commit the two Governments to the policy of abiding by and executing awards that may be made in consequence of such arrangements to arbitrate.

Because of the fact that the resolution is very comprehensive in character as relates to controversies over property rights of

Americans in Mexico, and because of the fact that there is much misunderstanding as to what the existing controversies are, I venture to occupy some time of the Senate in stating my understanding of the present situation.

There are many people in this country who sincerely believe that because Mexico is small and weak and the United States is great and strong we are acting the part of the bully, making unjust demands upon Mexico, and interfering with its purely internal affairs.

After reading the constitution and laws of Mexico, the diplomatic correspondence between the two countries relating thereto, and informing myself as best I could of the action of the Mexican Government taken thereunder and its acts outside of either its constitution or laws, I have no hesitation in saying that were the controversies with Great Britain instead of with Mexico the country would be aflame to-day with indignation against Great Britain and immediate suspension of diplomatic intercourse would be demanded. The fact is there is no strong government in the world to-day that would violate the rights of American citizens as Mexico has done, and the fact is further that it is only because of the weakness of Mexico and the strength of the United States that our Government has been so patient and forbearing.

That the United States has only kept clearly within its rights and duties, I shall attempt to establish by narrating the admitted facts in the principal controversies now existing.

First, however, I wish to discuss the matter of arbitration. Arbitration involves first of all the existence of a dispute. There can be no arbitration without an issue formed. Hence there can be no arbitration concerning the existence of an admitted right.

It is universally held that a nation has not the right to confiscate the property of the nationals of another country. Forfeitures may be lawfully imposed in certain cases for violations of law rightfully applicable to the national, but confiscation can not be resorted to.

Hence, in so far as controversies with Mexico involve admitted confiscations, they can not be the subject of arbitration except where there is a dispute as to the amount of the compensation to be paid for the taking, as is provided for in the claims conventions now existing between the United States and Mexico, to which the Senator from Arkansas has referred; but I would call attention to the fact that the jurisdiction of that claims convention is limited to claims for losses and damages; in other words, to recovery of money.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me to interrupt him at that point, I desire to say that the commission is expressly empowered to award restitution of the property.

Mr. LENROOT. Or the commission can fix the value of the property. If Mexico chooses to pay the value of the property instead of restoring the property, she may do so.

I shall later refer to many confiscatory acts of Mexico which in some cases have been expressly admitted and in others never denied.

I would next observe that a nation can not escape the performance of an international obligation by placing the source of its violation in its constitution. An international right can not be so swept away, and the purpose of one of the amendments to the pending resolution is to make certain that the arbitration, if had, shall include all the international property rights of American nationals that are in dispute.

It must be plain that an international right can not be restricted by one of the parties without the consent of the other. If a violation of a right occurs in a constitution or in the laws of a nation, that fact may make difficult the application of a remedy for the wrong, but it does not affect the right to a rectification of the wrong.

Another amendment in the pending resolution declares that the arbitration agreement should provide for the protection of American property rights pending the outcome of the arbitration. In other words, if we arbitrate, Mexico must agree to preserve the status quo and cease their alleged acts of confiscation during the arbitration proceedings. Without this agreement the United States could not, of course, consider arbitration.

Mr. President, let me at this point refer to the amendment to the resolution proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. I think the Senator from Nebraska utterly misconceives the interpretation of the language of the resolution regarding protection of property rights. It is clear that the protection there referred to is protection on the part of the Government of Mexico and has no reference to protection by the Government of the United States.

As a matter of fact, the only controversies now existing that can be considered as subjects for arbitration, not already pro-

vided for, are those pertaining to the oil and mining industries, and the right of the Mexican Government to require a limited renunciation of American citizenship as a condition to the enjoyment of a vested right.

All other questions are either already provided for in the two existing claims conventions or involve open and flagrant violation of American rights, not denied by the Mexican Government and the violation of understandings reached as a basis for our recognition of the present Mexican Government.

As to the first, there can be no arbitration of whether Mexico has a right to violate international law; and as to the second, there can be no arbitration of our right to withdraw recognition of the present Government of Mexico.

If, however, Mexico will compensate American owners for property confiscated, and will also agree to arbitrate the question of the property rights of Americans in minerals and oil acquired before May 1, 1917, and the question of renunciation of American citizenship so far as concerns property rights, and will also cease further confiscatory acts, and preserve the status quo in American property rights as of January 1, 1926, there is no reason why friendly relations with Mexico should not be established.

Contrary to many statements which have been made the United States admits the right of Mexico to make any laws that it may choose relating to the future acquisition of property. It may provide that hereafter no American shall acquire any property in Mexico and we would have no right to complain.

I quote from Secretary Kellogg's note to Mexico of January 28, 1926:

Every sovereign has the absolute right within its own jurisdiction to make laws concerning the acquisition of property acquired in the future. This right can not be questioned by any other state. If Mexico desires to prevent the future acquisition by aliens of property rights of any nation within its jurisdiction, this Government has no suggestion whatever to make.

Indeed, if Mexico should prohibit the future investment of foreign capital in new enterprises in Mexico, we could not complain, and however it might affect Mexico, I am not sure but that it would relieve the United States of much trouble, and unless an amicable adjustment of present controversies shall be reached, I think the United States itself should discourage the future investment of capital in Mexico.

I now come to a discussion of the character of the existing controversies with Mexico.

It is generally assumed that oil constitutes the principal American interest in Mexico, but the fact is, as shown by the Senator from Arkansas, that oil interests comprise less than 25 per cent of the American interests there.

I present a table of American investments in Mexico, which I have secured from the State Department. It is the same table as that presented by the Senator from Arkansas, but I ask that it may be inserted at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

*American investments in Mexico, as reported by American consular officers, December 15, 1926*

Rural property	\$166,047,000
Urban property	25,771,000
Oil lands	318,638,000
Refineries	50,070,000
Mines	317,427,000
Smelters	25,180,000
Timber	10,935,000
Railways	248,158,000
Manufacturing enterprises	27,716,000
Merchandising enterprises	26,140,000
Public utilities	30,799,000
Concealed interests	6,938,000
Miscellaneous investments not included above	125,242,000
Total	1,389,061,000

Mr. LENROOT. I repeat that from this table it appears that the oil interests comprise less than 25 per cent of the American interests in Mexico.

Perhaps the most distressing and certainly the most flagrant violation of the rights of American citizens concern the expropriation of rural property, the American investment in which amounts to \$166,047,000.

Article 27 of the Mexican constitution provides for the expropriation of private lands, but it is provided that such expropriation shall be only for means of public utility and by means of indemnification.

With the purpose of Mexico to provide lands for her people, we must all sympathize. It is a most laudable undertaking, and her right to make such expropriation of lands of American nationals upon proper indemnification has never been denied.

But article 27 of the constitution lays down rules for compensation and method of payment that are shocking to the American sense of justice. It is provided first that the assessed value of the lands must be the measure of damages, if such assessed value has been declared by the owner, but if not it is the value for taxation placed by the assessor, plus 10 per cent, it being provided that the payment of the tax by the owner is an implied acceptance of the correctness of the valuation. The American national is thus put in this position: If the assessment is made very low for the purpose of fixing a low value for purposes of expropriation, if he pays the tax he thereby accepts the value placed upon it and thus loses the major part of the value of his property, or if he does not pay the tax he loses it anyway for the nonpayment of taxes. This is a very good illustration, indeed, of the present Mexican idea of justice.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. LENROOT. I yield for only a question.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Is that a provision peculiar to Mexican law? I was under the impression that they had a similar law in Australia; that the Government at all times had the right to take over property at the amount that the owner agreed upon for taxation purposes?

Mr. LENROOT. In Mexico the owner does not fix any amount. The assessor fixes it, and the owner must take the value so fixed plus 10 per cent.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, he has an opportunity to fix the value. That is the case in Australia. The owner has an opportunity to fix the value of his property and the Government has the right to take it over at the value at which he fixes it.

Mr. LENROOT. There can be no judicial review of the value of property taken over except for improvements made subsequent to the time when the value of the property was fixed for taxation purposes.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what the taxes amount to? It is entirely possible that the Government might impose such taxation as would be equivalent to confiscation.

Mr. LENROOT. That question is always present. I think that the Government can go very far. That is not involved, however, in the matter I am now discussing, which is the right of expropriation and not the right of taxation.

Mr. FLETCHER. I did not know but what the Senator might have some figures as to the taxes.

Mr. LENROOT. No; I have not.

But this is not all. The constitution provides that the payment for certain of the lands will be made in 20 annual installments, not cash as international law requires, and the owner is further compelled to accept State bonds, not bonds of the Federal Government, but State bonds as his compensation. In other words, instead of compensation there is substituted a promise to pay of little or no value.

But quite apart from this, the Mexican Government has not even followed these provisions of the constitution. I understand that up to this time there have been 121 agrarian expropriations and 662 property seizures, and not one dollar has been paid in compensation and not a single bond has been issued therefor, as the constitution provides.

Here we have, first, what amounts to partial confiscation by virtue of the provision of the Mexican constitution, and, second, complete confiscation regardless of the constitution.

This is one of the matters that can not be arbitrated, for we can not arbitrate a question of right to confiscate.

There are not only large estates involved, but many small ones. I have read a letter from a man in Kansas to a Member of this body. He stated that about 30 years ago an American colony moved to Mexico and acquired a tract of land, which they divided among themselves. His son and daughter are now living there on 80 acres of land. He writes that the colony has been notified by officials that they propose to take 2,400 acres of their land and give it to the Mexicans.

I have seen a letter from a citizen of Oklahoma, wherein he states that he owned two city blocks in a small city in Mexico and 240 acres of land. The two city blocks have been confiscated and a part of the 240 acres without any offer of compensation.

In 1925 a decree was issued by President Calles appropriating 1,755 hectares of the property of an American, for which he has received no compensation.

I could give many instances of this character that have come to my attention, and I repeat that, so far as I can ascertain, no American has yet received any compensation for lands taken under Mexican agrarian laws.

Instead of bullying Mexico, the fact is that our Government has been most lenient and in the desire of Mexico to provide lands for her people has been most sympathetic and helpful.



In fact, our representatives agreed that for the purpose of providing communal lands for villages our Government would agree that for expropriations not exceeding 1,755 hectares for each village bonds would be accepted in payment of the claims of American nationals, but that cash must be paid for all lands taken in excess of that amount. But so far as I can ascertain no American has received either cash or bonds for his lands taken. These are matters, Mr. President, that can not be arbitrated, and I am frank to say that I do not see how we can continue any relations with Mexico unless she shall have some regard for her solemn promises and international obligations.

We want nothing of Mexico except friendship and good will and an observance of those fundamental obligations without which there can be no intercourse between nations. Is this unreasonable to insist upon?

I now come to the oil and mining questions which involve disputes which I believe are proper subjects for arbitration. However certain we may feel of the correctness of the American position—and I believe every Member of the Senate indorses it if he has investigated it or will indorse it after investigation—yet the fact is that Mexico does make a claim in respect to these questions that, however shocking it may be to our American sense of justice, it would be proper to submit to an arbitral tribunal, provided that American rights shall be protected pending the outcome of the arbitration.

On January 31, 1917, Mexico adopted a new constitution to take the place of the constitution adopted in 1857. This constitution went into effect May 1, 1917. The avowed purpose of the new constitution was to secure for the great masses of Mexican people better social and economic conditions; and to insure against changes that might be made by the Mexican Congress, the method by which this was to be brought about was placed in their organic law.

As I wish to confine myself strictly to the matter in controversy between the two countries, I will only say that this constitution of 1917 is of the most advanced character, and time alone will tell whether it will accomplish the aims hoped for. If it does, we should look upon it with approbation, even though many of its provisions may not accord with our ideas of economic welfare or justice. At any rate, it is none of our business except as it and the laws enacted pursuant to it affect the rights of American citizens and nationals of other countries to whom we owe a duty in the premises.

From the time of the Spanish conquest of Mexico until 1884 the Government held the title to all deposits of the subsoil in Mexico. In November, 1884, a new mining code was enacted. Article 10 provided:

The following substances are the exclusive property of the owner of the land, who may therefore develop and enjoy them without the formality of entry or special adjudication.

Petroleum and gaseous substances are then specifically enumerated as belonging to the owner of the land. In 1892, and again in 1900, the mining code was revised, but in each of these revisions it was declared that the owner of the surface lands was the owner of the petroleum and mineral fuels beneath.

Between 1884 and 1917 American citizens acquired large tracts of land in Mexico, not by concessions from the Government, as is often asserted, but through purchase from private owners.

Article 27 of the constitution of 1917 provides that—

The ownership of lands and waters comprised within the limits of the national territory is vested originally in the nation, which has had and has the right to transmit the title thereof to private persons, thereby constituting private property. Private property shall not be expropriated except for reasons of public utility and by means of indemnification.

Later on in the same section it is provided:

In the nation is vested direct ownership of all minerals or substances.

And among other substances petroleum and all hydrocarbons are enumerated.

Article 14 provides that no retroactive law shall be enacted.

The effect of these provisions, and laws enacted and decrees issued pursuant to them, has been the subject of a long diplomatic correspondence from 1917, under the administration of President Wilson, down to November 17 last. On December 31, 1925, the Mexican Congress passed a law carrying into full effect the provisions of article 27 of the constitution relating to petroleum.

Between 1917 and 1926 the regulation of petroleum rights was by executive acts. In 1921 five cases were decided by the Supreme Court of Mexico in favor of American nationals, the court holding that article 27 of the constitution was not retroactive and rights acquired before May 1, 1917, were not affected thereby. In 1923 President Harding appointed Charles Beecher

Warren and John Barton Payne as commissioners to meet representatives of the Mexican Government, it not having been recognized at that time. The commission held many meetings in the City of Mexico, beginning on May 14, 1923, and ending on August 15, 1923. As a result of these meetings a full understanding was had as to the protection of American property rights in Mexico, and it was upon the solemn promises there made that the present Government of Mexico was recognized by the United States.

The law of December 31, 1925, obliges the owners of vested rights in petroleum lands secured prior to May 1, 1917, to surrender those rights for concessions of not more than 50 years, the date of the concession to date from the time of the first exploitation of the land for oil, or the date of the contract for the exploitation.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, was the law of which the Senator is now speaking agreed to by Payne and Warren?

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, no. This is the law enacted on December 31, 1925; long afterwards.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Long afterwards. That is, they made an agreement which looked to the compensation of Americans, and that was followed by this law?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it would be proper to say that the controversy is over whether or not they did make such an agreement. The statement is in the record, and if the Senator will look at it he will come to the conclusion that there is much room for controversy as to whether or not they entered into such an agreement.

Mr. REED of Missouri. What record—the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. BORAH. No; in the record of the proceedings of the commission.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not want to interrupt the Senator, but I want to get the point clear, because as he stated it it was not clear to me.

Mr. LENROOT. There was nothing of that kind in the agreement.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator's opinion is that the agreement made with Payne and Warren, acting for the United States, did provide for the protection of American interests?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; there are two claims, as I understand, made by Mexico. As I understand, they do not deny that the agreement as made was contrary to the law they have now passed, but there was a provision in the statement that constituted the understanding that it was not for an unlimited time.

Mr. BORAH. No.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; there was.

Mr. BORAH. Well, I will not interrupt the Senator now. I will discuss the matter later.

Mr. LENROOT. Then the contention is also made that, even if there was a complete agreement, it did not have the force of a treaty, and therefore was not binding.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator from Idaho has the view that our rights probably were not protected in that arrangement?

Mr. BORAH. My contention is that the language which was employed by the commissioners upon the part of the United States and the language which was employed upon the part of the Mexican commissioners did not result in an agreement. It amounted to a reservation upon the part of both Governments of their rights.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Of course, the Senator would not maintain, even if that was true, that that would afford any justification to Mexico if Mexico has done any confiscatory acts?

Mr. BORAH. Quite right.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator would simply claim that this specific agreement not existing had not, of course, been breached. I beg the Senator's pardon for the interruption.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, so that everyone may form his own conclusions, I am going to ask consent to insert at the end of my remarks also the understanding, or whatever it may be termed, the statement made at the last formal meeting, held in the City of Mexico on August 2, 1923, by the United States-Mexican Commission, and approved by the Executives of the two Governments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNARY in the chair). Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, would it inconvenience the Senator if I should read it? It is brief:

The American commissioners have stated in behalf of their Government that the Government of the United States now reserves, and reserves should diplomatic relations between the two countries be resumed, all the rights of the citizens of the United States in respect to the subsoil under the surface of lands in Mexico owned by citizens

of the United States, or in which they have an interest in whatever form owned or held, under the laws and constitution of Mexico in force prior to the promulgation of the new constitution, May 1, 1917, and under the principles of international law and equity. The Mexican commissioners, while sustaining the principles hereinbefore set forth in this statement, but reserving the rights of the Mexican Government under its laws as to lands in connection with which no positive act of the character specified in this statement has been performed or in relation to which no intention of the character specified in this statement has been manifested, and its rights with reference thereto under the principles of international law, state in behalf of their Government that they recognize the right of the United States Government to make any reservations of or in behalf of the rights of its citizens.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I think it is very plain that both sides made reservations. The reservation made by Mexico was, as to lands, as to the subsoil, where no positive acts were performed, that they did not recognize any rights in American nationals; but as to all others they do, and that includes every producing well in Mexico existing on May 1, 1917.

The law of December 31, 1925, obliges the owners of vested rights in petroleum lands secured prior to May 1, 1917, to surrender those rights for concessions of not more than 50 years, the date of the concession to date from the time of the first exploitation of the land for oil or the date of the contract for the exploitation. The applicant was required to apply for the concession before December 31, 1926; and, failing to do so, his property was declared forfeited to the Government. In addition, an American owner, before he could secure a concession in exchange for his title, was required to enter into an agreement before the Mexican Department of Foreign Affairs that he will be considered Mexican in respect to his property, and not to invoke the protection of the United States Government, under penalty, in case of breach, of forfeiture to the Government of the concession acquired.

Here is the crux of the oil controversy: An American on May 1, 1917, had a fee title to land and all the oil in the soil under the surface. If he had performed a positive act with reference to that oil, that title is admitted by Mexico to-day. That was a vested right. It was his to do with as he chose, subject only to the payment of taxes and police regulations regarding the drilling of wells and production of oil. In exchange for this vested right the Mexican Government proposes to give him a lease for not more than 50 years, the lease to be dated back to the time when he began work; but he can not even do this without first renouncing his American citizenship with respect to his property and agreeing not to invoke the protection of the United States, irrespective of any wrongs committed against his rights by the Mexican Government.

Mr. WATSON. Is that subject to arbitration?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; and I am coming to that. I think it is subject to arbitration.

I ask any American citizen if he regards a lease as equivalent to a fee title here in our own country, and yet that is exactly Mexico's contention.

Remember these are fee titles granted in perpetuity and acquired by Americans prior to May 1, 1917, the date the new Mexican constitution went into effect.

I have no doubt but that many will say, if these are the facts, what is there to arbitrate? What possible claim can Mexico make to justify such a course? I admit that it is difficult to see how even an honest dispute can arise upon this question, and yet Mexico does set up a very novel theory. It is in effect that as the original grant of the subsoil was from the Government, it can withdraw the grant at any time before any rights arising out of the grant have been exercised.

If that doctrine should apply in the United States, Congress could take over without compensation all the minerals in lands which have been patented since the beginning of the Republic, except those which have been exploited for mineral or sold at a price which was based upon the possibility of minerals therein.

Then Mexico makes the novel claim that a lease is equivalent to a title, and that it has the right to require a renunciation of nationality with respect to property claimed as a condition to recognition of any rights whatever.

These claims of Mexico are novel, indeed, and yet they are of such a character that it would be desirable to arbitrate them, provided there be protection of American rights pending the outcome of the arbitration, and it is for that reason that I shall vote for the pending resolution.

I have tried to give an outline of the real nature of our controversies with Mexico. It is unfortunate that up to this time its Government has not had a greater regard for its international obligations. As I stated at the outset, the United States has been patient and forbearing with Mexico, more so than we

would have been with a strong country under like circumstances. I suggest that anyone who ventures to criticize the administration of President Wilson, or of President Harding, or of President Coolidge, with regard to his Mexican policy, should point out the things they have done that constitute wrongs against Mexico.

We do not seek to control the internal affairs of Mexico. Their confiscation under their constitution of all churches and places of public worship may shock us, but that is their affair, and no concern of ours, except as American rights may be involved. We admit that they have the right to make such laws as they see fit for the future. They may deport every American in Mexico, and, so far as international law is concerned, we could not complain. We desire peace and friendship with Mexico. If they desire to exclude American capital in the future, they may do so. With their aspirations of Mexico for the Mexicans we find no fault. All that we ask is that in accomplishing their object they shall observe their international obligations, and where there is an honest dispute as to the extent or nature of those obligations, we should be willing to submit the matter to arbitration.

I do not anticipate war with Mexico. I know nothing of the course the administration proposes to pursue more than the general public knows, but I venture the opinion that unless Mexico shall evidence a willingness in good faith to settle pending questions upon the basis of justice and equity, governed by rules of international law, recognition of the existing Government should be withdrawn, the embargo upon the shipment of arms raised, and all investment of American capital in Mexico discouraged in the future, until such time as Mexico shall be willing to assume and fulfill her international obligations.

In closing, the Senator from Arkansas said that this was no time for indecision or timidity. I want to repeat and emphasize that statement, but I propose to stand upon and for the unquestioned rights and duties and obligations of the United States, rather than condone offenses of Mexico.

It is intimated by some that regardless of what Mexico might do or fail to do, there should be no withdrawal of recognition, there should be no raising of the embargo upon arms, and I wonder what their solution would be in case of Mexico's refusal to arbitrate and refusal to perform what are admitted to be her international obligations.

I think this is a time when, instead of encouraging Mexico to further violate her international obligations, it is the duty of every Senator to take the position that it is Mexico's duty to fulfill and perform her obligations. If she shall finally refuse to perform her clear duty under international law, I see nothing left except to take the course I have suggested, and we will not be without a distinguished precedent if such a course be taken.

In March, 1912, under the authority of the Congress, President Taft issued a proclamation creating an embargo upon the shipment of all arms to Mexico. That embargo remained in operation until the 3d day of February, 1914, when President Wilson, still acting under the authority of the original resolution, lifted the embargo, allowing free shipment of arms to Mexico. The proclamation is short, and reads as follows:

Whereas by a proclamation of the President issued on March 14, 1912, under a joint resolution of Congress approved by the President on the same day, it was declared that there existed in Mexico conditions of domestic violence which were promoted by the use of arms or munitions of war procured from the United States; and

Whereas by the joint resolution above mentioned it thereupon became unlawful to export arms or munitions of war to Mexico except under such limitations and exceptions as the President should prescribe:

Now, therefore, I, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America, hereby proclaim that, as the conditions on which the proclamation of March 14, 1912, was based have essentially changed, and as it is desirable to place the United States with reference to the exportation of arms or munitions of war to Mexico in the same position as other powers, the said proclamation is hereby revoked.

Therefore, under proclamation issued by President Wilson in 1914, the shipment of arms to Mexico was freely allowed, until the 19th day of October, 1915, covering a period of a little over a year. On October 19, 1915, President Wilson, still acting under the authority of the resolution of March 14, 1912, again set up the embargo, but on the same day, and later in the day, he modified that proclamation, permitting the shipment of arms to Carranza and his followers, but to no one else.

Mr. President, there is no one of us who would not, for the reasons so well stated by the Senator from Arkansas, regret beyond words the necessity, if the necessity should arise, to withdraw recognition or raise the embargo upon the shipment of arms to Mexico. For that reason I favor this resolution. Every possible effort should be made by the Government to

secure an amicable adjustment of the difficulties, but if that shall fail, if Mexico shall refuse either to arbitrate such questions as are properly arbitrable, or shall continue, without any warrant whatever, to confiscate property of American nationals, then I see no remedy for the assertion of the rights and duties of the United States than to take the course I have indicated. I hope that will not be necessary.

## EXHIBIT A

[Extracts from the Mexican constitution of 1917, translated by H. N. Branch, LL.B., the Sorrento, Washington, D. C., March, 1917]

ART. 14. No law shall be given retroactive effect to the prejudice of any person whatsoever.

No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, property, possessions, or rights without due process of law instituted before a duly created court, in which the essential elements of procedure are observed and in accordance with previously existing laws.

In criminal cases no penalty shall be imposed by mere analogy or even by a priori evidence, but the penalty shall be decreed by a law in every respect applicable to the crime in question.

In civil suits the final judgment shall be according to the letter of the juridical interpretation of the law; in the absence of the latter, the general legal principles shall govern.

ART. 27. The ownership of lands and waters comprised within the limits of the national territory is vested originally in the nation, which has had, and has, the right to transmit title thereof to private persons, thereby constituting private property.

Private property shall not be expropriated except for reasons of public utility and by means of indemnification.

The nation shall have at all times the right to impose on private property such limitations as the public interest may demand as well as the right to regulate the development of natural resources, which are susceptible of appropriation, in order to conserve them and equitably to distribute the public wealth. For this purpose necessary measures shall be taken to divide large landed estates; to develop small landed holdings; to establish new centers of rural population with such lands and waters as may be indispensable to them; to encourage agriculture and to prevent the destruction of natural resources, and to protect property from damage detrimental to society. Settlements, hamlets situated on private property, and communes which lack lands or water or do not possess them in sufficient quantities for their needs shall have the right to be provided with them from the adjoining properties, always having due regard for small landed holdings. Wherefore, all grants of lands made up to the present time under the decree of January 6, 1915, are confirmed. Private property acquired for the said purposes shall be considered as taken for public utility.

In the nation is vested direct ownership of all minerals or substances which in veins, layers, masses, or beds constitute deposits whose nature is different from the components of the land, such as minerals from which metals and metalloids used for industrial purposes are extracted; beds of precious stones, rock salt, and salt lakes formed directly by marine waters; products derived from the decomposition of rocks when their exploitation requires underground work; phosphates which may be used for fertilizers; solid mineral fuels; petroleum and all hydrocarbons—solid, liquid, or gaseous.

In the nation is likewise vested the ownership of the waters of territorial seas to the extent and in the terms fixed by the law of nations; those of lakes and inlets of bays; those of interior lakes of natural formation which are directly connected with flowing waters; those of principal rivers or tributaries from which the points at which there is a permanent current of water in their beds to their mouths, whether they flow to the sea or cross two or more States; those of intermittent streams which traverse two or more States in their main body; the waters of rivers, streams, or ravines when they bound the national territory or that of the States; waters extracted from mines; and the beds and banks of the lakes and streams hereinbefore mentioned, to the extent fixed by law. Any other stream of water not comprised within the foregoing enumeration shall be considered as an integral part of the private property through which it flows; but the development of the waters when they pass from one landed property to another shall be considered of public utility and shall be subject to the provisions prescribed by the States.

In the cases to which the two foregoing paragraphs refer the ownership of the nation is inalienable and may not be lost by prescription; concessions shall be granted by the Federal Government to private parties or civil or commercial corporations organized under the laws of Mexico only on condition that said resources be regularly developed, and on the further condition that the legal provisions be observed.

Legal capacity to acquire ownership of lands and waters of the nation shall be governed by the following provisions:

I. Only Mexicans by birth or naturalization and Mexican companies have the right to acquire ownership in lands, waters, and their appurtenances, or to obtain concessions to develop mines, waters, or mineral fuels in the Republic of Mexico. The nation may grant the same right

to foreigners, provided they agree before the Department of Foreign Affairs to be considered Mexicans in respect to such property, and accordingly not to invoke the protection of their Governments in respect to the same, under penalty, in case of breach, of forfeiture to the nation of property so acquired. Within a zone of 100 kilometers from the frontiers, and of 50 kilometers from the seacoast, no foreigner shall under any conditions acquire direct ownership of lands and waters.

II. The religious institutions known as churches, irrespective of creed, shall in no case have legal capacity to acquire, hold, or administer real property or loans made on such real property (compare second paragraph of art. 27 of 1857); all such real property or loans as may be at present held by the said religious institutions, either on their own behalf or through third parties, shall vest in the nation, and anyone shall have the right to denounce property so held. Presumptive proof shall be sufficient to declare the denunciation well founded. Places of public worship are the property of the nation, as represented by the federal government, which shall determine which of them may continue to be devoted to their present purposes. Episcopal residences, rectories, seminaries, orphan asylums, or collegiate establishments of religious institutions, convents, or any other buildings built or designed for the administration, propaganda, or teaching of the tenets of any religious creed shall forthwith vest, as of full right, directly in the nation, to be used exclusively for the public services of the federation or of the States, within their respective jurisdictions. All places of public worship which shall later be erected shall be the property of the nation.

III. Public and private charitable institutions for the sick and needy, for scientific research, or for the diffusion of knowledge, mutual-aid societies or organizations formed for any other lawful purpose, shall in no case acquire, hold, or administer loans made on real property, unless the mortgage terms do not exceed 10 years. In no case shall institutions of this character be under the patronage, direction, administration, charge, or supervision of religious corporations or institutions, nor of ministers of any religious creed or of their dependents, even though either the former or the latter shall not be in active service. (The second paragraph of the 1857 constitution and Clauses II and III of the 1917 text are largely drawn from the "Leyes de Reforma." See note to art. 130, p. 122.)

IV. Commercial stock companies shall not acquire, hold, or administer rural properties. Companies of this nature which may be organized to develop any manufacturing, mining, petroleum, or other industry, excepting only agricultural industries, may acquire, hold, or administer lands only in an area absolutely necessary for their establishments or adequate to serve the purposes indicated, which the executive of the union or of the respective State in each case shall determine.

V. Banks duly organized under the laws governing institutions of credit may make mortgage loans on rural and urban property in accordance with the provisions of the said laws, but they may not own nor administer more real property than that absolutely necessary for their direct purposes; and they may furthermore hold temporarily for the brief term fixed by law such real property as may be judicially adjudicated to them in execution proceedings.

VI. Properties held in common by coowners, hamlets situated on private property, pueblos, tribal congregations, and other settlements which, as a matter of fact or law, conserve their communal character, shall have legal capacity to enjoy in common the waters, woods, and lands belonging to them, or which may have been or shall be restored to them according to the law of January 6, 1915, until such time as the manner of making the division of the lands shall be determined by law.

VII. Excepting the corporations to which Clauses III, IV, V, and VI hereof refer, no other civil corporation may hold or administer on its own behalf real estate or mortgage loans derived therefrom, with the single exception of buildings designed directly and immediately for the purposes of the institution. The States, the Federal district, and the Territories, as well as the municipalities throughout the Republic, shall enjoy full legal capacity to acquire and hold all real estate necessary for public services.

The Federal and State laws shall determine within their respective jurisdictions those cases in which the occupation of private property shall be considered of public utility; and in accordance with the said laws the administrative authorities shall make the corresponding declaration. The amount fixed as compensation for the expropriated property shall be based on the sum at which the said property shall be valued for fiscal purposes in the catastral or revenue offices, whether this value be that manifested by the owner or merely impliedly accepted by reason of the payment of his taxes on such a basis, to which there shall be added 10 per cent. The increased value which the property in question may have acquired through improvements made subsequent to the date of the fixing of the fiscal value shall be the only matter subject to expert opinion and to judicial determination. The same procedure shall be observed in respect to objects whose value is not recorded in the revenue offices.

All proceedings, findings, decisions, and all operations of demarcation, concession, composition, judgment, compromise, alienation, or auction which may have deprived properties held in common by coowners, hamlets situated on private property, settlements, congregations, tribes, and other settlement organizations still existing since the law of June 25, 1856, of the whole or a part of their lands, woods, and waters are declared null and void; all findings, resolutions, and operations which may subsequently take place and produce the same effects shall likewise be null and void. Consequently all lands, forests, and waters of which the above-mentioned settlements may have been deprived shall be restored to them according to the decree of January 6, 1915, which shall remain in force as a constitutional law. In case the adjudication of lands, by way of restitution, be not legal in the terms of the said decree, which adjudication have been requested by any of the above entities, those lands shall nevertheless be given to them by way of grant, and they shall in no event fail to receive such as they may need. Only such lands, title to which may have been acquired in the division made by virtue of the said law of June 25, 1856, or such as may be held in undisputed ownership for more than 10 years are excepted from the provision of nullity, provided their area does not exceed 50 hectares. (1 hectare=2.47 acres.) Any excess over this area shall be returned to the commune and the owner shall be indemnified. All laws of restitution enacted by virtue of this provision shall be immediately carried into effect by the administrative authorities. Only members of the commune shall have the right to the lands destined to be divided, and the rights to these lands shall be inalienable so long as they remain undivided; the same provision shall govern the right of ownership after the division has been made. The exercise of the rights pertaining to the nation by virtue of this article shall follow judicial process; but as a part of this process and by order of the proper tribunals, which order shall be issued within the maximum period of one month, the administrative authorities shall proceed without delay to the occupation, administration, auction, or sale of the lands and waters in question, together with all their appurtenances, and in no case may the acts of the said authorities be set aside until final sentence is handed down.

During the next constitutional term the Congress and the State legislatures shall enact laws within their respective jurisdictions for the purpose of carrying out the division of large landed estates, subject to the following conditions:

(a) In each State and Territory there shall be fixed the maximum area of land which any one individual or legally organized corporation may own.

(b) The excess of the area thus fixed shall be subdivided by the owner within the period set by the laws of the respective locality; and these subdivisions shall be offered for sale on such conditions as the respective governments shall approve, in accordance with the said laws.

(c) If the owner shall refuse to make the subdivision, this shall be carried out by the local government by means of expropriation proceedings.

(d) The value of the subdivisions shall be paid in annual amounts sufficient to amortize the principal and interest within a period of not less than 20 years, during which the person acquiring them may not alienate them. The rate of interest shall not exceed 5 per cent per annum.

(e) The owner shall be bound to receive bonds of a special issue to guarantee the payment of the property expropriated. With this end in view the Congress shall issue a law authorizing the States to issue bonds to meet their agrarian obligations.

(f) The local laws shall govern the extent of the family patrimony and determine what property shall constitute the same on the basis of its inalienability; it shall not be subject to attachment nor to any charge whatever.

All contracts and concessions made by former governments from and after the year 1876 which shall have resulted in the monopoly of lands, waters, and natural resources of the Nation by a single individual or corporation are declared subject to revision, and the Executive is authorized to declare those null and void which seriously prejudice the public interest.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, in the confusion incident to our present international complications it must be admitted that the situation has not been aggravated by Democratic criticism either in this Chamber or elsewhere. President Coolidge and his Secretary of State have at all times had our sympathy and good wishes. We preferred not political advantage, but that our foreign differences might be adjusted and international friction might be removed.

Carrying out that policy we have studiously withheld strictures and refused comment. We have not at all times been agreed upon the wisdom of the administration's course and would not now have our silence indicate our assent. Many steps have been taken in its execution that in the opinion of some of us were somewhat blundersome and unwise. The antagonism of our State Department toward Sacasa in Nicaragua and the apparent favoritism manifested by it in the factional

differences of that country, its undiplomatic and sometimes too aggressive action toward one or the other of those factions, the creation of far too many neutral zones, the landing of marines and prompt recognition of Diaz were some of the incidents in the general policy of our Government that appeared to be mistakes: the sometimes amateurish and undiplomatic effusions from our American ambassador to Mexico, the far too often intolerant and impatient attitude manifested in state papers, as well as state expressions, and the too frequent show of what appeared to be a vain and dictatorial position upon the part of our State Department has met our disapprobation.

But, sirs, we said nothing. We knew that the situation was delicate, the task was a difficult one, and we hoped that time might bring a change or that some incident might occur which would work a reconciliation and influence a better understanding.

But out of it all, Mr. President, one thing is sure, we have been taught the lesson that "interest does not tie nations together"—it too often separates them.

May I say that while it naturally fills our hearts with some degree of national pride to see our captains of industry going into every country planting American dollars and locating American industries, I fear very much that in time it will grow as a cancerous sore and effect our international peace and understanding.

It seems to me to be the order of the day that where American capital was invested in foreign countries, it has caused that investor to permit himself to become too greatly interested in the affairs of that country, and too often that interest has influenced him in international controversies to favor the foreign country as against his own.

In the consideration of treaties it seems now that the voice of American capital is raised just to the extent of its foreign investment. Not only does that situation apply in the consideration of treaties, but its unshapely hand with all of its baneful influence can be seen in our debt-funding agreements.

And yet, Mr. President, that is so easy to understand. Selfishness is not a very attractive quality and it is found in not a few of us. The average person seeks to promote his own interest and his vision is too frequently obscured by the selfish viewpoint. And when American interests invest and establish their industries and locate their factories, whether in Turkey or elsewhere, and controversies arise between those countries and our own, naturally the high authorities of those countries bring pressure upon those investors to exert their influence here. Being desirous not only to entrench themselves more firmly in the trade and commerce of that country, but to win favor with the powers that be, it is not a difficult matter for them to lose sight of our interest, and look beyond to the interest of the foreign country.

This condition to-day is most glaring respecting our debt settlement with France. Those who are doing business in that country are unwilling to antagonize those who direct its affairs or ruffle the feelings either of the press or the people of that country—so they pursue the easy way and adopt the highly selfish method of favoring French interests as against the interests of their own country. It is this new condition that threatens trouble and will in time compel alteration in our economic structure and a change in our domestic policies.

I need not in this discussion elaborate upon the proposition that a policy of protection founded upon the theory of giving protection to American labor can not be maintained if those interests that have sought protection, mass the revenues drawn from the sweat of American labor and send it into foreign countries, that factories might there be established and foreign labor there be employed, will in time destroy the very edifice that they themselves build.

It takes not the brain of a seer to vision the future with its many delicate problems if American interests continue to expand and weave their interests into the web of international controversies the world over.

May I be permitted to say that so long as capital finds its best field for profit here, not only will our great and varied natural resources be rapidly developed, but our peace will be reasonably assured. When American investments elsewhere attain the proportion as in the case of Mexico, where interests in dollars of Americans surpasses all other foreign investments and are greater than those possessed by Mexicans themselves, international differences naturally arise.

Of course, it has been the traditional policy of this Government—and it should ever be—to protect the lives and property of its citizens; but, Mr. President, that does not mean that every time a controversy arises over the property rights of one of its citizens in a foreign country we must be precipitated into a war. That policy does not license American citizens to

go upon their exploiting expeditions and speculate upon the whims and caprices of an unstable government.

We have labored long to bring the peoples to the south of us close to us. We have courted their friendship and coveted their love. We have tried to do those things that might weld us closer together. We have desired to interpret their feelings and adjust ourselves to their aspirations. Slow, but sure, have we climbed together to the heights of a better understanding. It would be an international catastrophe for this Government to adopt or pursue any policy that would cause South and Central American people to doubt our faith or lose confidence in our loyalty.

An intermeddling and dictatorial attitude upon our part can not advance, but very likely will destroy the hopes of such achievement. The tread of marines, piercing eyes from iron cruisers, and sharp notes from would-be diplomats destroy rather than make for common understanding.

In the consideration of this resolution to-day, conceived in the broadest feeling of international friendship, it is well that we should retrospect and recall for the moment the policies of other administrations when tense and delicate questions arose between us and Mexico.

I shall not forget, when I first entered public life and sharp differences existed between our Government and Mexico, how free was the whole controversy from partisan politics. During the first year of Mr. Wilson's administration it will ever be to the glory of the Republican Party and to the credit of Republican leadership in this Chamber that he received the unstinted cooperation of practically all of the membership of the Republican Party. There were, as I now recall, two exceptions. One was the late prisoner at the bar, Albert B. Fall, then a Senator from the State of New Mexico. In his case, never did more vitriolic criticism fall from the lips of man. Day after day upon the floor of this Chamber he hurled his anathemas of abuse at Wilson and his Mexican policy. Of course, in the light of what has since happened and the revelations incident to that warm and unflinching friendship between him and Edward L. Doheny, we can understand now more clearly than then the reasons that prompted those utterances and the motives that supported his pleas for intervention.

The other exception was in the case of the Republican nominee for President in the campaign of 1920. I shall not advert to that. I pass it by as one of those political mistakes that even the best of politicians sometimes make. But the fine patriotism and nonpartisan action displayed at that time by the rank and file of the Republican Party, and especially Republican leadership in this body and the House of Representatives, minimizes the efforts of those gentlemen and reflects credit upon you.

What were the facts that confronted Wilson in those days? During the last two years of the administration of Mr. Taft there was a fight being waged between contending factions in Mexico. Madero, the leader of one faction, and by many declared to be the champion of the masses, had won the Presidency. General Huerta was the officer then in charge of his military forces. There were many circumstances pointing to a connivance upon the part of our ambassador in Mexico with the Huerta clique to oust Madero and advance Huerta to the Presidency. Indeed, in a remarkable series of articles written by a reputable correspondent, Robert H. Murray, and published in *Harpers Weekly* of that year, the statement was made that the murder of Madero was conceived in the American Embassy and was carried out with the ambassador's knowledge. No darker blot smears the pages of our diplomatic history than the incidents surrounding that period in Mexico. And while, at that time, our Government, through an imprudent and incompetent diplomat, projected itself too much into the internal affairs of Mexico, it must be said for Mr. Taft that he refused to recognize the Huerta régime.

When Mr. Wilson became President he followed the policy bequeathed to him by his predecessor, and likewise refused to recognize Huerta as the head of the Mexican Government. The Wilson policy was to refuse to take sides as between the factions in Mexico. He cherished the desire to see a stable government established there. He pursued the policy of encouragement rather than intermeddling—a policy of permitting them to settle their own internal disturbances and work out their own domestic differences without any interference from us. The only rule laid down by the Wilson administration in those delicate days was that the lives of American citizens and American property should be protected.

Mr. Wilson permitted the shipment of arms and ammunition to the Huerta Government, following the policy inaugurated by Mr. Taft. And only when he was convinced that the constitutionalists under Carranza were drawing to his support the rank and file of the Mexican people, meeting success after

success against stupendous odds, obtaining arms only through conquering the enemy, did he change that policy and permit both sides to obtain arms and ammunition in the United States. That was the first change in policy upon the part of President Wilson touching the shipment of arms and munitions into Mexico. It was commended throughout the country. There was not a dissenting voice at the time. Mr. Lodge, who was then the ranking member of the minority on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, said:

I am in hearty accord and agreement with that.

Senator Root said:

The message is admirable in its general tone and spirit.

And then what happened? This action did promote peace, for in only a few months the Huerta régime crumbled and he was forced out of Mexico. That policy continued and no change was proclaimed until it was clearly demonstrated that Carranza and his following had obtained control of all the States of Mexico and that Villa and his following were but a band of bandits. Not until then did the President recognize Carranza as the head of the constitutional Government and place an embargo on arms and ammunitions to any revolutionist in that country.

Throughout the tense situation Mr. Wilson followed the course adopted by Mr. Lincoln, when he said:

I am not controlling events but events are controlling themselves

And so to-day, amid all this confusion and anxiety in our dealings with Mexico, it is refreshing to recall those high phrases of sentiment and speech, those lofty ideals of patience and toleration written in the words and deeds of President Wilson. They brought us into a finer spirit of cooperation and friendship with South and Central American countries than we had ever before known.

They carried a realization to our weaker brothers of the south that their "big brother" of the north was ever ready to cooperate for their progress and their advancement. The seeds of suspicion were removed and the fangs of distrust torn from every Latin-American breast. Our mutual interests were tied and welded by hooks of steel, a trade and commerce established that assured reciprocal benefits, and a common understanding born and a friendship fomented that was beautiful and refreshing.

And what were those policies? What were those expressions that carried hope and comfort to those struggling peoples? Here are a few excerpts taken from those remarkable state papers:

Not merely because they lie at our very doors. That, of course, makes us more vividly and more constantly conscious of them, and every instinct of neighborly interest and sympathy is aroused and quickened by them; but that is only one element in the determination of our duty. We are glad to call ourselves the friends of Mexico, and we shall, I hope, have many an occasion, in happier times as well as in these days of trouble and confusion, to show that our friendship is genuine and disinterested, capable of sacrifice, and every generous manifestation.

The peace, prosperity, and contentment of Mexico means more, much more, to us than merely an enlarged field for our commerce and enterprise. They mean an enlargement of the field of self-government and the realization of the hopes and rights of a nation with whose best aspirations, so long suppressed and disappointed we deeply sympathize. We shall yet prove to the Mexican people that we know how to serve them without first thinking how we shall serve ourselves.

America in particular—America north and south and upon both continents—waits upon the development of Mexico; and that development can be sound and lasting only if it be the product of a genuine freedom, a just and ordered government founded upon law. Only so can it be peaceful or fruitful of the benefits of peace. Mexico has a great and enviable future before her, if only she chose and attained the paths of honest constitutional government.

It was our duty at least to volunteer our good offices—to offer to assist, if we might, in effecting some arrangement which would bring relief and peace and set up a universally acknowledged political authority there.

The Government of the United States does not stand in the same case with the other great governments of the world in respect of what is happening or what is likely to happen in Mexico. We offer our good offices not only because of our genuine desire to play the part of a friend, but also because we are expected by the powers of the world to act as Mexico's nearest friend.

We wish to act in these circumstances in the spirit of the most earnest and disinterested friendship. It is our purpose in whatever we do or propose in this perplexing and distressing situation not only to pay the most scrupulous regard to the sovereignty and independence of Mexico—that we take as a matter of course to which we are bound

by every obligation of right and honor—but also to give every possible evidence that we act in the interest of Mexico alone and not in the interest of any person or body of persons who may have personal or property claims in Mexico which they may feel that they have the right to press. We are seeking to counsel Mexico for her own good and in the interest of her own peace, and not for any other purpose whatever. The Government of the United States would deem itself discredited if it had any selfish or ulterior purpose in transactions where the peace, happiness, and prosperity of a whole people are involved. It is acting as its friendship for Mexico not as any selfish interest dictates.

Meanwhile, what is it our duty to do? Clearly everything that we do must be rooted in patience and done with calm and disinterested deliberation. Impatience on our part would be childish and would be fraught with every risk of wrong and folly. We can afford to exercise the self-restraint of a really great Nation which realizes its own strength and scorns to misuse it. It was our duty to offer our active assistance. It is now our duty to show what true neutrality will do to enable the people of Mexico to set their affairs in order again and wait for a further opportunity to offer our friendly counsels. The door is not closed against the resumption, either upon the initiative of Mexico or upon our own, of the effort to bring order out of confusion by friendly cooperative action should fortunate occasion offer.

As high and lofty as are those utterances, it was the Mobile speech that will ever remain historic, and should be the policy for our future guidance.

It was in that remarkable speech, uttered so near Mobile Bay, the waters of which lash and kiss the shores of South and Central American countries, when he said:

There is one peculiarity about the history of the Latin-American states which I am sure they are keenly aware of. You hear of "concessions" to foreign capitalists in Latin America. You do not hear of concessions to foreign capitalists in the United States. They are not granted concessions. They are invited to make investments. The work is ours, though they are welcome to invest in it. We do not ask them to supply the capital and do the work. It is an invitation, not a privilege; and states that are obliged, because their territory does not lie within the main field of modern enterprise and action, to grant concessions are in this condition, that foreign interests are apt to dominate their domestic affairs, a condition of affairs always dangerous and apt to become intolerable. What these states are going to see, therefore, is an emancipation from the subordination, which has been inevitable to foreign enterprise and an assertion of the splendid character which, in spite of these difficulties, they have again and again been able to demonstrate. The dignity, the courage, the self-possession, the self-respect of the Latin-American states, their achievements in the face of all these adverse circumstances deserve nothing but the admiration and applause of the world. They have had harder bargains driven with them in the matter of loans than any other peoples in the world. Interest has been exacted of them that was not exacted of anybody else, because the risk was said to be greater; and then securities were taken that destroyed the risk—an admirable arrangement for those who were forcing the terms. I rejoice in nothing so much as in the prospect that they will now be emancipated from these conditions, and we ought to be the first to take part in assisting in that emancipation. I think some of these gentlemen have already had occasion to bear witness that the Department of State in recent months has tried to serve them in that wise. In the future they will draw closer and closer to us because of circumstances of which I wish to speak with moderation and, I hope, without indiscretion.

We must prove ourselves their friends and champions upon terms of equality and honor. You can not be friends upon any other terms than upon the terms of equality. You can not be friends at all except upon the terms of honor. We must show ourselves friends by comprehending their interest, whether it squares with our own interest or not. It is a very perilous thing to determine the foreign policy of a nation in the terms of material interest. It is not only unfair to those with whom you are dealing, but it is degrading as regards your own actions.

Comprehension must be the soil in which shall grow all the fruits of friendship, and there is a reason and a compulsion lying behind all this which is dearer than anything else to the thoughtful men of America. I mean the development of constitutional liberty in the world. Human rights, national integrity, and opportunity as against material interests—that, ladies and gentlemen, is the issue which we now have to face. I want to take this occasion to say that the United States will never again seek one additional foot of territory by conquest. She will devote herself to showing that she knows how to make honorable and fruitful use of the territory she has, and she must regard it as one of the duties of friendship to see that from no quarter are material interests made superior to human liberty and national opportunity. I say this not with a single thought that anyone will gainsay it but merely to fix in our consciousness what our real relationship with the rest of America is. It is the relationship of a family of mankind devoted to the development of true constitutional liberty. We know that that is the soil out of which the best enterprise springs.

We know that this is a cause which we are making in common with our neighbors, because we have had to make it for ourselves.

Reference has been made here to-day to some of the national problems which confront us as a nation. What is at the heart of all our national problems? It is that we have seen the hand of material interest sometimes about to close upon our dearest rights and possessions. We have seen material interests threaten constitutional freedom in the United States. Therefore we will now know how to sympathize with those in the rest of America who have to contend with such powers not only within their borders but from outside their borders also.

I know what the response of the thought and heart of America will be to the program I have outlined, because America was created to realize a program like that. This is not America because it is rich. This is not America because it has set up for a great population great opportunities of material prosperity. America is a name which sounds in the ears of men everywhere as a synonym with individual opportunity because a synonym of individual liberty. I would rather belong to a poor nation that was free than to a rich nation that has ceased to be in love with liberty. But we shall not be poor if we love liberty, because the nation that loves liberty truly sets every man free to do his best and be his best, and that means the release of all the splendid energies of a great people who think for themselves. A nation of employees can not be free any more than a nation of employers can be.

In emphasizing the points which must unite us in sympathy and in spiritual interest with the Latin-American peoples we are only emphasizing the points of our own life, and we should prove ourselves untrue to our own traditions if we proved ourselves untrue friends to them.

Mr. President, this is a very appropriate resolution. It carries forward the sentiment of the times. We want no war with Mexico. We want no misunderstanding with those peoples. It is inconceivable that a government, led by men who have accomplished much and are carrying forward a program of reform and progress, could favor in the end an act upon the part of their government which would do injustice to the citizens of America or impair them in their international rights.

Delicate as the situation may be, tense as events may compel, I am quite sure that the American people hope and pray that a withdrawal of our recognition of the Calles government must not be forced, and such occurrences precipitated as might, in slight provocation, light the torch of war and add to the miseries of a people who are sick from adversity and weak in military strength. Let us prefer to do those things which are unrestricted by international customs, and go beyond by extending our friendship not only to the nations south of us but to the world, and let them know that while we possess the strength of a giant, we do not propose to use it as such. Let us not be too quick to resent; prefer to give than to take. There is no glory in striking one much smaller than you. The more sympathy we extend the greater will be our honor.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], as well as to the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], and I always enjoy hearing my good friend, the eloquent Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. It seems that this resolution has encountered some opposition, and while the Senator from Wisconsin speaks a little in its favor, the tenor of his speech is against it. He seems to be making arguments throughout his speech as to why we should go to war with Mexico. I am very much interested in the resolution and in having it acted upon to-day. That is in a large measure what I have been wanting the Senate to do, and I rejoice that we are at last about to get action. I am also in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

The Senator from Wisconsin has told us about President Wilson placing an embargo upon arms to Mexico in 1914, and he stated that before the day was done the President modified his orders and permitted arms to be shipped to Carranza and his forces. The same Catholic influence that besieged him and prevailed upon him to change that order, is the same influence that sought to have him go to war with Mexico in 1916 just prior to the election; the same influence that sought to drive him into war with Mexico in 1916 is seeking to have President Coolidge plunge this country into war with Mexico to-day.

I discussed this matter at some length a week ago. I aroused the ire of several distinguished Senators, among them the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. Of course, there were three of the five Roman Catholic Senators who took part in the debate; one could hardly expect them to remain silent and say nothing when I was assailing the war program of their friends the Knights of Columbus, but the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Maryland felt called upon to lecture me because I, an American Senator, had dared to read in this body a Mexican war propaganda resolution which had been passed

by American citizens who are Roman Catholics in faith and who are members of the Knights of Columbus.

Mr. President, during that speech I said that it was impossible to get the truth from the Senate gallery through the press to the people of the United States. I make that assertion again to-day. I have had sent to me from every nook and corner of the country garbled reports that went out from this Senate press gallery. It is nothing short of the suppression of the truth that I uttered here. It is so marked and brazen that I feel that the American people should know the truth through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and I am going to suggest to Henry Ford, who is a man of tremendous wealth, accumulated at the hands of the people of the United States, that he establish in this Capitol a "fair-play press bureau," and let it be known to the country and to all the newspapers that wish to use it that it will give to the people the truth that they are entitled to know from the seat of Government at Washington.

I do not think the truth about the Catholics, even if it is in their favor, should be suppressed by any press bureau and I do not think the truth about Protestants, if it is in their favor or against them, should be suppressed by any press agency that has the privilege of the Senate press gallery.

In the first place, the biggest morning daily newspaper in the Capital is a Catholic paper—the Washington Post. It has a column that it calls "The Doings of the Senate," or something to that effect, which is supposed to recite what occurs here. I made a speech here last Friday, a short speech, in which I called attention to the fact that the editor of a Roman Catholic newspaper in Buffalo, N. Y., said, on January 13, that this country would be at war with Mexico by the 1st of June. The Washington Post did not have a line about it; it suppressed the truth and kept its readers from what occurred in opposition to the war program of the Knights of Columbus.

I have here a copy of the New York Times. It carried a story of my speech last week—and what a story it was! It was headed:

Democratic colleagues turn on HEFLIN.

Was not that a well-timed and interesting headline for the Knights of Columbus and their adherents?

It is easy to understand just exactly the impression they were trying to make upon the reading public.

Resent injection in debate of religious question raised by HEFLIN.

The man who wrote that knew that he was uttering a falsehood when he wrote it. I did not inject a religious issue. The Knights of Columbus injected it; the Bishop of Philadelphia, when he congratulated them and spoke of the Catholic Church and its interest in Mexico, injected the religious issue. It is true that I discussed the issue that their un-American conduct presented to the country, and I have no apology to make for doing it.

How tense the situation here became! The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]—snow-white-haired candidate for President—comes in with innumerable tears welling up in his system. They gathered on the brink of his eyelids and then dashed down the furrows of his ambitions cheeks as he sought to get a glimpse of the White House; but, Mr. President, his performance on that day has turned the toes of his presidential boom to the daisies. When he went into the Mexican war pond swimming with the Knights of Columbus, seeking Catholic support, he lost the Protestants and the Jews. But every man to his taste. He made his choice. He had a right to go and play with them if he wanted to. On that day he spoke at length about Catholic boys and Jewish boys and Protestant boys fighting side by side in the World War. I said, "Yes; that is all right, but it has nothing to do with this resolution." It does not change a line in it. I said that I honored all those boys, and I repeat it. He said "Catholics signed the Declaration of Independence." A few of them did. Three-fourths of those who signed it were Protestants and Masons. I trust that I will not be accused of injecting a religious issue by stating that fact.

The Senator wept as he walked up and down the aisle about his seat and told how terrible it was that I should inject the religious issue into this discussion. I reminded the Senator that I would inject anything that involved the truth into a discussion to keep my country out of war, but that I never injected the religious issue into this discussion. Am I to be accused of injecting a religious issue into the discussion because I discuss a resolution passed by the Knights of Columbus at Philadelphia? If the Knights of Columbus demand that this country shall go to war and I desire to come here and discuss it, shall I refrain from doing so because they happen to be Roman Catholics?

That is not my idea of a Senator's duty to his State and country. I do not care what Senator discusses the doings of the Methodist Church—and I am a member of it—or the Baptist Church, or the Presbyterian Church, or any other church; if they are doing anything that injuriously affects the peace and safety of my country, they ought to be discussed. Why should we be so mealy-mouthed about this thing? What is there about the Roman Catholic situation in the United States that makes some people fear to discuss it? Why are some Senators afraid to speak above a whisper about this Roman Catholic power in the United States? Why should I, an American Senator, be afraid to stand up here and say what the truth warrants me in saying about a Catholic or anybody else who is caught carrying on a propaganda to involve my country in war?

Mr. President, the Senator who does his duty here is like a soldier on the firing line. He encounters many unpleasant and dangerous situations.

One of the fundamental principles in this great Government is freedom of religion, and the absolute separation of church and state. And yet when I discussed the Knights of Columbus resolution here the other day a Roman Catholic priest in the gallery back of me hissed me four or five times. I heard the noise but I did not know what it was. An American citizen sitting over here in the gallery to my right told me since that he left the Chamber when the guard refused to put the priest out. That is a miserable pass that we have come to in this administration when an American Senator can not stand in the Senate of the United States and speak against the efforts of the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus to involve us in war without being insulted by the hisses of a Catholic priest. What are we coming to, Senators? I am doing what I have a right to do as an American Senator and I will discuss Catholic activities wherever I deem them harmful to my country and if I catch one of them hissing me it will not be good for him.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. COPELAND. May I ask the Senator—if it must be in the form of a question—whether he would condemn the entire Catholic Church because one priest happened to hiss him?

Mr. HEFLIN. Oh, no. I am satisfied that there are some Catholics who would not approve it; but I am telling Senators what occurred here, and the paper that I hold in my hand tells about the hissing. I repeat, has this administration reached the point where an American Senator can not stand in the Senate unafraid and speak in behalf of his country and in behalf of peace without being annoyed and insulted by Catholics who want war with Mexico?

"The Senator from Alabama was hissed," is the headline carried by many newspapers. Why did not they tell the truth and say "A Catholic priest hissed Senator HEFLIN"? Every newspaper attack that has been made upon me was either written by a Roman Catholic editor or inspired and brought forth by a member of the Roman Catholic Church. I have letters from citizens of every State in the Union, without a single exception, many of them inclosing editorials, and saying:

Here is an editorial from a Catholic paper bitterly assailing you; but do not let it worry you; the American people are with you. Continue to tell the truth.

Not only that, Mr. President; the Washington Post, Ned McLean's Catholic paper, carried the speech of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] almost in full. The Washington Star, which I have thought in the main was a pretty fair paper and was probably freer from this influence than the other papers, published his speech in full and gave nothing of what I said. Neither one of them did. Why did they withhold from their readers the truth of the real issue? The press ought to give the truth to the public, just as an honest judge will give the truth to the jury, because here the public is the jury, and the public ought to have both sides, so that it can determine which is right. But in the case of this jury the press agent, the judge in the gallery, sends out certain portions of the testimony and he suppresses and stifles the other testimony and refuses to let the jury consider it.

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

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator complains of a conspiracy of silence against him on the part of the newspapers. My various and sundry speeches when I first came here were not appreciated by the papers, and I asked of the editors, "Have you a

conspiracy of silence against me?" They said, "Yes, Senator; and we advise you to join it." [Laughter.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Well, Mr. President, having heard the Senator frequently, he will pardon me, I know, if I say I think they were right about it. [Laughter.]

I called attention in that speech to the fact that the old constitution of Mexico had in it a provision that forbade any religion except the Catholic religion. It put the Mexican Government back of the Catholic Church, and the Washington Star, in carrying the speech of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] did not even mention what I said about these things; and the Post, in carrying the speech of the Senator from Missouri, did not give that.

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

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

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. May I ask the Senator what constitution of Mexico he refers to?

Mr. HEFLIN. The old constitution, just prior to 1917.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator will find that he is entirely mistaken.

Mr. HELFIN. I know I am exactly right. I had it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LENROOT. But there is no such provision in the constitution.

Mr. HEFLIN. The provision is in there, and I had it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, it is in the old Mexican constitution. In that speech I also showed what the new provision was, and that was that any person could join the church of his choice and worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. That is like the provision of our own Constitution; and the Star and the Post and these other papers did not mention that.

Is the press at the Capital to continue under this Catholic domination? Has the time come when the truth from an American Senator on this floor can not reach the States from the press gallery yonder?

Why, one newspaper article sent out from here went down into my State, and it paid me a nice compliment at first; but watch how it was turned around. It said, "Senator HEFLIN was regarded as a powerful man in debate, and usually carried the Senate and the gallery with him, but not on this occasion; it was entirely the other way." Do you know why that was done? It was done to leave the impression that the Senate was not in sympathy with me in condemning the efforts of the Knights of Columbus to get us into war with Mexico; to leave the impression that the gallery, composed of people coming from all over the United States, was not in sympathy with me.

I make the assertion that three-fourths of the Senate was in sympathy with my position and four-fifths of the gallery were in hearty accord with me. The only applause that came from the gallery was when I was speaking. If there is a Senator here who will say that it is wrong to discuss in the Senate the efforts of the Knights of Columbus to involve us in war, and that I did wrong in discussing it in the Senate, let him stand up and say it.

Mr. President, with conditions as they are regarding war propaganda, we should not adjourn this Congress and go home and let something happen, as this Catholic editor in Buffalo says it will happen before the 1st of June, and have our boys fighting in Mexico. Then when we are called back it may be too late and there will be nothing to do but to "get behind the President." I am going to call upon patriotic Senators to stand here and fight, if necessary, to hold this Congress in session.

Why should we hurry off? I know that some of you Senators want to get home and rest and go fishing and hunting. That is not worth the snap of your finger against the lives of thousands of boys that will be lost in a conflict with Mexico. Of course, we would whip Mexico, in the long run. It would cost a lot of money, and a lot of our boys would be killed, and we would become involved with a lot of South American countries. God only knows where it would end.

I have one editorial from a Pennsylvania paper which said they were jumping on Senator HEFLIN because he caught the President fishing for a third term in Catholic waters. Are you Republican Senators afraid to open your mouths on this question? I am telling you what the Catholic forces tried to do with a Democratic President. They tried to make Wilson go into war with Mexico in 1916, and he would not do it, and they whirled a mass of Catholic votes against him, and if they had had two more weeks they would have defeated him, but he dared to stand by his guns and serve his country. We were

right then face to face with the most embarrassing situation this Government was ever confronted with. We were right then engaged in watchful waiting, trying to keep out of the World War, and here was a force thinking more of a situation in Mexico than it did of the Government's position in world affairs, seeking to drive us into war with Mexico in 1916; and because Wilson declined, they did all in their power to defeat him. He won by a nose. So, the same political force is at work on President Coolidge. I am just telling you, they are not any respecters of persons. They would just as soon vote the Republican ticket as the Democratic ticket. And now they want war with Mexico.

I have a letter here from a man up in the Northwest who told about a little boy who came home from a Catholic Church one Sunday not long ago and said, "Mama, the priest said we are going to war with Mexico."

The other day the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Democratic leader in the Senate, rose and made some remarks. I did not take any offense at what he said. He just said that he regretted that the debate had taken the turn that it had. Probably he meant the turn the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] gave it, or the turn the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] gave it. But how did the Catholic-controlled press turn it and twist it? They said, "The Democrats pounced on Heffin, Senator ROBINSON in the number, and gave him a terrible drubbing."

Mr. President, I had a mighty good night's sleep the night following that debate. I did not have any sore spots on me. It will be many a day before these Senators get away from the speeches I made against them. They are in that Record to stay. I am smoking them out and calling attention to their real positions on vital questions here.

Why should we not pass this resolution, and why not put the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska on it, which provides that if armed forces are to be used, Congress shall be consulted in advance? Why not? We are in session, and why not stay in session? I make that point and insist upon it, especially, because of the peculiar and dangerous influences that are at work to get us into war with Mexico.

The President should not object to that. If I were President and had the lives of our boys in my hands, I would welcome such a situation. I would be glad to have Congress advise with me on whether the armed forces should be used. Why not? Nobody can declare war but Congress. Why let Congress adjourn and go home on the 4th of March, and be away for a month or two, and let this war propaganda be carried on until, at the proper time, one of our boys is shot in Mexico, until at the proper time one of our ships is blown up, and the President calls us back, and when we get back the fighting will already be on, and there will be no way to stop it?

War is a serious thing, Senators. We seem to have forgotten very quickly about the last war. I shall not soon forget seeing the caskets bringing back the dead bodies of our soldiers from France, wrapped in the Stars and Stripes of this Union; seeing loved ones meet them at the station and follow the remains to Arlington and deposit them in the earth, to sleep until the resurrection morn. I shall not forget that thousands and tens of thousands of American boys who loved life as you and I love it, and had just as much right to live as you and I, went down to death in that struggle.

I repeat, Mr. President, I love my country, I believe, as much as does any man in this body. I will go as far to protect it as any man in this body, but there is a great deal in what the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] said. These crafty, avaricious Americans who have accumulated millions out of their fellows at home, and frequently obtained it through questionable methods—and may be it is ill-gotten gain—go off into a foreign country and buy up property in a dangerous and hazardous situation, and then display our flag and sound the trumpet of distress and say, "I am an American citizen. It is true, I came in here of my own accord. It is a dangerous situation that I find myself in. It was so when I came, but I have bought this property. I bought it believing that I could use the United States Army to clean up and protect it, and I now call upon the Army to come and save my holdings."

The upstanding men and women of America do not enthuse over that kind of call, they do not possess that kind of patriotism.

Already armed ships and soldiers have been sent to Nicaragua. Nicaragua is not the object in view. Mexico! Mexico! That is the excuse to go down there and get into that. Those who are agitating for interference in Nicaragua know what it means, that it means war with Mexico ultimately. If we have made a mistake in the steps we have taken with our armed forces so far, the manliest thing this Government can



do is to say it has made a mistake, and get out of it, as Wilson did on two or three occasions.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] made a speech which sounded mightily to me like a war speech, giving many reasons why something should be done. There has been talk about the Senator for Secretary of State, and if ever a nation on this earth needed a Secretary of State, a strong, virile fellow, it is the United States, but the Senator from Wisconsin has made a speech here to-day that would keep him from being confirmed, because it looks as if he had blood in his eye, too, and that he wants war. We had better have a man as Secretary of State, if a change is to be made, who wants peace. If we are going to have a change, then let Congress fix this resolution so the officials can parley all they please, but the Army will not march until Congress commands it to march. Who can object to that?

Mr. President, I have received between 500 and 1,000 letters since I addressed the Senate a few days ago. The writers complain about the unfairness of the press. Men and women throughout the country are asking what the matter is that the newspapers will not give the truth. They say that they borrow the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and pass it around and read it, and that that is the only way they can get the truth from the Capitol.

If the press has been bought outright, if the money interests of the Nation control it, we must do as we did FRANK SMITH, of Illinois, refuse it admission to the Senate gallery. They must come with clean hands, and if a man is to sit in that press gallery, he must tell the truth about Senators and what they say, and let the country know what takes place in debate, and not warp it and twist it and hide the truth, as they do now.

Of all the papers that I have searched and had searched, the only paper that printed what I said about the old constitution and the new was the United States Daily, here in Washington.

Quite a number of weekly papers publish the facts as they find them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Senators, that is a severe indictment of the press of our country, and I have been told by some Senators that I would hurt myself with the press if I did not quit attacking the press. I said, "I am not attacking the fair and honest press." If the press is doing that which is hurtful to my country, I will attack them, just as I will attack any other enemy. If I were to sit silent and permit things to be done that I thought were wrong, things that I thought I should condemn, I would not be worthy to be here. If I were to do that, in order to have myself complimented by the subsidized press, I would be less than a man.

Mr. President, every Senator here knows that all a Senator has to do to have himself praised continually and have himself boosted and have himself declared to be a great statesman is to bow the knee to the money power, to the corrupt, criminal interests of the country. If he will do that, they will send statements to the columns of the paper at home telling how he is growing intellectually and as a debater, what a big man he is becoming, what a nice man he is, and before they quit they will say he ought to run for President. If the folks back home read it, they will say, "He is some pumpkin." If he is not a pumpkin, he has a pumpkin head. [Laughter.]

He serves the special interests. He does not serve his country. He is an enemy to truth and is an enemy to justice. Why not tell the truth about every crooked and harmful agency we find here in the Nation's Capital? Here is a letter which I received from New York:

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: Your magnificent stand in the Senate against intrigue intended to force us into war with Mexico through the Nicaraguan question has won the country's praises. Every real American who is awake to the issue is back of you. The Knights of Columbus intrigue is notorious, and it is a blessing to have you bring it before the public while the trimmers and balancers try to cover up and curry political favor with the country's enemies.

I will print the letter in full.

Here is another letter from Ohio:

The writer, who just finished reading an account of the fiery debate waged on the floor yesterday regarding the Catholic influence to precipitate a war with Mexico, wishes to commend you on the outspoken attitude you showed. I am most thoroughly in accord with your statements about this matter, and most of my Protestant friends likewise agree. Cleveland is largely a Catholic city and consequently the newspapers bear that in mind, and just to show the influence exerted upon them one needs only to read the Catholic doings, Catholic priests, etc., that appear in all newspapers frequently and the large amount of space accorded to them. In this regard I may state an incident told me by a friend. A couple of weeks ago a young Catholic,

after going home, said the priest said they were going to war with Mexico.

I have already stated that incident. I have another letter from Greensboro, Ala., from one of the finest men in the world, a brilliant editor himself.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have followed your views through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in your patriotic stand to keep the United States out of war with Mexico, and I admire and applaud the stand you have taken. You have done more in the past two weeks to open the eyes of the American people about conditions as they really exist than any man who was ever in the United States Senate. Your constituents are back of you. Pardon me for suggesting that you have those speeches of yours printed in pamphlet form and given general distribution. The newspapers are not going to give you a square deal in this matter and the people at large are entitled to know the real facts as you have presented them.

With all good wishes, etc.

Your friend,

WILLIAM E. YERBY.

I desire to read just another letter or two, and then I ask permission to print others in the RECORD without reading.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

[See Exhibit.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Some of these letters attack the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE], and I do not want to read them or print them either. They have enough sins to answer for anyhow.

Another letter I want to read was received from South Carolina, with the names of some 30 or 40 people signed to it. They were heartily indorsing my stand. Here is one which I received from Washington:

MY DEAR SENATOR: I inclose a clipping from to-day's Star giving in full Senator REED's speech on intolerance. I looked in vain for your remarks, and this is merely another illustration of the delightful manner in which our newspapers dish out only what they want the dear public to read. Senator REED said—

Then he quoted what the Senator from Missouri said.

That Fourth of July oration was only a part of the answer, however, and it will be interesting, indeed, to have him to undertake the remainder.

Another Senator told me the Senator from Missouri had made the same speech over at New York when he spoke over there, in what some thought was the launching of his boom for President. A REED shaken by the wind, a presidential wind. It will blow mighty cold on him before he gets the nomination.

Here is another letter from Ohio. It contains an attack, too, that I had better not put in the RECORD. Here is one from Illinois:

DEAR SENATOR: I note your address in the United States Senate on January 19, 1927, and must say that I congratulate you on the stand taken on the Mexican-Nicaraguan affair. You sure hit the Knights of Columbus between the eyes. I believe that 95,000,000 of the American citizens would indorse your stand. It is a good thing—

I do not know that it would be good form to read this about my dear friend REED, but I will read it, anyway:

It is a good thing that JIM REED has concluded not to run again for Senator.

I will let that go in. It has a little spice in it. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, none of the remarks made about my speech the other day have touched the facts which I submitted. I am going to give a résumé of them before I close.

Mr. President, I have shown that the old constitution of Mexico had a provision in it which declared that none but the Catholic religion would be tolerated in Mexico; all others were excluded; and that the new constitution provides that the people of Mexico are at liberty to join the church of their choice and worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. I have shown that the Roman Catholics of the United States bitterly condemn the new constitution of Mexico and are seeking to have the old one restored.

I repeat, I am opposed to having American boys killed in a war with Mexico for such a purpose. The separation of church and state is a fundamental principle with the people of the United States.

Mr. President, the newspaper report—New York Times—on the proceedings of the Knights of Columbus convention at Philadelphia said:

The religious situation in Mexico as it affects the Catholic Church was considered one of the most important questions before the conven-

tion, and had been under consideration since it convened last Monday. A special committee appointed to consider the matter reported to-day, and its report was unanimously adopted.

The Knights of Columbus in annual supreme convention assembled at Philadelphia said in part:

As a pledge of our concern for our fellow Knights of Columbus of Mexico, and of our determination to pursue relentlessly our campaign for the eradication of these evils at our own doorsteps, fomented and approved by the official action of our State Department, we hereby authorize our supreme board of directors to assess our membership to the extent of \$1,000,000.

In another place this same Knights of Columbus resolution says:

The period of "watchful waiting," or any other such procedure is over. We, as American citizens, demand of our Government that this action be taken forthwith.

Again, this resolution says:

As to the Knights of Columbus in Mexico, we extend to our brethren our sincere sympathy and fraternal concern. We bid them not to be downcast or dismayed.

Near the end of the resolution passed by the Knights of Columbus at Philadelphia they used this language:

We pledge the support and cooperation of 800,000 men—

And so forth.

They were not pledging their support to this Government. They were condemning this Government and pledging their support to the Knights of Columbus in Mexico who were trying to overthrow the Government that the United States had recognized. They, citizens of the United States, were encouraging the Knights of Columbus in Mexico and promising to aid them in doing away with the present Mexican Government while the Government of the United States was, through its constituted authorities, refraining from doing anything that would disturb the peaceful relations between this Government and Mexico.

I have shown that the Roman Catholic Bishop of Philadelphia, D. Cardinal Dougherty, sent a message to the Knights of Columbus of the United States shortly after they passed their war-propaganda resolution at Philadelphia, in which he said:

This opportunity is taken to congratulate the Knights of Columbus on the splendid pronouncement concerning the Mexican situation. It seemed to have aroused a dormant element in this country and to have shown it that American Catholics may not with impunity be disregarded and slighted.

I have shown that a judge from New York City, Judge Talley, a Catholic, appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, saying that he spoke for the Catholic clubs of New York City and for the lay members of the Catholic Church of New York City in his demand that the United States sever all diplomatic relations with Mexico.

I have also shown that the Catholic editor of the Catholic Union Times, of Buffalo, N. Y., on January 13, 1927, predicted that the United States would be in war with Mexico by June 1, this year.

In view of the facts that I have submitted no intelligent and honest American can deny that certain Catholic influences are at work to get us into war with Mexico, and no man who has any regard for the truth will say that I injected this Roman Catholic religious issue into the discussion of the Mexican situation. The Catholics themselves injected it into the Mexican situation. I have discussed and criticized Protestant American oil kings and others who have oil interests in Mexico for trying to involve us in war with that country, and I have criticized eastern Protestants and others who own Nicaraguan bonds for their efforts to get us into war with Mexico, and neither the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] nor the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] lifted his voice in protest.

But when I dared to read and discuss in the Senate and give to the country a resolution passed by the Catholic Knights of Columbus of the United States—a resolution that contained an attack upon the Government of the United States, and a demand that the United States Government "forthwith" abandon its peaceful relations with Mexico, which meant war; a resolution which boldly pledged the Knights of Columbus of the United States to a course in Mexico directly opposed to what the Government of the United States had pledged itself to do toward promoting and keeping the peace with Mexico—then it was that the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Missouri came to the rescue of the war-promoting Roman Catholics of the United States. Am I to understand by their actions on that occasion, and are the Protestant and Hebrew people of America to understand that in this American Senate

you may discuss the Jew and the gentile of the Protestant faith, but you dare not criticize in the American Senate any of the plans and purposes of the Roman Catholic Church?

It would seem that these two Senators would have peace-loving, patriotic American Senators, with emphasis on the word "American," remain silent even when they found Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus in the United States raising a million dollars to carry on a Mexican war propaganda and seeking to use the Army of the United States to restore the Roman Catholic Church to power in Mexico.

Mr. President, the time for plain talking has arrived. I do not intend that the subsidized press, the bought and owned newspapers of the United States, or any other influence, shall assail and misrepresent me and try to suppress the truth that I bring to this body; I do not intend that it shall happen without boldly speaking the truth in a RECORD that will preserve it for all time.

I have been warned, too, about the course I am taking. I have received some very threatening and dangerous letters. My life has been threatened by some of those who do not like my speeches against the course of the Knights of Columbus. I have been warned that they would "bump me off" if they could do it without being discovered. I have had friends to tell me that they would look out for that, and if anything did happen to me, Lord have mercy on some of them; and I indorse the sentiment. If anything happens to me, and I am not permitted to continue my work for my country here as an American Senator and speak the truth as I see it, I want the guilty parties punished. If any power has arisen in America bold and brazen enough to suppress the truth, it ought to be put down.

#### EXHIBITS

THE GREENSBORO WATCHMAN,  
GREENSBORO, ALA., January 23, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have followed you through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in your patriotic stand to keep the United States out of war with Mexico, and I admire and applaud the stand you have taken. You have done more in the past two weeks to open the eyes of the American people to conditions as they really exist than any man who was ever in the United States Senate. Your constituents are back of you.

Pardon me for suggesting that you have those speeches of yours printed in pamphlet form and given general distribution. The newspapers are not going to give you a square deal in this matter, and the people at large are entitled to know the real facts as you have presented them.

With all good wishes, I am  
Your friend,

WM. E. W. YERBY.

ELMHURST LODGE, No. 610, F. & A. M.,  
OAKLAND, CALIF., January 20, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your voice has been heard across the continent in behalf of America and American principles. More power to you. God give us a man of your type in the White House. Then will the American people get to realize that America is more than all creeds or politics.

I send you the congratulations of all 100 per cent Americans in California.

Very truly yours,

M. I. HENDERSON,  
1255 Ninety-eighth Avenue, Oakland, Calif.

THE HOTEL RANDOLPH,  
Winchester, Ind., January 19, 1927.

Senator J. THOS. HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to congratulate you for calling "A spade a spade." In cases like the present Mexican mixup it is always the plain truth that hurts. I have just been looking at your picture in the Indianapolis Star, and from the looks of your set jaw, I don't think they can make you take it back—crack them again, only harder.

Yours sincerely,

E. C. JOHNSTON,  
2625 North Sacramento Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

NORTH BERGEN, N. J., January 18, 1927.

Hon. Senator HEFLIN.

DEAR SIR: Thank God for men like you who dare to serve and sacrifice for the right. To-day this Nation needs men like you. More

so than any other time. Justice is now calling, and bless your soul your ear is not deaf to the voice of duty. You may be in the minority in the Senate (yet I doubt it), but think I can safely say you are in the majority outside of the Senate. You will never rue the day for taking this stand. The 100 per cent Americans are right behind you so hold your ground and victory will be your reward much to the envy of your colleagues. Trusting these words of encouragement will revive that American spirit, with which you are so blessed, and knowingly you can not and will not fall, I am

Very truly yours,  
JOHN MILES,  
588 Thirty-seventh Street, North Bergen, N. J.

NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC LEAGUE,  
Middletown, Ind., January 18, 1927.

The Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
Congress Hall, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I wish to inform you that I have just returned from a tour of Mexico and wish to congratulate you on your recent speech that you made in the United States Senate.

President Calles, of Mexico, will make that country a wonderful nation in the future if the United States of America does not break relations with that Government; also I might add that I am convinced that there are certain organizations in this country that are working for a break of relations. But 90 per cent of the people are with you and want peace. Let us stay on friendly relations with Mexico and back up a government that is trying to give the people their only chance of education that they have had in 400 years. If some of the Senators would go to Mexico and see the conditions down there, they would all be for Señor Calles and his Government. This letter is from the president of the National Democratic League, a real Democratic organization, and fighting for the Democratic Party.

Yours respectfully,

FRED V. CULP.

TERRE HAUTE, IND., January 19, 1927.

Hon. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank God we still have some fearless Americans in Congress. I only wish Indiana could boast of some like you.

Yours respectfully,

O. P. CULBERTSON,  
1912 First Avenue, Terre Haute, Ind.

HOT SPRINGS NATIONAL PARK, ARK., January 19, 1927.

DEAR SENATOR: I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the bold fight you opened up in the Senate yesterday. Millions of Protestants are applauding you for doing just what you did. You are exactly right. It is plain as the noonday sun that this disturbance in Mexico is a Catholic war, but just like the Catholics they are using somebody else to do their fighting.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,  
Yours truly,

W. H. HARRY.

Knights of Columbus speakers have been going over the land for months urging the people to demand that the United States Government declare war with Mexico at once.

You put your finger on a sore spot, and how the vicious victim howled. Keep up your splendid, patriotic work.

OLIN R. THOMAS,  
Kingfield, Me.

NEW DOM HOTEL (INC.),  
Hartford, Conn., January 20, 1927.

Senator THOMAS HEFLIN,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please accept my hearty and sincere congratulations for your brave and patriotic exposure of the Knights of Columbus to involve this country in war with Mexico. Keep up the good work.

Every true American owes you a debt of gratitude for your splendid work.

With kindest regards,

JOHN W. GORDON,  
260 Fifteenth Avenue, Columbus, Ohio.

HOTEL ROWE, GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: You surely were right about who was responsible for the cry of war with Mexico; that's why it hurts 'em. Weren't they raising a million dollars a short time ago to make the fight? Of course, you're right, even if you are a Democrat and

I am,

A REPUBLICAN.

PHILADELPHIA & READING RAILWAY CO.,  
Reading, Pa., January 19, 1927.

Senator THOMAS HEFLIN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

YOUR HONOR: Your views on Knights of Columbus causing this American-Mexican fuss is right in my belief, and I sure admire you for your pluck in standing for the right in midst of opposition.

May God bless you in every way in carrying out Americanism in the Senate, and may He give you the power to pass true American laws. Although I am normally a Republican, my hand and vote shall always go to the real American, no matter what his politics.

I beg to remain, and praying for you,  
Yours most respectfully,

ROBERT H. BROWN,  
1222 North Sixth Street, Reading, Pa.

ODENVILLE, ALA., January 17, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN, M. C.,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I take the occasion to express my appreciation of the stand you have taken against President Coolidge's policy in trying to drag us into war.

For God's sake, and for the sake of our boys, keep up your fight. I assure you there is no one who will appreciate it more than I.

Yours cordially,

C. M. GILL.

EAST ORANGE, N. J., January 18, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: You spoke truly when you stated recently on the floor of the Senate that a chain of newspapers had been tipped off to attack you for your stand against war with Mexico.

The inclosed copy of an editorial appearing in the columns of the New York Evening Telegram, under date of January 17, is the proof of the pudding.

Just to be mean I have written the Telegram that the editorial in question is "old stuff" and does not prove a thing except that there is an organized propaganda on foot to vilify and slander anyone who dares to oppose the will of a foreign potentate who happens at the present time to be fomenting war in this country.

The attitude of this crowd is also shown by a letter placed in a prominent spot in the paper of same date, which ends by saying "Let's go." This certainly means "let's go to war."

With all best wishes, I am, yours sincerely,

HENRY ALEX. DANIELS,  
214 Harrison Street.

DUKE UNIVERSITY,  
Durham, N. C., January 19, 1927.

Senator THOMAS HEFLIN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: Accept my hearty congratulations for your truthful and timely speech in the United States Senate in regard to the activities of the Knights of Columbus in regard to the religious conditions in Mexico. As a student of church history, I wish to state that I agree with your views on the matter. It is brave on your part to denounce a cause which, as you well know, will bring the criticism of that cringing group upon you. We are coming to a sad condition in this country when our legislators, in order to get political preferments, kneel to that group. The people of the South are proud of you.

If ever I can be of help to you in the furnishing of materials which I have secured from my research in American church history which bear upon this issue, please call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL N. GARBER.

CLINTON, IOWA, January 17, 1927.

Hon. HEFLIN, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We appreciate the stand you have taken in regard to the Knights of Columbus outfit. We are glad to know that there is some one big enough to take the right stand. May success and honor be yours in the fight you have made for the right.

Very truly yours,

OSCAR GUNDERSON.

WOODMERE COTTAGE,  
Catskill, N. Y., January 19, 1927.

To the Hon. Mr. J. THOMAS HEFLIN.

DEAR MR. HEFLIN: We read in yesterday's paper an article that makes us want to congratulate you on your stand that the Knights of Columbus have been trying to stir up trouble between the United

States and Mexico, ever since that trouble with the Catholics came up in Mexico, but we do not call that a religious issue as some of the other Senators did, because you mentioned the Knights of Columbus.

Hoping that you will continue your fight for the rights of the good old United States of America.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. W. J. BIRD.

Heartiest congratulations.

ALBION, ILL., January 19, 1927.

Senator HEFLIN,

*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SIR: Just a few lines to inform you I am one of many who admire you for your courage in telling the truth to the Senate regarding the Knights of Columbus and the Mexican trouble.

That others may be as patriotic as yourself and dare to tell the facts of the case in the face of all the vilification that outfit may heap upon you is the wish of myself and I believe thousands of others who may not say much but who are thinking.

Sincerely,

HARRY J. GLOVER,  
*Ex. A. E. F. Infantry.*

METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH,  
*Axtell, Kans., Jan. 19, 1927.*

The Hon. J. T. HEFLIN,

*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

My DEAR SIR: I feel constrained to write you and commend your position in both the Fall-Doheny and the Mexican situation.

While of a different political faith, and not one to believe in needlessly criticizing, yet there are times to speak out; I believe you have rightly sensed the feelings of a great majority of the American people, and are expressing their sentiments.

There is no doubt in my mind but what American capitalists in Mexico and the Roman hierarchy both would like to have the United States, with armed forces, pull their chestnuts out of the fire. Love of money and power makes a tremendous combination, and we need to recognize the alliance and check it now. We want no war with anybody.

I trust you will continue, when opportunity permits, to expose any and every attempt to inveigle this Government into war with any foreign power. Let Mexico and Nicaragua and every other nation work out their own salvation without interference, save in a spirit of helpfulness, from us.

More power to you in these righteous causes.

Very truly yours,

MILTON M. THORNE.

483 WEST END AVENUE,  
*New York City, January 19, 1927.*

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

MY DEAR SIR: Allow me to congratulate you on the firm and courageous stand you have taken on the Mexican situation. I feel you are absolutely right in your accusations against the Roman Church. Bolshevism is the red herring the Catholics are dragging over their own subtle trail.

Yours sincerely,

GRACE HASTINGS.

LOUISVILLE, KY., January 18, 1927.

Hon. SENATOR HEFLIN,

DEAR SIR: I just want to thank you for having nerve enough and an honest conviction that the Knights of Columbus are in back of that Mexican affair, and I glory that a southern Senator was the one to wake up the American people to this menace. It is a shame that more of our public men have not guts enough to speak out and say what they think.

Senator REED does not want to hinder the President in this affair because it happens to suit his following if we did become involved with Mexico.

I have always been a Republican and can honestly thank a Democrat. Respectfully,

J. B. WYATT.

JANUARY 19, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: May I, a total stranger but an admirer of your fearlessness, express my appreciation and admiration of your splendid speech in the Senate attacking and exposing the part that the Catholic organizations are playing in our Mexico and Nicaraguan affairs, of which we are hearing so much? Of course, we only hear a part of your address in the papers, the most important, no doubt, being suppressed. Would it be asking too much of you to send me all of your addresses on this subject, as I am very anxious to know it?

Rest assured, my dear Senator, that your friends are numberless not only in your State but in all States, whose hearts are with you in spirit if not in close contact in your noble and gallant fight for the truth.

Again assuring you of my high regard and trusting that I am not imposing upon your time in writing, I am

A Republican but an American first.

Yours truly,

THEO. B. ALEXANDER,  
*37 Loch Lomond Street, Uniontown, Pa.*

JANUARY 19, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

DEAR SIR: I have read with much interest your speeches in the Senate on the Mexican trouble and want to thank you for the fearless way you came out with the truth. The Knights of Columbus are making all the trouble they can so as to reinstate their church in Mexico, and it is through war and rebellion that they accomplish their end. Anyone familiar with Mexican history knows what an enemy the Roman Catholic Church has been to that country. Go on with your good work. You have many friends North who are with you.

Yours sincerely,

JENNIE L. TAYLOR.

TULSA, OKLA., January 19, 1927.

Hon. Senator HEFLIN,

*Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: I have noted from the public press that you brought forth considerable discussion by your remarks on the Mexico situation.

I am sure that you felt that this discussion would be brought on when you made these remarks. Considerable respect should be accorded a man who states his convictions regardless of the consequences.

I am in hearty accord with your stand as set forth in this speech, and I believe that there are a great many more who feel the same way.

Yours very truly,

H. E. RORSCHACH.

UNION PASSENGER STATION,  
*Montgomery, Ala., January 19, 1927.*

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: As one of your constituents, I want to heartily indorse your speech which you made in the Senate yesterday, the 18th, which was reported in this morning's paper. I am sure that there are thousands more that agree with you in what you said which seldom register their opinions, except at the polls, and you are aware of what was registered in your favor and will be any time you run for office again. I am inclosing a piece written to the Birmingham Age-Herald relative to the quarrel with Mexico for fear you might have overlooked this.

I am sure what was said by you in the Senate yesterday can be backed up by the facts.

I will appreciate it if you will mail me any addresses you have made on this subject.

Very truly yours,

R. C. PERDUE,  
*110 Cramer Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.*

CHARLESTON, W. VA., January 20, 1927.

Senator HEFLIN,

*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: I am just a mere voter, but more power to you on the item I have clipped from the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail.

You are right and others will see it later on. I was told by a Catholic that every Knight of Columbus in the United States had been assessed \$1 for the Mexican trouble.

More power to you.

A voter,

F. A. DENNY,  
*Box 684, Charleston, W. Va.*

ASSOCIATED LUTHERAN LAYMEN OF  
SALEM EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH,  
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL SECRETARY,  
*Detroit, Mich., January 22, 1927.*

Senator JAMES THOMAS HEFLIN,

*Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: Recently I have read various articles in the daily newspapers of this city in connection with the present Mexican crisis, and among these different accounts your attitude and opinion on the subject had been explained.

My hat is off to you, Senator HEFLIN, in accusing the Roman Catholic hierarchy, together with the Knights of Columbus, in trying to push the United States in a war with Mexico. Why should this country settle an argument with Mexico for the foreign potentate most commonly known as Pope. The Nicaragua question is only put in to throw the American people off the real reason. President Calles

did not close the Roman Catholic churches in Mexico, but the Roman Catholic episcopate, for the reason that the hierarchy does not care to submit to the rules and regulations of Mexico. The Protestant clergy have submitted to the new ruling and the Pope should not be excepted. See how the Knights of Columbus have adopted resolutions to have our President fight for their church. See how they are using American money to spread dirty propaganda among their people in this country. Let the Knights of Columbus and the Pope come out with the real facts about the Mexican crisis and things would be different. This country believes in the separation of church and state, and I am glad to know that you are one of the few who do not hesitate to come out with the facts. Wish to God we had more men in Washington like you. Let Senator REED peruse history where the Roman Catholic Church has ruled and he will see a different light. Has he forgotten how the Protestants had to suffer during the time of the Reformation? How people were murdered and burned at the stake just because they would not submit to the Pope? Rome has not changed, and if Rome had the chance it would do just as in the past. Tell Senator REED to read history and the trouble the Roman Catholic Church has caused in this world.

Yours truly,

LOUIS S. TONN,  
General secretary, 6328 Hancock Avenue, East.

ECFAULA, ALA., January 19, 1927.

Senator THOMAS HEFLIN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: It is with great pleasure and admiration that I have followed your course in the Senate upon the Mexican issue. It seems that you were charged on January 18 of injecting the religious issue into the Senate. When our country's welfare is at stake it is high time for the exposure of influences aimed against it. These influences are plainly directed through the workings of the Knights of Columbus organization.

As a native of Alabama and a son of one of your heartiest supporters, the late Robert Moulthrop, I wish to tell you how deeply gratified I am that there is a man in the Senate who is big enough and strong enough to make such an exposure.

May the excellent judgment and fearless spirit of our own Alabama Senator continue and prosper in this issue.

Sincerely yours,

MOSS MOULTHROP.

21 COOKE AVENUE,  
Jamestown, N. Y., January 19, 1927.

Senator HEFLIN: Congratulations on the stand you have taken as to the trouble with Mexico. You are absolutely right, and anyone with half an eye—or a mind unbiased—should be able to discern the underhanded part the Roman Catholics—Knights of Columbus—have had in attempting to force the United States into war with Mexico. They have done everything possible to force us to take sides with them in their disgruntled state of mind.

You are brave. Stand firm! Many good people are with you.

Mrs. CHARLES H. RHODES.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, January 19, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The writer just finished reading an account of the fiery debate waged on the floor yesterday regarding Catholic influence in precipitating a war with Mexico, and wishes to commend you on the outspoken attitude you showed.

I am most thoroughly in accord with your statements about this matter, and most of my Protestant friends likewise agree. Cleveland is largely Catholic, and consequently the newspapers bear that in mind; and just to show you the influence exerted upon them one needs only to read of Catholic doings, Catholic priests, etc., that appear in all newspapers frequently and the large amount of space accorded them.

In this regard might state of incident told me by a friend. A couple of weeks ago a young Catholic youth after coming home from church remarked to her that his priest had said the United States would soon be at war with Mexico. Draw your own conclusions.

I have a brother in the Navy, who probably is in Mexican waters at this moment, and I assure you that I don't want him to be shot up to further the Catholic cause in that country. \* \* \*

It is comforting to know of at least one man who dares have the courage of his convictions, and you may rest assured that there are hundreds of thousands and probably millions of Protestants in this country to-day who feel the same as you and I.

There are probably other Senators and Representatives who feel the same as you do, but daren't express themselves. This will be decided if the matter comes to vote.

Keep up the good work, and accept my best wishes.

Yours very truly,

F. H. CHORMAN,

9 WEST NINETY-SIXTH STREET,  
New York, January 18, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

Senator from Alabama, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: Your magnificent stand in the Senate against intrigue intended to force us into war with Mexico, through the Nicaragua question, has won the country's praises. Every real American, who is awake to the issues, is back of you.

The Knights of Columbus intrigue is notorious, and it is a blessing to have you bring it before the public, while the trimmers and balancers try to cover up and curry political favor with the country's enemies.

I inclose some valuable data about Nicaragua, written by Jose Miguel Bejarano, secretary of the Mexican Chamber of Commerce, in New York, and delivered as a radio address on Saturday, January 15, through WHAP.

Also, an enlightening analysis of the Roman Church problem in Mexico, by Harry W. Pascoe, former United States vice consul at Torreón, Mexico.

A booklet from my pen herewith explains in brief form the conflict in political doctrine between America and Rome; see pages 17 and 18. With appreciation.

Yours very respectfully,

FRANKLIN FORD, Manager WHAP.

HAYERHILL, MASS., January 19, 1927.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: You are doing brave and needed work in calling attention to the K. of C. crusade to involve us in war. \* \* \*

To protect my family from persecution I can not take the risk of making myself known. Romish tyranny has us by the throats.

This morning's Boston papers unite, as might have been expected, to slur and ridicule your efforts, but you doubtless know of the overwhelming, though silent, sentiment which sides with you.

R.

PETERSBURG, VA., January 22, 1927.

Hon. JAMES T. HEFLIN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: I was in Alexandria, Va., Wednesday of this week and read the account in the Post of your speech in the Senate Tuesday on the subject of the Roman Catholic Church and Mexico, or, rather, not an account of your speech, for that seems to have been carefully suppressed by that paper, but a very full account of what certain other Senators said in reply. It was not until I obtained a copy of the Richmond Times-Dispatch that I saw something of what you had said.

I am sending you under separate cover a marked copy of the Presbyterian Survey for December last, which contains a fair account of what is going on in Mexico from the Protestant standpoint, and I am also asking that a marked copy of the Sunday School Times, of Philadelphia, on the subject of the Church of Rome be sent you.

My prayer is, that God will deliver not only Mexico but our own country and all its free institutions from the political aspirations and domination of the Roman Catholic Church.

Very cordially yours,

ROBERT M. FRIEND,  
404 West Washington Street.

NEW YORK CITY, January 19, 1927.

HONORED SIR: I voice the feelings of thousands of loyal Americans in congratulating you on the brave stand you have taken in the Senate against a Catholic war. We know too well that it requires courage and conviction to stem the tide of pressure which is trying to sweep this land toward the destruction of its Anglo-Saxon ideals and traditions.

I, too, am a student of American problems and know the perils that beset us. I am writing to enlighten as far as can be done the general public about the true situation as regards the papal church in this country.

Just now one of the most vital needs is to clear up a feeling in the public mind that after all you are raising merely a religious question. Many readers of the news believe that, and the Catholics themselves are doing their best to make it appear so.

It ought to be shown that we have no quarrel with the Catholic Church as a church. But it is more than a church; it is a political organization, a temporal power, just as much as is England, or France, or any other nation. It is an organized nation of Catholics working within our borders—after taking our oath of citizenship—to destroy the very country of which its members are citizens.

If you should mention this in one of your fine attacks it would ease the minds of many good Americans who don't want the religious issue raised.

You will pardon my boldness in mentioning this fact, but you are winning the country's battles as much by your fine stand as if you were fighting on the firing line.

My wife and family join in wishing you well in your fight. You are gaining friends every day.

I am coming to Washington next week and should value the opportunity of calling on you for a moment, if possible.

Very truly,

GARRETT W. THOMPSON,  
601 West One hundred and thirty-seventh Street.

MOUNT VERNON, IND., January 20, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Allow me to congratulate you on your remarkable defense of our country's rights which you made on the floor of the Senate. It is true that you probably will receive much criticism from the enemies of our country because you dare to tell the truth, but it is likewise true that you have made hundreds of thousands of friends by these same utterances.

I can not be accused of partisanship in writing this letter, for I have always been classed as a Republican in politics. I do admire a man, whatever his political affiliations, who has the strength to stand by his convictions. Those men who have made our country great have been such men, and they will live long ages after those dual allegiance, so-called statesmen, are gone into oblivion.

Those who boasted so loudly only a few short months ago that they would show this Government what they meant when they demanded, not asked, that this country ruin the truest patriot that our weak brother on our south has had in charge for many generations are now whining because real men and real Americans are calling their bluff.

\* \* \* \* \*

I served as a volunteer for over two years in the World War and I class myself as a true American, not just in name alone with a divided allegiance, but as one who recognizes no hand across the Atlantic as my lord and master. The Knights of Columbus started the issue in this country, and if we didn't have men like you to bring it on the Senate floor the country would indeed be in bad straits. Listen at them howl! They always have when cornered. Perhaps they are trying to drown out the cries of our Masonic brothers in Italy. I haven't heard anything derogatory from the Baptists, the Methodists, and the other Protestants in Mexico. Are the Catholics always abused and picked on? Why?

With best wishes to you in your good work and hoping to receive a full account of your speech from you, I am,

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND OLIVER.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Lincoln, Nebr., January 19, 1927.

Senator THOMAS HEFLIN,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to commend you on the attitude you have taken and held during the present controversy on the Mexican question, as it meets with my hearty approval and with the strong approval of all my associates and friends.

Yours very truly,

G. B. THOMAS,  
Deputy Secretary of State,  
2813 Pacific Street, Omaha, Nebr.

THE READING CHRONICLE,  
Reading, Mass., January 19, 1927.

HON. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

My DEAR SENATOR: Allow a Massachusetts newspaper man to congratulate you on your fearless stand in the United States Senate on the Knights of Columbus-Mexico question. With a few more of your type of men in this country our Nation would soon become a safe place in which to live. America needs to be awakened and I am confident that she is being by men of your caliber.

Wishing you all kinds of success and hoping soon to see "none but Americans on guard," I remain,

Very sincerely,

DONALD T. PATRICK,  
312 North Main Street.

KANSAS CITY, MO., January 20, 1927.

HON. THOMAS J. HEFLIN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Just a few lines to let you know that your remarks in the Senate of January 18, as reported by the press, were appreciated.

You are to be highly commended for your courage in stating facts on the Catholic-Mexican situation. Very rarely does one dare express his views openly or tell the truth about Catholicism and especially a

statesman, as it would be political suicide and oblivion in most States. You are exactly right. Keep up the good work. The country needs more patriots of your type.

Very truly yours,

ALVA K. RICHARDS.

SHERMAN, TEX., January 19, 1927.

Senator HEFLIN,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to tell you that you are right in your stand on the Mexican situation, and you sure showed your metal. We need more men like you.

Respectfully yours,

C. D. MORROW.

STERLING, COLO., January 19, 1927.

Hon. Senator HEFLIN,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is great pleasure to read in Denver (Colo.) Daily News of your remarks on Tuesday, 18th, in the Senate with reference to Mexico and the part Knights of Columbus have taken heretofore.

As you must feel sure, there are many thousand loyal Americans who believe like yourself; but alas! few have "the courage of their convictions" to say it.

While some may condemn you, I'm sure a great many more will commend you for your true statements.

With very best wishes for your continued success in getting folks to face the facts, I am,

Yours sincerely,

JAMES A. EBERHARDT,  
408 Park, Sterling, Colo.

PARMA, IDAHO, January 19, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
Washington.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In to-day's paper I notice that you made a speech in the Senate yesterday bringing up the matter of the activities of the Knights of Columbus in the Mexican situation. I want to take this opportunity to say that I am with you on this question and wish that you will keep the good work going on.

I can assure you that the people out here are not in favor of any war or meddling in the Mexican situation. They are in favor of the Mexicans handling their own affairs and us doing the same.

The writer was formerly from Tennessee, and am sure that you have the nerve to tell them the facts in this case.

Yours very truly,

RAY WILSON.

CHICO, CALIF., January 16, 1927.

HON. Mr. HEFLIN,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I have read with a great deal of interest parts of your speech delivered before the Senate in regard to the efforts of the Knights of Columbus to entangle our country in a war with our sister republic, Mexico.

It is to be regretted that we haven't got more real men like yourself as representatives who are not afraid to stand up for the principles of our country as you are doing. The good people of Alabama should be proud to have a real American like yourself who will not bow to a foreign power disguised as a religious organization.

If it is possible, I would like very much to have a copy of this speech if it has been printed, as you know we could get only a small part of it in the daily press. This favor will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

OWEN J. ODOM,  
Postoffice Box No. 851.

JANUARY 19, 1927.

Senator J. T. HEFLIN,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The daily papers carried a story of your criticism of the Knights of Columbus in regard to the Mexican situation.

It is indeed gratifying to know that there is one man in Congress that is not afraid to speak his mind, and I assure you that fully 80 per cent of the population of our State, regardless of politics, are fully in sympathy with your views.

Entirely too many so-called Protestants are knuckling down to Catholicism, especially in the Senate, that it makes your attitude and actions all the more commendable.

Wishing you continued success in your fight for Americanism, I am,

Yours very truly,

DODGE DAVIS,  
3961 Hoyt Avenue, Indianapolis, Ind.

CHICAGO, ILL., January 23, 1927.

Mr. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to congratulate you on your speech in not wanting to go to war with Mexico; in wanting to favor the Knights of Columbus or the Catholic Church. I realize your life is in danger, same as mine would be if I signed my name to this letter, for you are dealing with a rough class of people. We have a law whereby United States citizens and property must be protected in a foreign country at any cost. This law is only being made the goat where religion is the real cause. Were it left to the Catholics, and they were in power, they would kill off every Jew or Protestant that ever lived. Read the oath of a Knights of Columbus, a priest or a bishop's oath, and you will be satisfied this to be true. They are opposed to the United States Government, because a Catholic can not be President of the United States, against public institutions and the public schools, yet 70 per cent of the public offices in the cities of the North are held by Catholics, and only 5 or less per cent of the population in the United States are Catholics. To walk in the city hall of Chicago is like going in Dublin or in Cork, and you search anyone of them you will find a revolver in their pocket. Where a Catholic holds property you will find the Jew or Protestant next door to him pays more taxes than he does, and in a great many cases don't pay no taxes at all. Just the past week four priests and five nuns were expelled out of China and on their way to this country, for they know the door is wide open to them and all other Catholics. Every Sunday indignation meetings are being held in Chicago, taking up collections and doing what can be done in Mexico for the Knights of Columbus. I trust no bodily harm will be done to you and that you can serve your country for many years to come. I am,

Yours respectfully,

ALBANY, ALA., January 20, 1927.

Hon. TOM HEFLIN,  
Alabama Senator, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE AND DEAR SIR: Attached you will find "copy" of a letter written William Loyd Clark, which explains itself.

Mr. HEFLIN, we people of our State are interestingly watching you and the fight being made by you against war with Mexico. Go to it, my dear sir, and we people will again go with you "all" the way when election time again arrives.

Sir, we are proud of your fight, and I only take this means of assuring you of the fact, and it will be a pleasure to us when Hugo Black arrives on the scene to aid you, because we know he will take about the same stand that you have generally.

Faithfully yours,

J. A. THORNHILL.

SOUTHWEST OVERALL CO.,  
Kansas City, Mo., January 19, 1927.

Hon. Senator HEFLIN,  
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I read with great interest your speech in the Senate yesterday. Am glad there is one Senator that will call things by their right name. I am a lifelong Republican, but am for you in your ambitions, whatever they may be.

J. E. BLINN,  
2606 Elmwood Avenue.

THE BILTMORE,  
New York City, January 19, 1927.

MY DEAR SENATOR: It is certainly refreshing to find one Senator who has courage enough to tell the truth. I admire your fearlessness in this age, where those in power stoop to anything to gain favor for personal gain, and are swayed by any wind that will serve them.

I am sure the country will feel grateful for your truthful statement. May God keep you and bless you.

Sincerely yours,

A LOVER OF JUSTICE.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., January 17, 1927.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: This is to thank you heartily for your timely exposure of the venomous activities of the Knights of Columbus in seeking to embroil this Nation in war with Mexico.

Do keep up the good work and not be daunted by any threats.

Stand to your guns; we are with you.

In gratitude and thankfulness that Protestantism and liberalism has still one champion in the Senate since Watson left us, I remain,

Yours enthusiastically,

V. C. CLOWE.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Raleigh, January 21, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
United States Senate, Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: As a humble American, I desire to congratulate you upon the stand which you have taken with regard to our relations with Mexico. Your manly fight to keep us out of war is being applauded by thousands of people who have sons, and who are fearful at the thought of having them butchered upon the altar of war to satisfy the desire of certain interests who would naturally profit by the conflict.

The Senate would do well to follow your advice which, as I have always observed, is sound and never permits of foolish argument. Remember one thing, Senator, the good people of the country are back of you and have utmost confidence in your opinions.

May God bless you and give you more power to see the right, so that it may prevail, is the prayer of

RALPH G. SIMMERSON.

NEW YORK, January 21, 1927.

Hon. JAMES T. HEFLIN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In these days when there are so many mere politicians who are ready to sacrifice principle to expediency, it is indeed refreshing to know that we have at least one Member of the Senate who has the courage to speak his convictions, even though by so doing he arouses the opposition of a large and powerful religious-political organization.

I have read the account of your speech before the Senate with reference to the machinations of the Knights of Columbus, in the New York Times. I feel certain that you would not have made such striking statements without the best possible evidence of their truthfulness. It appears to me that the silence of so large a number of your fellow members indicates that they agree with your views.

While there remain at the head of the Government men of your type who are not afraid to take their stand upon principle and honestly denounce political corruption, I believe there is still hope for the future of this country. May that day never come in our history when religious bodies will hold sway over civil government.

Assuring you that there are, besides myself, a great many of your fellow citizens who deeply appreciate your courageous stand, I am,

Respectfully yours,

J. J. SHORT.

AMERICAN TYPE FOUNDERS CO.,  
Los Angeles, Calif., January 20, 1927.

Hon. "TOM" HEFLIN,  
Senator from Alabama, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Just a line to heartily congratulate you on your stand with respect to the Knights of Columbus and the Mexican situation.

Power to you. The people who are 100 per cent American are with you to a man.

Yours very truly,

C. G. LISTER.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., January 19, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Accept my sincere congratulations upon your stand against the practice of fomenting war with Mexico.

The Catholic Church is now showing its dragonlike head, and it would have succeeded in showing the full body had it not been for your fearless and justifiable stand.

I am sure that the 100 per cent American Protestants will not forget you.

Sincerely,

ALBERT R. CAVA,  
373 Manhattan Avenue.

HODGES, ALA., January 17, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to ask you to use your influence against a war with Mexico. I do not think the reasons and conditions set forth by the President and State Department justify a war with Mexico.

The Calles Government seems to be the best Mexico has had for some time. The real motive for this trouble seems to be hid behind the curtains from the masses.

Yours very truly,

J. M. DAVIS.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
*Senator of United States from Alabama.*

MY HONORED SIR: I commend your speech of 18th in the Senate concerning war with Mexico. Be not afraid! Our country requires men who can take the bull by the horns.

Stand firm, worthy Senator.  
 Very cordially,

J. E. CROUCH,  
 1170 West Twenty-eighth Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

PORTLAND, OREG., January 19, 1927.

Hon. J. T. HEFLIN,  
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You were absolutely right when you said that the Knights of Columbus were planning to intervene in the Mexico trouble. I am inclosing a pamphlet sent to me in which they are trying to raise a million dollars. I regret that I threw the letter aside. It stated that the money was to be used in Mexico.

Go to it. You are doing a wonderful service in exposing corruption. I am a Republican, but hit them hard if they are nixed up in it. Your stand regarding interference in Mexico and Nicaragua is commended by all the people in this part of the country who know the situation.

Very respectfully,

W. T. BROWN.

EUREKA, KANS., January 19, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
 United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: May I have copies of your recent speeches in the Senate on the Mexican and Nicaraguan imbroglio?

I am so glad the United States has at least one Senator who will tell the people the truth in the matter of this attempt to drag this Nation into war with Mexico, for to me it is as plain as day that that is the real milk in the coconut of this trouble.

Unfortunately for me, I guess, I have never been in your State, though born near you in Tennessee 69 years ago.

I beg to be,

Very respectfully,

C. G. TEFTELER,  
 190 South Main Street.

OAKLAND, CALIF., January 20, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: May I add just a word of commendation for the most excellent speech you made regarding the Mexican situation.

Every word that you spoke was the truth, and it is the truth that hurts the opposition. Why the need of a million if their purposes were open and above board. As I see it, the Catholic Church, aided and abetted by the Knights of Columbus, are doing their best to get this country in war with the countries south. Keep up the good work; we are with you.

Sincerely yours,

G. A. HEMPLE, Sr.,  
 Title Insurance Building,  
 15th and Franklin Streets, Oakland, Calif.

WASHINGTON CAMP No. 2, PATRIOTIC SONS OF AMERICA,  
 Sedalia, Mo., January 21, 1927.

To the honorable Senator HEFLIN,  
 From the State of Alabama,  
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In the name of thousands of American citizens of this great State of Missouri I congratulate you for your recent gallant fight on the Mexican question and for your great victory for true Americanism and the Christian religion.

We know that the Roman Catholic Church is Mexico's ancient enemy, and the fact that the Protestant Churches of that country are obeying the law as it is written and the Roman Catholic Church is the only one defying it proves it!

Then, too, is it not a fact that Rene Capristan Garza, a Mexican Knight of Columbus, has been conducting revolutionary "juntas" in the State of Texas recently, and that he and Jose F. Gandara, of El Paso, Tex., have been proclaimed provisional Vice President and President, respectively?

Again I congratulate you and wish you great success.

Respectfully yours,

E. N. KAUFFMAN,  
 District President Washington Camp, No. 2,  
 Patriotic Sons of America.

SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE CO.,  
 Leavenworth, Kans., January 19, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
 United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: There are millions of Americans who back you in every utterance you made on the floor of the Senate in regard to the Catholic Church in Mexico. God give us men, more men, like you.

Keep us out of war.

Respectfully,

H. W. SEXTON.

SPRINGFIELD, OREG., January 19, 1927.

Senator TOM HEFLIN,  
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After reading Associated Press reports stating that you charged Knights of Columbus with seeking to embroil United States with Mexico, I wish to congratulate you upon your fearlessness in bringing this issue before the lawmakers of our country.

I am more than pleased to know that one man at least has the moral courage to call a spade a spade, even in the face of ridicule coming from Rome and her "loyal members."

I do not believe it is the pleasure of the common people of this country to go to war with Mexico to uphold the bloody cross of Rome, and it is, indeed, timely that the religious issue should be brought to the floor of the Senate.

Even though a few of your colleagues may oppose you, thank God a few—yes, many—loyal Americans are singing your praise for your loyal stand.

Most sincerely yours,

HAROLD K. PHILLIPS,  
 746 Sixth Street.

KINGFISHER, OKLA., January 22, 1927.

SENATOR HEFLIN,  
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We wish to congratulate you on your stand in the United States Senate with regard to the Mexican situation. Our State is being flooded with Knights of Columbus literature. We are not K. K. K. sympathizers. Just want a square deal for a sister republic. Why should our boys give their lives for Wall Street and the Pope of Rome?

Yours truly,

FRANK SCOTT,  
 MRS. SCOTT.

SAPULPA, OKLA., January 20, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
 Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Just read of your defense of that for which all true Americans stand, "Justice and liberty," as reported by the press.

Kindly permit me to congratulate you for the stand which you have taken.

Very truly,

EARL WALROD.

PRINCETON, ILL., January 20, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It was with the greatest satisfaction and delight that I read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD your courageous, fearless, and splendid speeches on the Fall-Doheny affair and especially your just and timely attack on the Roman Catholic Church.

I wish to congratulate you most heartily on the bold stand you are taking and hope that God may give you further strength and courage to keep up the good work, unflinchingly to speak the truth, and hew to the line, no matter how the chips may fall.

And, believe me, my dear Senator, you are not alone in this noble fight. There are millions of true red-blooded Americans behind you and hailing you for your great feat of taking the vicious bull by the horns.

You have certainly done our beloved country a great service of far-reaching consequences for good, and succeeded already in curbing the machinations of the Knights of Columbus, which was sorely needed.

God pity our country if ever a Roman Catholic gets into the White House. It would mean that we would be deprived of our liberty and be ruled by the Pope in Rome, who has altogether too much sway in this country already.

If we could have more men of your type in Congress, who would fearlessly defend and speak the truth, the serpent's head would soon be crushed and we would not need to worry about the future.

Very respectfully yours,

ERNEST LACK,  
 Pastor of St. John's Lutheran Church.



NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS,  
OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL STATE VICE PRESIDENT,  
Boise, Idaho, January 20, 1927.

Hon. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please accept my hearty congratulations. It is indeed encouraging to find a Senator with the necessary courage to point out the plague spot in the Mexican and Nicaraguan mixup.

The most deplorable part was, that not a so-called Protestant Senator with the moral courage to stand by you appeared, and it is further disgusting to find some of them joining the opposition gang, which used their usual line of abuse instead of facts to answer your charges.

I am also pleased to note that you voted against making a loophole in our immigration laws; and, therefore, I can depend upon your aid in passing a deportation law.

In case that you do not already know, I wish to suggest that you can perhaps get many facts supporting your charges, from Mr. James S. Vance, 219 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Thanking and wishing you all future success possible, I remain,  
Sincerely yours,

J. R. BULLOCK.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 23, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
Senator from Alabama.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I desire to express my gratification that the country has one man, at least, in the Senate of the United States that has the backbone to spread the truth concerning the Mexican situation, and I feel that I also express the sentiment of several million other citizens of this country.

These several million citizens are not being misled by such papers as the Washington Post, which has been keeping constantly on its front and editorial pages the lying propaganda in regard to Mexico, but it is gratifying to us to see printed in the records of Congress the truth, and that some one in the Senate knows the truth and is not afraid to let it be known.

Yours sincerely,

BART B. PIGMAN,  
4609 Ninth Street NW.

UNITED STATES BANK & TRUST Co.,  
ROCHESTER, IND., January 20, 1927.

J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have read with much interest a part of your address delivered in the United States Senate the 18th instant. I have also read the so-called rebuke given by your colleagues. I am a stranger to you and know but little of your past history, but I wish to say that your stand is absolutely right. I have in my possession three pamphlets that are being circulated throughout the United States by the K. of C.'s; one is marked the second edition of 1,000,000 copies, in which they state they are spending \$1,000,000 to enlighten the people of the United States as to the religious war now raging in Mexico, and urging tolerance. It doesn't take a very far-seeing man to understand if they want to know, that the Catholic Church would have us at war with Mexico for what they call religious intolerance. This country has been looking for some one with courage on whom the mantle of the late William Jennings Bryan may fall—a man who is willing to stand for the things that are right even though he may appear to be fighting alone. I can assure you that you have millions of people who are saying amen to your appeal.

Very faithfully yours,

A. B. GREEN,

HAVERHILL, MASS, January 21, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You are indeed to be congratulated upon your loyalty toward your countrymen, your fearlessness of speech, and your courageous stand on Americanism, so eloquently voiced within the Senate.

I assure you that your great work will be admired by all real Americans.

Yours very respectfully,

FRANK E. SOUTHARD.

DUBUQUE, IOWA, January 19, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: After following up the Mexican question and taking particular notice of the stand you are taking in the fight I can not sit away out here in Iowa and keep quiet any longer.

I have been a Republican all my life, having voted it for nearly 30 years, possibly because Iowa is a Republican State, but I am here to

tell you that I sure would change my politics if I were living in your State or if we had a man representing us who had half the courage that you are showing in this time of need.

How any man that dares lay claim to being a good American citizen can doubt your stand in this fight is beyond me.

If a man with an ounce of gray matter will take up a copy of Roman Catholic literature and read it, he will be fully convinced as to who is trying to drag us into war with Mexico. The inclosed marked editorial in the "only Catholic daily" printed in this country is a fair sample of their underhanded method of doing business.

Of course, you will have to expect a few spineless Protestants and so-called Masons bowing to the wishes of Rome, but a few more like you will make them hide their head in shame.

Trusting that you will win your battle and that the good Lord will be with you forever, I beg to remain,

Very fraternally yours,

SAM R. STARR, 32<sup>d</sup>.

JANUARY 19, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HEFLIN: Inclosed find clipping from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of even date, and if these are the facts I wish to congratulate you upon the stand taken, and will assure you that you have the unqualified sympathy and support of a great many people of politics different from your own, and you surely are giving the facts, for I have a half brother who is a missionary in Mexico at the present time, and he gave a very thorough explanation of the situation when here early in the winter; but there is one thing I note you omit in referring to this antagonistic group, and that is you refer to them as "Catholics," which should "always" be prefixed by "Roman," for that is one of the plans they put over about 1881, so that only the Roman Church would be considered when the name Catholic was used.

I forwarded some letters I received from several of the Roman organizations when I was on the ticket at primaries, in which they demanded that I deny indorsement of patriotic organizations, or they would refer my name to their Irish and German as opposed to them, but I did not do it.

I would like to see some bill placed on the list to have some designated way of distinguishing the parties who for various reasons have their names changed, as many are very deceiving and apparently are changed more for misrepresenting purposes than for other reasons given, and any foreigners convicted on a penitentiary charge be deported upon conviction, and sincerely hope that the bill to register and fingerprint all foreigners surely be passed by large majorities.

Again congratulating you upon the stand as taken in this matter, and wishing you success in all your undertakings,

Yours very truly,

W. A. GRIGSBY,  
1301-1308 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

CARROTHERS CONSTRUCTION CO.,  
Kansas City, Mo., January 18, 1927.

Senator HEFLIN,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is a pleasure to note that you have the courage to tell the truth about the real reason for the impending war with Mexico; that is, the influence of the Knights of Columbus.

\* \* \* \* \*

My vitriolic fellow townsman, JIM REED, becomes suddenly mellow when the interests of the Catholic Church are being upheld. \* \* \*

I served on the Mexican border in 1916, in the Army during the World War, and until a month ago I was a captain in the Missouri National Guard. I have resigned and shall not reenter the military forces of the United States until the present difficulty is adjusted. \* \* \*

At present the Knights of Columbus seem to be winning the struggle for armed intervention. But I hope that may not discourage you from continuing the fight.

Most sincerely yours,

JOHN W. CARROTHERS.

RED STAR GROCERY STORE,  
North Carrollton, Miss., January 19, 1927.

Senator TOM HEFLIN,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Allow me the pleasure of thanking you on behalf of many of our loyal citizens for the noble and courageous stand that you made on behalf of American principles and for religious liberty. Surely the Knights of Columbus have no more right to foster war on this country than we have to defend our country against their designs.

I am glad to see that there is one white man with nerve enough to speak out what every Senator knows, yet for some reason dodges with all the skill of a Red Grange.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. BILLUPS.

P. S.: I wrote my Senators several days ago, asking them to do what you have done.

ATLANTA, IND., January 19, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: God bless the one man who does not side-step the truth.

Yours for freedom,

FLORENCE (Mrs. S. S. W.) WALTON.

CAWKER CITY, KANS., January 18, 1927.

Senator HEFLIN,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR:

I am writing to tell you that you are right in your statements concerning the activities of the Knights of Columbus in the Mexican troubles. I know that the knights are rampant for intervention, as one of my sons-in-law is a member of that organization, and he is rabid; also others of the same faith. They openly talk of war with Mexico, and there must be organized propaganda back of all this talk. Keep on with your discussion of the subject whenever occasion requires, and remember that a host of Americans are backing you up.

With kind regards, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

G. S. BATTEY.

HAZEL-ATLAS GLASS CO.,  
Boston, Mass., January 20, 1927.

Senator HEFLIN,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I was interested in your comments on the floor of the Senate that the Catholic Church was responsible, through the Knights of Columbus, for the troubles in Mexico.

Notwithstanding you were criticized severely by other Senators, which was to be expected, I think you are on the right track, and I have thought this right along. I firmly believe that you are correct. You evidently have proof of what you stated. I can only surmise this, but putting the incidents together, as stated earlier, I think you are the only one who had nerve enough to state your convictions.

Yours truly,

CHAS. M. MACMILLIN.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., January 15, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have the privilege of meeting with masses of people and I find the largest amount of these people do not want the United States to enter in war with Mexico. So I want you to know how the most of we people feel about the Mexico situation.

I would like to ask you to use every effort possible to keep the United States out of war with Mexico, because we have just seen the World War and the great expense which it has cost our Government, the homes that have suffered loss, and above all the hearts it has broken for sweethearts, wives, children, and to our devoted mothers. There are many homes in Mexico which are precious to those people, and so let peace and good will be with them and also with our American homes.

Our great Government has always looked to God the Father on which our Government was founded. So I beg you to use every effort possible to help keep this Nation of ours out of war.

Respectfully yours,

MURRY M. STEELE,  
Route 7, Box 132-B.

GREENE, PA., January 21, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been reading your speeches on the Mexico situation and I want to congratulate you that you have backbone enough to get up and pour that kind of truths into the rest of the honorable body of which you are a part. It is about time Americans would get awake, and I feel proud to note that there is at least one man who is not afraid to give utterance to these truths. The people are getting your utterances even if the press does not publish them and are digesting them. Keep up the good work and I pray that power

will be given you to salt it down in the brains of the unbelievers. I wish to state that I come from a long line of Republican stock, but I thank the Giver of all good that I can see and appreciate the good in a man of the opposite party. If you have any literature send along some and I'll guarantee it will do good.

Your well wisher,

H. CLARENCE BOYD.

ALEXANDRIA, LA., January 18, 1927.

Senator HEFLIN,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations to the Senator from Alabama from voters of Louisiana.

We have read your patriotic address on the floor of the Senate in defense of our country against a "foreign foe." "God give us men" like you.

We are inclosing a letter we are sending Senator RANDELL. Would that both letters could be read from the floor of the Senate.

We are going to work to have men like you in the presidential chair. We want to put none but Americans on guard.

"God bless you."

SOME LOUISIANA VOTERS.

EDGEWATER, N. J., January 7, 1927.

Senator HEFLIN,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your conduct in the Mexican dispute marks you as an outstanding honest man. It requires the highest bravery to fight the tide on such matters as this.

I notice with gladness that your term lasts until 1931; may the coming years disclose the same fine service.

Yours very sincerely,

W. R. SASSAMAN.

WHITE EARTH, January 11, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: Permit me to tell you how very heartily I approve your stand against a possible war with Mexico, and that the common people of the country will be with you to the last to prevent another conflict such as the country has lately gone through.

I was particularly impressed with your speech in the Senate on January 8, 1927, and we, who have had any experience in trying to assist World War veterans, positively know that in most instances, they have been most shamefully treated as pertains to compensation and medical treatment they deserved. I have given freely of my time and occasional funds, in helping those boys to get justice from the Government, many of whom had to give up in utter despair because the "red tape" involved practically made it impossible for them to ever secure results.

It is right, as you say, before we are forced into another war, we should first pay the financial debt we owe our soldiers.

It begins to look as if the paid and kept press of the country have started a campaign to bring about sentiment for an intervention in Mexico. I hope Divine Providence will preserve your strength and vigor and you will never hesitate to condemn and expose those sinister interests who demand the body, soul, and resources of our country in order that their wealth may be advanced.

I am certain these sentiments, are likewise shared by 99 per cent of this community, and I feel it a duty to advise you of such public sentiment. The people are entitled to know what is going on. Only through such fearless men as yourself are we able to keep informed. \* \* \*

Yours very truly,

FRANK D. BEAULIEU.

NEW YORK, January 15, 1927.

Senator J. T. HEFLIN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am taking this means of congratulating you on the charges you made in the Senate yesterday relative to a million-dollar fund which is now being utilized on a program of intrigue and propaganda to bring about a war and intervention with Mexico.

I have managed to get a glimpse of this propaganda which is in the form of pastoral letters, etc., and has for its purpose to incite and boycott.

Men in public life, politicians, editors, newspapers, educators, etc., are as a whole reticent to discuss anything pertaining to this clergy for fear of boycott, especially in New York and other centers.

Please again accept my congratulations and more power to you.

Yours very truly,

J. SPARER.

MOBILE COUNCIL, No. 5,  
JUNIOR ORDER UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS,  
Mobile, Ala., January 20, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Permit me to thank you on behalf of Mobile Council, No. 5, Junior Order United American Mechanics, for your recent fearless expressions on the floor of the United States Senate concerning the attempt of the Knights of Columbus to force our country into war with Mexico.

Your declaration that it is "About time we were finding out if these people hold allegiance to a foreign power or potentate," above the Constitution of the United States, should be given serious thought by all statesmen and citizens with the best interests of our Nation at heart.

We do not believe that your remarks were prompted by religious prejudice as charged. We thank God that there is one man in the Senate with nerve enough to stand on his feet and tell the truth about the Mexican situation. Of course, it could be expected that you would be charged with religious prejudice.

With all best wishes for the success of those Senators who are fighting to prevent trouble with Mexico, and kindest regards to yourself, I am,

Respectfully yours,

[SEAL.]

E. W. RUSSELL, Recording Secretary.

By order of the council.

GEORGE WASHINGTON COUNCIL No. 67,  
JUNIOR ORDER UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS,  
Wilmington, N. C., January 22, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is with pleasure that I attach hereto copy of resolution passed at our regular meeting last night, January 21, indorsing your splendid fight on the Mexican situation, and especially that part of your fight wherein the Knights of Columbus were mentioned.

Personally, I am very grateful that there are a few real heroes in our Congress and Senate who are fighting to make America safe for Americans.

With very best wishes, I am, very truly yours,

[SEAL.]

R. H. EVERETT,  
Recording Secretary.

Whereas the Knights of Columbus, an organization composed of only Roman Catholics, did, on or about the 5th day of August, 1926, in a meeting in Philadelphia, adopt a resolution expressing sympathy for and pledging support to the Knights of Columbus in Mexico, and at the same time, and in the same resolution demanded that this Government take steps which, if the demand had been granted, could only have resulted in war with a neighboring country; and

Whereas the said Knights of Columbus did, at the same time and place, put in motion machinery for the raising of a fund of \$1,000,000, with which to carry their program into effect; and

Whereas following their action at that time, they have indulged in a continuous and persistent propaganda throughout the country, which can have no other purpose than to poison the minds of the people against the Mexican Government and drive this Nation into war with Mexico; and

Whereas no just cause exists for unfriendly feeling on the part of the people of this Nation against the Mexican Government or its people, as that Government is only trying to free its unfortunate citizens from the body, mind, and soul dominion which has cursed them for more than 300 years as the direct result of their slavish adherence to the Roman Catholic hierarchy; and

Whereas in the Senate of the United States there is one man, the Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN, of Alabama, whose fearless courage and conscientious convictions have enabled him to stand up in that body and tear the mask off that pernicious, disloyal, and unpatriotic horde who would plunge the Nation into war with a peaceful people for the sole and only purpose of again forging the chains of mental and physical slavery on the poor peons of Mexico: Now therefore be it

Resolved by George Washington Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, No. 67, numbering more than 500 members, That we indorse all that he has said on this question and stand as a unit behind him in the great fight he is making for the people of this country, and that we unqualifiedly denounce and condemn each and every one who undertake by innuendo, hypocrisy, falsehood, and misrepresentation, either officially, individually, in groups, or by publication, to minimize, discount, and belittle his efforts and utterances in this perilous hour of our country's history; and be it further

Resolved, That the recording secretary of this council be instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to Senator HEFLIN and that a copy of same be also sent to Hon. WILLIAM E. BORAH, United States Senator from Idaho, with the thanks of this council for the efforts these two gentlemen are making in the Senate to avert war.

NATIONAL BANK BRANCHES

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I desire to present a conference report relating to House bill No. 2, being the banking bill, and to make, by unanimous consent if I may, a motion in relation thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to receiving the conference report?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have no objection, Mr. President, but I suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania that he explain the action he is seeking to take.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to do that, and I think I can do it very briefly.

It will be recalled that this measure was passed by the House of Representatives and was subsequently amended in the Senate. In conference a deadlock developed because the House conferees were subject to an overriding instruction from the House on the most important feature in disagreement between the two Houses. In the presence of that overriding instruction it was impossible for the conferees to do anything but to report a disagreement. That has now been done in the House, but upon the presentation of that report the House passed a resolution in which it receded on many of the points of difference, including all of the most important ones with which the Senate was concerned, accepted the Senate amendments in regard to branch banking, with the single exception that I shall presently specify, accepted those provisions upon which the Senate had most strenuously insisted, and asked for a recession on our part only in the case of a number of minor provisions which the Senate conferees had been prepared to yield in conference.

The one point in connection with branch banking which the Senate will yield, if the motion which I shall presently offer prevails, is this: The Senate inserted an amendment in the bill authorizing the Comptroller of the Currency, under certain circumstances, to include within the limits of a municipality for purposes of branch banking contiguous territory. The House declined to agree to that enlargement of the political boundaries of a municipality, and the Senate conferees have yielded on that point.

So with respect to a similar power given by a Senate amendment to the Federal Reserve Board to do the like in the case of members of the Federal reserve system having branches.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. As I understand, then, the provision which permitted an economic unit to be included within the limits of a city for the purpose of establishing branch banks has been eliminated, and it is restricted now to the territorial limits of the city?

Mr. PEPPER. It is restricted to the actual political divisions of the city.

I may say, Mr. President, that the Senate conferees were strongly in favor of the contiguous territory provision, but it was found that there was an irreconcilable difference of opinion on the subject, and the vote of the House yesterday settled it conclusively so far as that body is concerned.

Mr. KING. I regret that the Senate conferees felt constrained to yield, because I think it will work irreparable hardship and injury to some banks in some communities.

Mr. PEPPER. Let me remind the Senator that the Senate conferees do not yield, because we have reported a disagreement to both Houses; but the House then proceeded to pass a resolution which has been messaged to the Senate, in which the House performs the functions of a committee of conference, because it recommends certain recessions on the part of the Senate, accomplishes certain recessions on the part of the House, and paves the way for the motion which I am about to make.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to ask him what the conferees did in regard to the amendment proposed by my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] authorizing the Federal Reserve Board to abolish branch banks when in their judgment that should be done? That is my recollection of the purport of the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, section 7 of the bill on the subject of branch banks contains the provision to which the Senator from North Carolina refers. It is provided in section 7 that a branch may not, in the first instance, be established without the consent of the Comptroller of the Currency. It is provided, in the second instance, that it can not be changed in location or be moved from one place to another without his consent; and the powers of the Comptroller of the Currency as to the parent institution are by the act extended also to all the branches.

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

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

Mr. FESS. Does the parliamentary status permit a final decision, so that the report will not have to go back to the House?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. Mr. President, I first present the conference report and ask that it may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read.  
The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2) entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide for the consolidation of national banking associations,' approved November 7, 1918; to amend section 5136 as amended, section 5137, section 5138 as amended, section 5142, section 5150, section 5155, section 5190, section 5200 as amended, section 5202 as amended, section 5208 as amended, section 5211 as amended of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and to amend section 9, section 13, section 22, and section 24 of the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes," having met, after conference have been unable to agree.

GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER,  
WALTER E. EDGE,  
CARTER GLASS,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

LOUIS T. McFADDEN,  
JAMES G. STRONG,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be agreed to.

Mr. KING. That reports a disagreement.

Mr. PEPPER. It is a conference report. I have sent to the desk, however, a motion, which I offer in connection with the filing of the report and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the amendments of the Senate to House bill 2, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,  
January 24, 1927.

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, and 34 to the bill (H. R. 2) entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide for the consolidation of national banking associations,' approved November 7, 1918; to amend section 5136 as amended, section 5137, section 5138 as amended, section 5142, section 5150, section 5155, section 5190, section 5200 as amended, section 5202 as amended, section 5208 as amended, section 5211 as amended, of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and to amend section 9, section 13, section 22, and section 24 of the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 11 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert:

"The words 'State bank,' 'State banks,' 'bank,' or 'banks,' as used in this section, shall be held to include trust companies, savings banks, or other such corporations or institutions carrying on the banking business under the authority of State laws."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 26 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert:

"Sec. 5155. The conditions upon which a national banking association may retain or establish and operate a branch or branches are the following:

"(a) A national banking association may retain and operate such branch or branches as it may have in lawful operation at the date of the approval of this act, and any national banking association which has continuously maintained and operated not more than one branch for a period of more than 25 years immediately preceding the approval of this act may continue to maintain and operate such branch.

"(b) If a State bank is hereafter converted into or consolidated with a national banking association, or if two or more national banking associations are consolidated, such converted or consolidated association may, with respect to any of such banks, retain and operate any of their branches which may have been in lawful operation by any bank at the date of the approval of the act.

"(c) A national banking association may, after the date of the approval of this act, establish and operate new branches within the limits of the city, town, or village in which said association is situated if such establishment and operation are at the time permitted to State banks by the law of the State in question.

"(d) No branch shall be established after the date of the approval of this act within the limits of any city, town, or village of which the population by the last decennial census was less than 25,000. No more than one such branch may be thus established where the population, so determined, of such municipal unit does not exceed 50,000; and not more than two such branches where the population does not exceed 100,000. In any such municipal unit where the population exceeds 100,000 the determination of the number of branches shall be within the discretion of the Comptroller of the Currency.

"(e) No branch of any national banking association shall be established or moved from one location to another without first obtaining the consent and approval of the Comptroller of the Currency.

"(f) The term 'branch' as used in this section shall be held to include any branch bank, branch office, branch agency, additional office, or any branch place of business located in any State or Territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia at which deposits are received, or checks paid, or money lent.

"(g) This section shall not be construed to amend or repeal section 25 of the Federal reserve act, as amended, authorizing the establishment by national banking associations of branches in foreign countries, or dependencies, or insular possessions of the United States.

"(h) The words 'State bank,' 'State banks,' 'bank,' or 'banks,' as used in this section, shall be held to include trust companies, savings banks, or other such corporations or institutions carrying on the banking business under the authority of State laws."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 30 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert:

"Sec. 9. That the first paragraph of section 9 of the Federal reserve act, as amended, be amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 9. Any bank incorporated by special law of any State, or organized under the general laws of any State or of the United States, desiring to become a member of the Federal reserve system, may make application to the Federal Reserve Board, under such rules and regulations as it may prescribe, for the right to subscribe to the stock of the Federal reserve bank organized within the district in which the applying bank is located. Such application shall be for the same amount of stock that the applying bank would be required to subscribe to as a national bank. The Federal Reserve Board, subject to the provisions of this act and to such conditions as it may prescribe pursuant thereto, may permit the applying bank to become a stockholder of such Federal reserve bank.

"Any such State bank which, at the date of the approval of this act, has established and is operating a branch or branches in conformity with the State law, may retain and operate the same while remaining or upon becoming a stockholder of such Federal reserve bank; but no such State bank may retain or acquire stock in a Federal reserve bank except upon relinquishment of any branch or branches established after the date of the approval of this act beyond the limits of the city, town, or village in which the parent bank is situated."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 36 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the section number and in lieu thereof insert: "16."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 37 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the section number and in lieu thereof insert: "17."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 38 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the section number and in lieu thereof insert: "18."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 39 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the section number and in lieu thereof insert: "19."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert: "An act to further amend the national banking laws and the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes."

That the House insist on its disagreement to amendments of the Senate Nos. 1, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 35.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I offer the motion which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate recede from its amendments Nos. 1, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 35.

That the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 11, 26, 30, 36, 37, 38, 39, and the amendment to the title.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am going to ask that the motion go over under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made to the consideration of the motion.

Mr. PEPPER. I have asked for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is asked by the Senator from Pennsylvania for the immediate consideration of his motion. Is there objection?

Mr. WHEELER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana objects.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, if the matter goes over, I suggest to all Senators that we proceed with the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is correct. The unanimous-consent agreement requires the consideration of the unfinished business.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Will there be a formal report on the matter?

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure that the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which I assume this matter will be referred, will be glad to comply with the suggestion that a formal report be filed; but I should like to ask, in view of the importance of this matter and the vast amount of complication that is involved, that an understanding be reached that it may be taken up and disposed of at a time to be agreed upon. I should like very much to have the leaders on both sides consider the propriety of that suggestion.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I was willing to take up the subject now, being assured that only a short time would be required to dispose of it. It does not seem to be possible, however, to reach a conclusion respecting the matter this afternoon; so I think we should resume the consideration of the unfinished business.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, let me say, if I may, that I do not think any complications whatsoever are involved. The House has agreed substantially to every amendment to the House bill made by the Senate, and is in disagreement, as I recall, upon four very inconsequential amendments made by the Senate, upon which the Senate conferees themselves were prepared to yield in conference.

I can not conceive of any complications that enter into it, or any things that may not be readily and quickly understood. It is, in fact, the Senate bill, with the exception of four inconsequential amendments that have been put on.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I call the attention of the Senator from Virginia to the fact that a motion was presented by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER] to carry out the arrangement that has been effected among the conferees, and the consideration of the motion was objected to, so that the matter can not be disposed of at this time.

Mr. GLASS. That I understood. I was not insisting upon proceeding now. I merely wished to indicate to the Senate, if I might, that in my view there is nothing complicated about the matter.

Mr. PEPPER. Let me say, for the information of the Senator from Virginia, that before he entered the Chamber, in response to a suggestion from the Senator from Arkansas, I had attempted to make a brief statement of just what is involved, with the result, I think, of showing to the Senate that just what the Senator from Virginia has stated is true—that there are only five minor points involved if the motion now pending should be adopted, but its consideration has been objected to.

Mr. GLASS. Upon some of which the Senate conferees were ready to yield, because they regarded them as inconsequential.

Mr. PEPPER. Upon all of them, I think, Mr. President, with the possible exception of the contiguous-territory provision.

#### ARBITRATION WITH MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate Resolution 327, reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only about 10 minutes, or even less, in a very brief discussion of the resolution of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

In the last few weeks I have received many telegrams and letters strongly urging me to oppose our going into war with either Mexico or Nicaragua. The sentiment in Tennessee is almost unanimous in opposition to our involving ourselves with any of our South American neighbors, and it is a sentiment with which I am in whole-hearted sympathy.

Mr. President, to make war on Mexico, or Nicaragua, or to enter into a state of warfare with them or either of them under present conditions would be criminal. I am opposed to the administration's course in dealing with Nicaragua and with Mexico. Its policy—if its actions can be so dignified as to be

called a policy—is utterly at variance with every true American policy, doctrine, or ideal. Up to the present time the administration's course in Mexico and Nicaragua has been characterized largely by mistakes and misunderstandings. With regard to Nicaragua, I believe the President has been misled as to its constitution, and that he and Secretary Kellogg have failed to sense the facts regarding our intervention in that country. Many believe that American investors have largely dictated what the administration has done in Mexico and in Nicaragua. Under no circumstances should we permit these interests to involve us in war or even to break off diplomatic relations.

I have never believed in dollar diplomacy. It is a selfish policy that in most instances is hurtful to our neighbors, and I am quite sure in the end will prove equally hurtful to us as a Nation. We want the friendship of these people to the south of us; and while we want to trade with them and want them to trade with us, we should in all of our dealings treat them with such fairness and justice as to earn a like treatment from them; and we will, if we do our part. I firmly believe we should protect the lives and property of our law-abiding nationals in foreign countries; but in order to do so I do not believe it is necessary to make war on the countries in which such nationals may live whenever they consider their property in jeopardy.

Mr. President, our interference with the internal affairs of Nicaragua and our attitude toward Mexico is attempted to be defended on the ground of the Monroe doctrine. The Monroe doctrine has no such meaning. In 1823 Mr. Monroe announced:

That the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.

And, again:

But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

And, again:

It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can any one believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves would adopt it of their own accord. It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition in any form with indifference. If we look to the comparative strength and resources of Spain and those new governments, and their distance from each other, it must be obvious that she can not subdue them. It is still the true policy of the United States to leave the parties to themselves in the hope that other powers will pursue the same course.

Our course in Nicaragua is an utter perversion of the Monroe doctrine. It is an assumption of a right to do ourselves what we deny to European nations. We have not left Nicaragua to herself. We have virtually taken her over.

In this connection, Mr. President, I desire to read to the Senate a short excerpt from a recent article by Mr. Elihu Root on the subject of the Monroe doctrine:

The Monroe doctrine does not assert or imply or involve any right on the part of the United States to impair or control the independent sovereignty of any American state. In the lives of nations as of individuals there are many rights unquestioned and universally conceded. The assertion of any particular right must be considered not as excluding all others, but as coincident with all others which are not inconsistent. The fundamental principle of international law is the principle of independent sovereignty. Upon that all other rules of international law rest. That is the chief and necessary protection of the weak against the power of the strong. Observance of that is the necessary condition to the peace and order of the civilized world. By the declaration of that principle the common judgment of civilization awards to the smallest and weakest states the liberty to control its own affairs without interference from any other power, however great.

The Monroe doctrine does not infringe upon that right. It asserts the right. The declaration of Monroe was that the rights and interests of the United States were involved in maintaining a condition, and the condition to be maintained was the independence of all the American countries.

Again said Mr. Root:

A false conception of what the Monroe doctrine is, of what it demands and what it justifies, of its scope, and of its limits has invaded the public press and affected public opinion within the past few years. Grandiose schemes of national expansion invoke the Monroe doctrine. Interested motives to compel Central or South American countries to do or refrain from doing something by which individual Americans may

profit invoke the Monroe doctrine. Clamors for national glory from minds too shallow to grasp at the same time a sense of national duty invoke the Monroe doctrine. The intolerance which demands that control over the conduct and the opinions of other peoples, which is the essence of tyranny, invokes the Monroe doctrine. Thoughtless people who see no difference between lawful right and physical power assume that the Monroe doctrine is a warrant for interference in the internal affairs of all weaker nations in the New World. Against this supposititious doctrine many protests, both in the United States and in South America, have been made, and justly made. To the real Monroe doctrine these protests have no application.

Mr. President, I can not too strongly commend these words of wisdom from a former great Secretary of State and from a former Member of this body. The Monroe doctrine gives no warrant for our course in Nicaragua or for that course proposed to be taken in Mexico.

It is entirely a misconception of that doctrine that under it this Government has the power to interfere in the internal affairs of a South or Central American republic and govern it by force, or through the form, of election, and put one dictator or another in power, collect the revenues, guarantee the bonds, and in substance and in fact create a military despotism, such as we have done in Nicaragua.

Mr. President, in my judgment it is absolutely indefensible for our Government to be intriguing with any faction in Nicaragua or any other foreign country. Certainly we have no business aiding a revolution in Nicaragua, which expelled one of the duly elected and constitutionally elected rulers in that country. Certainly we have no business furnishing arms and ammunition to one of the revolutionary parties there.

Under the Monroe doctrine, or under any correct policy, we should be exceedingly just and kind and even generous to our southern neighbors. We do not need any of their territory. We do not want any of their territory. We should not have any of their territory. We should not control their elections. We should not collect their revenues. We should not run their governments, and we have no business interfering with their internal affairs except in a helpful and wholly impartial way. Surely we had no business in aiding in putting a former American agent in the Presidency in Nicaragua and then having our marines hold him there by force. Surely we had no business joining a revolution which ran the Vice President out of the country. Surely we have no business creating neutral zones or spheres of influence in Nicaragua and then patrolling them in the interest of our own people or of a revolutionary faction. We should not permit any of our citizens to indulge in any exploitation of the resources of our southern neighbors. With all due respect to Secretary Kellogg, whom I have known for a long time and like personally, I think he is utterly mistaken in the attitude he has taken in all these matters. I read the so-called red propaganda given as a defense for his action, and was amazed to find that it is apparently nothing but inconsequential propaganda and is of no evidential value whatsoever. In any legal controversy in which it might be offered such propaganda would unquestionably be ruled out by the court as wholly inadmissible evidence. Even if it were admitted, it would have no weight, as has been suggested by a Senator sitting near me.

Mr. President, there is no difference between us and Nicaragua or between us and Mexico which can not easily be adjusted by arbitration. In the maze of misinformation, of misinterpretation, misconception, in which the administration finds itself both in Mexico and Nicaragua, it is, to my mind, exceedingly fortunate that our Foreign Relations Committee has adopted the Robinson arbitration resolution, recommending to the President that we arbitrate all differences with Mexico, which advice if followed by the administration will, in my judgment, lead us out of the trouble in Mexico. The same policy should be followed in other countries.

We should cultivate peace and good will with all Central American and South American Republics. We should make it certain to them that we do not intend and that we shall not permit any exploitation by our nationals in these countries. We should so treat them as to earn their good will and respect and their perfect confidence in our good intentions toward them. We should seek their friendship rather than give them the slightest ground to think we would rob them of their wealth either by force or by diplomacy.

To those of my constituents who have asked me to protest against going to war against Mexico or Nicaragua, I would say that I do not believe that the Congress will declare war. With this resolution to guide the administration, I would be astonished to find that the President would permit us to be drawn into a state of war with either Mexico or Nicaragua. I think the military and naval forces of the Government should not be used in a state of war with Mexico unless by direction of

the Congress. Under the Constitution only the Congress has the right to declare war. The overwhelming sentiment of this country is opposed to any such war, and it is a sentiment that we should all respect and abide by. I am heartily in favor of the Robinson resolution and hope it will receive every vote in the Senate.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the pending resolution. Its adoption may quiet the fears of a few people in this country who have been persuaded that President Coolidge is now honing his knife with homicidal intent. That it will have any beneficial effect outside of the United States I gravely doubt. I think we shall be fortunate if the first, second, and third estates in Mexico do not construe it as a declaration of war by the Colossus of the North; and, very briefly, I desire to put into the Record my reasons for entertaining this opinion.

The inhabitants of Mexico and Central America have my sympathy. Their troubles for the most part are anthropological and meteorological in their origin and consequently not easily removed. In other words, the weather is largely responsible for the variations in the color and the conduct of men and women the world over, and the weather is something the Senate has not yet resolved to investigate and punish for misconduct. Where food can be had for the gathering and clothing is required for ornamental purposes only, people have much spare time; and while it would seem that nations so favored by nature should be among the first to find and frequent the paths of peace and progress, a glance at the map of the earth clearly indicates that such is not the case. Indeed, the physiological and psychological effect of an excess of leisure, near the Equator or elsewhere, is both startling and alarming.

If our proud and belligerent neighbors just below the Rio Grande had the intelligence and the diligence to ascertain and comprehend the reasons why, with untold wealth beneath their feet and peace and sunshine over their heads, they have not and will not pay the interest upon their defaulted national obligations they would know what has been and still is the matter with Mexico. And they would realize that they will remain in their present condition until they can rear generations of men and women who will use their spare time for other purposes than those of self-destruction. If the weather has endowed the Mexican with a congenital incapacity to preserve order or pay his debts; if neither precept nor persuasion from outside nor anything they can claim as their own will undo the work of untold centuries of warm weather—then what? Will Mother Nature stick to her knitting and in conscientious disregard of the doctrine of self-determination, will she continue to help only those who can and do help themselves?

And this brings me to the main consideration that has induced me to take the floor. Mr. President, I am aware that the civilized nations have blessed and published this doctrine of nonintervention or self-determination, regardless of its consequences to those in whose interest it is invoked. The immortal Lincoln preached it, as have his successors who have occupied the pulpit of democracy; but neither Lincoln nor anybody else ever carried it beyond the edges of expediency. When a larger portion of the earth than is now the case was owned and occupied by their weaker brethren and title by conquest was the order of the day, every great power hoped that this doctrine would keep its rivals in the real-estate business on the neutral side of the fence until it could trump up a *casus belli* that would serve as an excuse for getting its muskets first into the field, not for the purpose of protecting the weaker brother but for the sole purpose of securing title to his land.

There are instances where international jealousies and fears have applied the nonintervention gospel as promising the least of many unpleasant possibilities. And it may be that in some cases fewer men and women have been killed and robbed and ravished in its observance than in its breach. But the point that I want to emphasize is the unblushing fact that this doctrine is founded upon the assumption that might or the largest mob is always right when it asserts itself in domestic upheavals. In other words, it assumes that outsiders are morally bound never to interfere in domestic quarrels however brutal and revolting their consequences to insiders. Moreover, Mr. President, had the white man observed it, he would have been excluded from the Western Hemisphere, and the civilizations of the Eastern Hemisphere would have remained tied to the stake of barbarism.

Virtuous or vicious as this doctrine may be if literally and universally applied, the map of the earth, to which I have called attention, clearly indicates that it is a doctrine which heretofore has been happily disregarded by forces which have been and I think will continue to remain beyond the control of treaties and treaty makers.

For many years the people of Mexico and Central America have enjoyed to the full the right to settle their domestic affairs, mental, moral, and material, without interference from outside. They have established representative democracies, and they have adopted model and humane constitutions. Yet their story, for the most part, has been one of revolution, which has resulted in stagnation or retrogression. It may be that outsiders have obtained property rights in Mexico and the Central American countries at much less than their real value. It may be that public officials have been bribed to grant concessions which have been very profitable to the grantees.

Much as we may regret these circumstances, it still remains to be said that if these transfers to aliens were tainted with fraud they could have been set aside by the domestic courts, if these courts had been presided over by honest judges. And with the taxing power they could have got a reasonable share of the profits enjoyed by the outsider had they been able to find and elect honest lawmaking bodies. If, as free and independent democracies, their nationals have preyed upon each other, and if while so engaged they have sold revolutions to the highest bidder, foreign or domestic, whose fault is it? And certainly they would have been drawn and quartered and consumed by foreign powers long ago but for the protecting arm of the United States in its strict enforcement of the Monroe doctrine. They may deny anything that anybody may say about them to-day; they may accuse the United States of hostile and imperialistic intentions; and their denials and accusations may be repeated and sustained by their friends in other countries; nevertheless, their lamentable political, industrial, and sociological record is written in indelible ink of their own manufacture. That they envy and hate us is a matter of course. That our less fortunate neighbors in other lands should sympathize with them is natural. That many well-meaning Americans should cry imperialism at this time is to be expected. From Queen Elizabeth to Thomas Jefferson and from Thomas Jefferson to Calvin Coolidge the English-speaking inhabitants of America have been denounced as wanton and aggressive imperialists by those who were not affiliated with the party in power when additional territory was acquired. It is my belief that these same objectors would have cried the dominant administrations to perdition had they failed to do precisely what they did do or had they ever, under any circumstances, suffered without protest invasions upon the personal safety or property of American citizens "by anybody, anywhere, at any time."

I think all this means that those responsible for Uncle Sam's conduct must be patient but exceedingly firm. We are a great and powerful people. Our progress has been rapid and phenomenal in its proportions, and the time has arrived for better or worse when we do not want a square rod of land belonging to our neighbors.

But, Mr. President, there are many kinds of imperialism, and among them is the imperialism of science and peace and justice. It is this kind that Uncle Sam is guilty of advancing, and none other. A few years ago he gave peace and liberty to Cuba and the Philippines; the greatest philanthropy in history. About eight years ago he helped make the world safe for democracy, and in this endeavor he saved his associates from irreparable humiliation and defeat. He is now "reaping the old reward," the blame of those he has bettered and the hate of those he has protected, and the voice of the distinguished gentleman who uttered the prophecy, which I have quoted in substance, is now heard among those who are illustrating its accuracy. Whether it was the climate or its Creator that called Uncle Sam to the tasks he has so well performed, I do not know. It is my belief that up to date the weather and the Creator have acted as partners, and it is my opinion that this partnership will be continued as a solvent and going concern in spite of human resolutions to the contrary.

I am brave enough to hope that the people who reside in the center of America and all other centers will some day reach a stage of civilization that will enable them to settle their domestic affairs without bloodshed and pillage, and that until they do this somebody will step in and protect the lives and property of law-abiding foreigners. Among the moral standards that we know anything about up to date, there is no difference between the obligation that rests upon the citizens of Washington to rescue a citizen of New York who is being murdered on Pennsylvania Avenue and the duty of the United States to protect the lives and property of its law-abiding citizens in Central America or Central Asia or Central Europe or Central Africa. And if we do not recognize this obligation and enforce it to the letter in Mexico and Central America, other nations under like hazards will step in and do it for us.

No nation is bound to wait until its citizens have been killed and their property destroyed. No nation is bound to postpone

intervention until it is too late to accomplish its only purpose, and nations in which the normal condition is that of insurrection and violence must expect that prompt and effective precautionary measures will be invoked. The statements and claims of those who oppose intervention in Nicaragua merely emphasize the fact that both sides to the controversy are now in battle array, ready to settle their differences in historic Central American style, and with the chances all pointing to the immediate removal of minority statesmen to the nearest cemetery.

Now that the President has taken time and Nicaragua by the forelock, the rival forces, according to their usual custom, will smile and smile and promise to settle their differences with the ballot, and if we remain and watch them, American lives and property will be safe until the votes are counted. Then the defeated candidates will cry fraud, and immediately upon our retirement the open season for Nicaraguan officials elect will begin, with no bag limit.

Mr. President, the disturbance now on the stage in Central America does not compare with the hubbub of muck and muck which Colombian statesmen of the old school kicked up when we recognized the independence of Panama. To allay and quiet the cries of the Colombian infant we administered financial Castoria to the extent of \$25,000,000; when Colombia in good conscience and equity should have been assessed more than that amount as a small portion of the benefits accruing to her by reason of the construction of the canal.

Responding to this same motherly regard for the young, we have already given Nicaragua \$3,000,000 for the right to build a canal across her territory, which if built will make Nicaragua rich in spite of herself.

I think we safely may expect that the Central American incident of 1926 and 1927, like its predecessors of similar nature, will soon be closed and that the empire of science and peace and justice to which I have referred will continue to expand north and south and east and west in spite of the doctrine of self-determination or in harmony with it, as the climate and the Creator may direct. As for the future of Mexico, the good people in the United States who love peace and hate war, even as I do, can as well reach the conclusion now as later that the nation or the race that is too lazy to work, too weak to keep the peace, too ignorant to teach itself, and too proud to learn from others will find no permanent habitat where the temperature is below the combustion point.

Mr. President, I would like to read as a part of my remarks the opinion of a celebrated anthropologist who lives in Mexico. His name is Manuel Gamio. He was formerly a director of the bureau of anthropology. This article was printed in the New York Times of January 23, 1927. There are only a few lines, and I will read them:

Manuel Gamio, former director of the bureau of anthropology, touches upon a matter of great importance if a democracy is to be made out of Mexican racial dissimilarities when he says that Mexico as a nation can not be placed upon a permanent base until the indigenous population is scientifically studied to bring about not only "unification of tongue and equilibrium of economic interests" but cultural and spiritual fusion. Señor Gamio has proposed to President Calles a thorough investigation of "the true characteristics and aspirations of the widely different social groups." Concerning relations with the United States, Señor Gamio proposes that this country attach to the embassy at the City of Mexico a man of scientific attainments "to investigate that most interesting factor in international relations, the human factor, and thereby discover the reason for the social and cultural hostility between the Anglo-Saxon and Indo-Hispanic elements on this continent, and propose the remedy for such a situation."

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Arkansas if it is his intention to have a vote this afternoon?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I am entirely ready for a vote.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I voted in the Committee on Foreign Relations for delay or at least further consideration of this resolution because I hesitate to interfere with what I have always contended was the fundamental responsibility of the Chief Executive and of the State Department.

Of course, I assume it is unnecessary for me to state this action on my part was not aimed in any way at the very laudible object and intent of the resolution. Everyone believes in the principle of arbitration. That goes without saying. I am sure there is not a Senator in this body who will seriously contend that the President and the State Department will not always follow that policy when such a policy promises solutions or is at all possible of adoption.

Of course, I likewise recognize that Congress, or either branch thereof, are entirely within their rights when they go on record advising or suggesting policies to the State Depart-

ment, but I repeat I fear such action, especially when it is practically impossible to be familiar with all the facts, may confuse and complicate rather than really assist in a solution of the problem.

I do not propose to review the history of the relations of the United States and Mexico. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENOX] in his able speech has admirably presented these facts to the country, and it does not furnish a very bright page so far as Mexican policy in the past is concerned.

Dealing, however, with the present major controversy, it appeals to me as most difficult to find a starting place for arbitration. The President of the United States has clearly indicated, and properly so, that it is the duty of the Government to protect American property as well as American lives. This very resolution recites in no uncertain terms, and properly so, that "the arbitration agreement to provide for protection of all American property rights pending the final outcome of the arbitration." There is, therefore, certainly no disagreement between the Executive and State Department and the proponents of the resolution as to that fundamental understanding.

On the other hand, the President of Mexico very naturally asserts that the provisions of the constitution of Mexico is not a subject for arbitration; that in sovereign States the people who live under it alone can interpret the constitution. It is alleged that this constitution, adopted in 1917, provides for retroactive confiscation of certain property rights, or it is so analyzed and implied.

So there we have the two clearly defined contentions and in their application as far apart as the poles.

It seems to me the only question to arbitrate, or at least the question which is furnishing the present irritation, is the alleged right under this constitution to confiscate property rights of American citizens obtained previous to the adoption of the constitution.

We insist, on the one hand, we will not arbitrate that question. We declare in the resolution that these rights are sacred.

On the other hand, Mexico declares it is their constitution, and apparently assumes it is their right. So, I repeat, an arbitration of this real irritant in the present situation seems hopeless. There may be minor misunderstandings that arbitration or, I imagine, diplomatic exchange might clear up, but as to the major ones a settlement apparently could only be reached on the part of the United States by failing to protect the property of its citizens, or on the part of Mexico by admitting the retroactive confiscation in the constitution will be revised.

Anyhow, I repeat that the Executive and State Department, fully aware of this situation and undoubtedly of many more details entering into it, must be depended upon to represent this Nation. It may be said this resolution in no way directs them; that it simply expresses the opinion of the Senate. I do not doubt it likewise expresses the firm opinion of the country, that if real arbitration can be undertaken it should be adopted. Somehow, however, I fear that when action is taken in this legislative way it may in some manner offer consolation to the Mexican side of the controversy and might make the duty or the work of our Executive and State Department just a little more difficult. They can be trusted to do their very best in the premises. The passage of this resolution could not inspire them to a higher standard of Americanism or duty.

I recognize the popularity of this type of legislation, because it is supposed to lead in the direction of peace rather than war. Everyone indorses such a purpose. My only object in discussing the resolution is the fear that it may do more harm than good by the manner it may be received in Mexico.

I join with others in absolute confidence that there will be no war with Mexico. Certainly no Member of this body or citizen of this country would for one moment infer that the President of the United States has ever indicated through thought or action his desire to use force. I have no doubt he would properly meet any contingency; but whatever resolutions the Senate pass the President will go on meeting his obligation and doing his full duty, and will have back of him the universal confidence of the American people.

I recognize that the resolution will pass, and I sincerely hope its effect will be beneficial. I have no desire to obstruct its passage, as my acquiescence in the unanimous-consent agreement testifies. I simply wished to express my convictions in an important matter of this character. I am not opposing arbitration. I am opposing the policy of dictating to the Executive the methods to be employed in dealing with foreign nations in protecting American life and property.

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

Mr. KING. Mr. President, with the purpose of the resolution before us I am in entire sympathy. It has been the policy of our Government from the beginning to settle international controversies by arbitration or other peaceable means. The American people have never desired war and are to-day the foremost exponents of peace. Upon a number of occasions the United States has entered into special treaties for the purpose of arbitrating disputes. The resolution before us should be interpreted in the spirit that has guided in construing treaties of an arbitral character between nations. There are some disputes which may not be the subject of arbitration, and in voting for this resolution I do so with the understanding that there may be questions arising between Mexico and the United States or between the nationals of the United States and Mexico that are not within the letter or the spirit of the resolution.

I vote for this resolution with the understanding that the United States owes a duty to its citizens to protect their lives and properties—a duty which it may not neglect or disregard.

The resolution declares, in substance, that any course pursued with a view to arbitration must be consistent with the honor and the best interests of the United States, and must be promotive of international peace and good will. Any policy adopted by the United States in its dealings with Mexico which does not preserve the honor of our Nation and does not make for the establishment of justice and does not have regard for the rights and interests of American citizens obviously would not "be promotive of international peace and good will."

Notwithstanding that I am placing upon the resolution the interpretation just indicated, I have some misgivings as to its effect upon the Mexican Government and the results which will flow from its adoption. I am not without apprehension that the Calles government and the Mexican people will regard the adoption of the resolution as a declaration upon the part of the American people against any policy which looks to the protection of the lives and property of American citizens in Mexico. It can not be denied that many of the Mexican people are hostile to the United States and the American people. They regard with disfavor the large investments which have been made in Mexico by Americans and would be glad to see Mexican soil rid of all American nationals.

The "gringo" is hated by some Mexicans and feared by others. The Mexican people are not unaware of the strained relations which have existed, intermittently, for a long period of years between the two Governments. They know of the many trespasses committed against Americans, that many Americans have been killed upon Mexican soil, and that tens of millions of dollars of property belonging to Americans have either been confiscated or destroyed by the Mexican Government or by its nationals. They know that hundreds of notes have been exchanged between the two Governments, growing out of the wrongs committed against American citizens. They know of the efforts made by the United States to secure indemnity for these wrongs, and they know that all efforts have proven futile. They have discovered that trespasses committed against the nationals of Germany or France or Great Britain or other powerful nations have brought sharp rebukes and demands for reparations which the Mexican Government knew must be complied with. But the Mexicans have learned of the tolerance and patience and forbearance of our Government, and instead of this attitude upon the part of the United States resulting in good will and amity it has, with some Mexicans, provoked them to assume a contemptuous course toward the United States and its nationals.

They have construed the tolerant and forgiving, and, indeed, compassionate course of this Nation as a sign of weakness, if not of fear. The Calles government has, in my opinion, not been considerate of the rights of American citizens who have interests in Mexico. He has adopted policies which he must have known would provoke controversy and be regarded by many American citizens as attacks upon their rights. Undoubtedly a chauvinistic spirit has accompanied some of his activities, which has found repercussions in various parts of Mexico. And so, Mr. President, there is, in my opinion, ground for the fear that the Calles government will look upon the adoption of this resolution as a recession from a policy calling for the protection of the lives and property of American nationals.

Mr. President, there has scarcely been an administration since the days of John Quincy Adams which did not yield a large crop of troubles and controversies between Mexico and the United States. Mexico's conduct in the days when Andrew Jackson was President was so intolerant and so menacing as to provoke sharp notes from our Government and the final withdrawal of some of our diplomatic representatives from Mexico.



The rights of American nationals in Jackson's administration were attacked and their property destroyed.

The transgressions of Mexico continued down to the breaking out of the Mexican War. American lives had been lost in Mexico, and American property had been destroyed.

The claims presented by our Government to Mexico for indemnity had been ignored, and after the Mexican War and from then down until the present day our Government has been compelled to make representations to Mexico because of her violation of the rights of American citizens. These appeals and representations have been in vain. Hundreds of American citizens have been killed upon Mexican soil, and hundreds of millions of dollars of property has been destroyed, or confiscated. But no reparations have been paid, and thousands of American citizens have been deprived of all their property because of the transgressions of the Mexican Government or its nationals.

As I recall, the only compensation which American citizens have ever received from Mexico grew out of the terms of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, under which several million dollars, which was to be paid to Mexico, was reserved by the United States to meet claims of some American citizens.

Mr. President, the Senate of the United States adopted a resolution in 1919, as I recall, calling for an investigation of the damages and outrages suffered by citizens of the United States in the Republic of Mexico. The Committee on Foreign Relations was instructed to inquire into the number of citizens who have been killed or have suffered personal outrages in Mexico and the amount of property indemnity for such murder and outrages; the amount of damages suffered on account of the destruction, confiscation, and larceny of personal property and the confiscation and deprivation of the use of lands and the destruction of improvements thereon.

The committee was also instructed to ascertain the number of citizens of the United States residing in Mexico at the time President Diaz retired from the Presidency and the number there residing at the time the resolution was adopted, and also the nature, character, and value of their holdings and property in Mexico.

A subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee was appointed. It conducted hearings and submitted testimony found in nearly 3,500 pages of reports. The committee reported that between 1910 and May 20, 1920, 397 American citizens had been killed in Mexico and 64 soldiers; that 58 American civilians were killed by Mexicans along the border and in the United States and 68 American soldiers. The committee also reported that 32 civilian Americans had been outraged or wounded in Mexico during the same period and 29 United States soldiers. The committee further reported that there were 90 American civilians wounded on the border and in the United States and 47 soldiers. They also reported that the losses sustained by Americans, by reason of the death of American citizens, personal injuries and damage to property, individual and corporate, totaled over \$505,000,000.

Mr. President, for all of these wrongs Mexico has not paid, as I am advised, a single penny.

The committee reported that at the outbreak of the Madero revolution the value of American holdings in Mexico was \$1,057,000,000. This, however, was based upon a statement prepared by Marion Letcher, who was the American consul at Chihuahua. The committee further stated that the holdings of Americans were considerably in excess of those reported by Mr. Letcher, and my recollection is that they estimated the value of all American holdings to have been nearly one and one-half billion dollars.

The committee also reported that there were approximately 60,000 Americans in Mexico when Diaz left Mexico. Mr. Henry Lane Wilson, who was the ambassador to Mexico, stated that there were at that time 75,000 Americans, including transients, in the Republic of Mexico. Of this number, 15,000 were cultivating lands in small holdings. Many were engaged in mining, railroading, and various other activities. The American citizens built railroads, developed water power, constructed lighting plants, erected smelters, opened up mines, built dams and irrigating systems, and converted barren and arid wastes into fertile fields and farms. They gave employment to tens of thousands of Mexican nationals and added to the wealth and prosperity of that Republic.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the conclusions and recommendations of the committee appointed to investigate conditions in Mexico. They referred to the fact that most of the Americans had been driven out, and then stated that the United States should in an unequivocal way—

Diligently watch the fortunes of those Americans who can not get away and shall hold those responsible for their sufferings and losses to a definite reckoning.

The committee repeated the words of Secretary Evarts, Secretary of State in 1878, that—

The first duty of a government is to protect life and property. This is a paramount obligation. For this governments are instituted and governments neglecting or failing to perform it become worse than useless. This duty the Government of the United States has determined to perform to the extent of its power toward its citizens on the border. It is not solicitous; it never has been about the methods or ways in which that protection shall be accomplished, whether by formal treaty stipulation or by informal convention; whether by the action of judicial tribunals or that of military forces. Protection in fact to American lives and property is the sole point upon which the United States are tenacious.

It is quite apparent that our Government, in its dealings with Mexico, has not lived up to this pronouncement by Secretary Evarts. It has not protected by judicial tribunals or military forces, or otherwise, the lives or property of American citizens in Mexico.

With respect to article 27 of the new constitution of Mexico the committee state that it should not apply to property—

heretofore acquired by Americans or which may hereafter be acquired, except where the limitation is written in the deed, lease, or other instrument of title, and particularly

The provision of said article to the effect that the subsoil products, other than of metalliferous minerals, shall be the property of the National Government of Mexico, to be disposed of by decree or by law, shall not apply to the property of American citizens purchasing from other individuals or from State, national, or municipal authorities of Mexico, unless the limitation or reservation with reference to such subsoil products shall be written in the original deed or other instrument of conveyance, transferring the surface of such property to such American purchaser.

I shall not further refer to this report, although it is illuminating and should receive the attention of Congress.

Mr. WHEELER. Under what administration were the persons killed, referred to by the Senator? That was not under the present administration—

Mr. KING. No; I stated that the committee reported that these homicides occurred between 1910 and May 20, 1920. My information is that a number of American citizens have been killed upon Mexican soil since then.

Mr. President, the tragic conditions which have existed in Mexico since it became a republic persist even to this hour, and when I referred to the beginning of the Republic, I did not mean to imply that Mexico's condition prior to that time was not one of sorrow and travail. Mexico to-day is in a condition of ferment. What the result will be it is difficult to determine. Believing, however, as I do, that humanity is marching forward, I can not help but feel that out of the shadows which now envelop Mexico there will ultimately emerge a stronger and a better Mexico. She may pass through further trials and be visited by additional afflictions. The road leading to progress and civilization is a hard one, and those who follow it leave the impress of their wounded and bloody feet.

Mr. President, I fear that the situation in Mexico has not been improved by Calles. In my opinion, notwithstanding his declarations and at times protestations to the contrary, he is pushing Mexico toward Bolshevism.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. KING. Let me complete my thought and I shall then yield.

I do not mean to say that Calles accepts the ideology of Lenin and Trotsky to its full extent, or the extreme communistic pronouncements of Karl Marx, but I think the evidence is convincing that he sympathizes with many of the views of the communists of Russia and supports some of the policies there proclaimed. Undoubtedly, Calles had reason to complain, as did patriotic Mexican citizens, of the industrial and economic conditions existing in Mexico when Calles came to power and which had existed for many years.

No one who has been familiar with Mexico for the past generation or who is acquainted with her history can feel other than that reforms were needed in Mexico, reforms of an essential, economic, and political character. Mexico was too static. The gulf between the millions of illiterate Indians and those who possessed wealth and power was too wide. Mexico was an anachronism in this day of political liberty and of economic and industrial progress.

Mr. President, I sympathize deeply with the Mexican people, and I shall welcome every movement calculated to bring them greater happiness, peace, and prosperity. Economic and political conditions in Mexico for many years have not been conducive to peace and progress, or at least there have been con-

ditions which retarded intellectual and industrial development so essential for the happiness and welfare of the 15,000,000 of people residing there.

Calles had a difficult problem confronting him when he came into power. The same can be said of his predecessor, Obregon. The latter was too militaristic. The latter, in my opinion, is not only militaristic but he is too greatly impregnated with socialistic heresies and too much prejudiced against the spiritual values of religion. I now yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the Calles government has turned the railroads back to private ownership, and if the railroads are not being run at the present time by New York bankers, among them Mr. Lorie?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am not as familiar with the railroad situation as the Senator is, but my recollection of the railroad situation is that during the conflicts and internal struggles following the departure from Mexico of Diaz the railroads fell into disrepair, and in many parts of Mexico into disuse. Many miles of track were destroyed, engines were wrecked, and cars burned. The Government attempted to operate the railroads, or at least some of them, during the régimes of Madero, Carranza, Huerta, and Obregon. Their efforts were not successful, and in order to meet the necessities of the country the railroad and transportation facilities have been generally turned back to the owners. The Calles government, because of a lack of means and for other reasons, was unable to give the service required and private operation has been sought. The history of the attempts of the various Mexican régimes to operate the railroads presents a very sorry picture.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator permit one other question?

Mr. KING. Perhaps the Senator had better speak in his own time.

Mr. WHEELER. I merely wanted to ask one question. Is it not a fact that the Calles government has been the first government in Mexico for some time that has paid the interest upon its bonds.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I know that during the revolutions since the days of Diaz, Mexican finances have been in a chaotic condition. The Senator will remember, however, that De la Huerta, who sought to be President, when the Secretary of the Treasury made important reforms in the fiscal affairs of Mexico and as I now recall, negotiated a loan in New York which replenished the treasury and aided the Mexican Government partially, at least, in putting its house in order. Calles was the beneficiary of the work of De la Huerta. He has also received large contributions, in the shape of taxes, of course, from the oil companies and I think he has negotiated some reforms so that he has been able to meet the interest charges upon Government bonds. However, he has made but little, if any, progress toward industrial and economic improvements, and Mexico's condition is not satisfactory, either politically or economically.

I do not wish to detract from any accomplishments of President Calles, and I believe that he has desired to improve the condition of the great mass of the Mexican people. But I have felt that he was strongly anti-American and was generally hostile to foreigners. It is quite likely that he perceives that many of the industries of Mexico were created and owned largely by Americans and in part by Europeans.

It is perhaps true that he fears the influence of foreign capital and of nationals of other countries who may take up their residence in Mexico. It is not unnatural that in weak countries there should be deep concern when foreigners acquire large holdings of land and become powerful in the control of industry. And this feeling, undoubtedly, is stronger if those from other countries possess greater business acumen, executive ability, and other traits of leadership in connection with business and industrial activities.

But conceding to Calles some reason for these apprehensions and views, and attributing to him a sincere desire for the welfare of his country, I can not help but feel that he has exhibited too much hostility to Americans and to the business interests in Mexico, owned or controlled by American citizens.

I believe that he and the governors of some of the Mexican States have ruthlessly expropriated the property of foreigners, as well as of some Mexican citizens, that their so-called "expropriation" has been virtually confiscation. I have believed that the new constitution was aimed at foreigners and that under its provisions the property of American citizens in Mexico is without protection.

There can be no objection, Mr. President, to a rational policy looking toward a more equitable division of the arable lands of Mexico. It is an unhealthy condition in any country for

the greater part of the land to be owned by a small percentage of the population. There can be no objection to the Government, in a proper and just way, acquiring by purchase or under the power of eminent domain, a portion of some of the large estates and arranging for their distribution among the landless population. Ireland's condition was intolerable, and Gladstone wisely forced through a reluctant parliament a measure under which many of the Irish people were enabled to acquire lands for their own use. A similar policy is entirely justified in Mexico, and if Calles pursued a wise policy in the matter of acquiring needed lands for the use of the landless millions of Mexicans, the voice of criticism would not be heard.

But the conduct of the Calles government in dealing with the agrarian question has not brought satisfaction to the poor and it has overwhelmed the possessors of lands with fear and consternation. It is believed by many that the right of private property is denied, and there is a general feeling of anxiety upon the part of many in the community which makes for unrest and growing discontent.

Moreover, it has been felt by many of the Mexican people, and this view is shared by a large number of people outside of Mexico, that the Calles government is hostile, not alone to the Roman Catholic Church, but to religion generally. I shall not enter into a discussion of this question. It is highly controversial and its consideration here and now would serve no useful purpose. I will say, however, in passing, that it is my belief that Calles and many of his supporters partake more or less of the Bolshevik view with respect to religion. The Russian Bolsheviks make no secret of their hostility to all forms of religious faith. They regard religion as hostile to communism, and believe that the communistic state can only reach the plenitude of its power when religion is destroyed and when all belief in a Supreme Being or in another life is extirpated from the human heart.

Their theory is that a belief in God strengthens the family and that the perpetuity of the family results in a desire for property which leads to capitalism. Therefore, to destroy capitalism, religion must be destroyed. If Calles read aright the results of history, he would not seek to weaken the faith of the people in God. He would realize that true religion contributes to the maintenance of law and order, the protection of the State, and the progress, happiness, and welfare of mankind.

I only repeat when I say that economic conditions in Mexico call for change. Most of the 15,000,000 people residing in Mexico are Indians and they are illiterate. It is a stupendous task to bring Mexico to the high place which she should occupy. There are many elements of strength in Mexico, and the elements and forces there exist out of which a great state may arise. There are hundreds of thousands of Mexicans of culture and education and ability. They are patriotic and sincerely desire to see their country occupy an honorable place among the nations of the earth.

Unfortunately for Mexico there have been too many military chieftains, too many bigoted and ignorant persons who have reached positions of place and power through and by reason of the Army and the sword, rather than because of their ability to serve the people or an unselfish devotion to the welfare of their country. If the best elements in Mexico could fill the political and governmental positions, then Mexico would soon catch the light of a brighter and more glorious day.

Mr. President, I sympathize with the point of view of the Mexicans and the Haitians and the Filipinos and the people of other countries less advanced than our own when they perceive that foreigners who have corporate wealth behind them are acquiring large holdings in their respective countries and are dominating or greatly influencing the economic and industrial situation.

I had occasion rather intensively to study conditions in Haiti. The people there, as Senators know, are largely negroes. They won their liberty in 1804 and established a Republic. They wrote into their constitution a provision forbidding foreigners to own land in Haiti. They feared that foreign capital might invade their territory, acquire the ownership of arable lands, and make the people tenants and peons. The United States, using the mailed fist, forced the Haitians under military rule. Our marines are now upon Haitian soil and the American military man, General Russell, is the practical dictator of Haiti and her people. He is the real power. Behind him is the shadow in the form of Borno, the alleged President of Haiti.

I repeat that the United States is governing Haiti at the point of the bayonet, and the Haitian people are subjected to our military rule. We forced a constitution upon them which permits foreigners to acquire land, and already thousands of acres of Haitian soil have passed under the control of American corporations. This has led to a deep-seated resentment and fear upon the part of the Haitians, and thousands of them have

migrated, seeking homes in Cuba, Porto Rico, and other islands in the Caribbean Sea.

Mr. President, the resolution before us and the question which we were discussing has broader implications than have been indicated in the discussion. Many years ago the Pan American Union was established. James G. Blaine earnestly sought to bring North and Central American and the Latin American Republics into closer political and economic relations. He and other American statesmen have assiduously labored to promote amity and good will among all of the inhabitants of North America, South America, and Central America. Many Pan American conferences have been held for the purpose of promoting not only international good will but trade and commerce between the various countries which I have just referred to.

Congress has enacted measures to promote trade with the Latin-American Republics, and American business men have been earnest in their efforts to find markets for American products and to increase the trade and commerce between the United States and the countries to the south of us.

At many of these Pan American conferences, American citizens have been encouraged to make investments in Mexico and Central America and in the South American Republics, and our bankers and investment brokers have been importuned by these countries to make investments.

It is known that there has been a lack of capital in Mexico for the development of her resources. The same is true in Central America and the South American Republics, and they have made extensive loans in the United States in order to make improvements greatly needed by the people in their respective countries.

The United States to-day is the great creditor nation of the world. We have billions of dollars for investment. Shall we place an embargo upon American citizens so that they shall be prevented from investing in foreign countries? Are we to interdict Americans from making investments in Mexico and in Central and South America? And, if they make investments, shall we take the position that these investments may be confiscated without protest, that American lives and American property, beyond the borders of the United States, shall not be entitled to protection?

There are some who believe that Congress should forbid any capital investments by Americans in other countries. There is still another class who insist that if Americans invest, they must do so at their own peril, and that the Government of the United States should not interfere under any circumstances to protect such investments or even the lives of American citizens who may lawfully be engaged in business activities beyond the borders of the United States.

Mr. President, the United States can not be a hermit Nation. Hundreds of thousands of Americans are now in other lands, some residing there permanently, others there carrying on legitimate business undertakings. The United States is exporting billions of dollars' worth of manufactured and other products annually. To carry on our foreign trade, American business interests are compelled to keep abroad tens of thousands of American business men. They are compelled to make investments and to expend capital in foreign countries. Our prosperity at home is dependent largely upon our foreign trade and commerce. The fact that we have surplus capital to invest is due, in part, to the fact that we have markets abroad for our surplus products. Our Nation is becoming more and more a part of the world as well as a world power. This means that we must have somewhat of a cosmopolitan view. It means that American citizens when abroad may expect that they are still American citizens and entitled to the protection of their country.

The report to the Senate committee upon Mexico, which I referred to a few moments ago, revealed that approximately \$500,000,000 of property of American investments in Mexico had been confiscated or destroyed, and also, as I stated, hundreds of American lives have been lost. Shall these wrongs and trespasses of Mexico go unredressed? Shall we say to those families whose husbands and fathers have been killed, "You shall never be compensated"? Shall we say to the Americans who now have property in Mexico, "Our Government will afford you no protection; your investments are subject to the whims and caprices of those who might rise to power in Mexico, and, if confiscated, the United States is powerless to afford you redress"?

This resolution, Mr. President, as I have indicated, I fear may be construed by some Mexicans as an avowal upon the part of the United States not to intervene in any way for the protection of the lives and property of American citizens in Mexico. Following so closely upon the rather bellicose state-

ments contained in the press as to the possibility of war between the United States and Mexico, it will by some Mexicans, I am afraid, be construed as the announcement of a policy that American rights beyond our borders will only be protected, if protected at all, through arbitral proceedings.

This interpretation of the resolution is not warranted, and I shall, therefore, as stated, vote for its adoption, although I could have wished that its presentation in the Senate were at a later date. This resolution merely emphasizes the position so often taken by our country; the United States desires peace; it desires the friendship and good will of all peoples. It is sincerely interested in the welfare and happiness of the people of all lands and it will ever be ready, I believe, to do its full part in advancing the cause of justice and righteousness in all the world.

Mr. President, I regret that there has been such a sinister propaganda carried on in the United States during the past few weeks to the effect that the United States and Mexico would soon be engaged in a military struggle. I have received many letters and telegrams imploring me to do what I could to prevent war with Mexico. I believe that some foolish persons and others who were controlled by unworthy and sinister motives have been largely to blame for this hysterical outburst which has been manifest in all parts of our country. Mr. President, no war with Mexico, notwithstanding the blundering and unwise foreign policy of the present administration.

Mr. DILL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. DILL. Will the Senator say how we can solve our difficulties with Mexico if we refuse to arbitrate except by war?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the responsibility of meeting the situation and offering a solution for any existing American problem does not rest with me or with the Senator from Washington. The question, however, is a proper one, although I did not take the floor for the purpose of entering into a discussion of that matter. Manifestly we must settle our difficulties and disputes with Mexico by peaceful means; that is, by negotiation, by arbitration, by mediation, or by some sort of judicial proceedings, or we must abandon the dispute and if it relates to transgressions committed by Mexico against American citizens, we must abandon our citizens and deny them protection or resort to physical force. Civilized states will be willing to settle disputes by peaceful means. We ought not to have diplomatic relations with countries which refuse to carry out their treaty obligations and to govern their conduct with the United States, as well as other countries, according to the highest principles of international comity and justice.

Of course, if Mexico continues to violate the rights of American citizens with impunity and refuses to make reparations for the wrongs which she has done and may do and declines all peaceful means of settlement, then a situation would confront the United States calling for some definite action. Our Government would have to abandon American citizens and refuse to afford them any protection whatever or enforce such proper and just demands against Mexico as justice required.

Mr. President, I am told that a majority of the American people believe that American citizens who make investments abroad do so at their peril, that if their lives are lost in other countries through the fault of foreign governments or their property is destroyed for like reason our Government can go no further than to use its good offices to secure redress through diplomatic channels or by arbitration. Their view seems to be that there is some obloquy attached to doing business beyond the boundaries of the United States, though all Americans are gratified when they learn of the extension of our foreign trade.

I have heard people suggest that it would be a good thing if the United States refused to loan a single dollar to other countries, and particularly to the Republics south of our borders. Their argument was that if we had no dealings with them, and particularly if no investments were made in their country by the United States, they would in order to secure the confidence of the United States seek to maintain more suitable governments and would inaugurate reforms and improvements, economically and politically, that would speedily push forward their countries to higher standards of civilization and of international morality and justice.

Mr. President, in conclusion I express the hope that Calles will moderate his course, that he will deal justly with the Mexican people, and will treat American citizens who have interests in Mexico in a fair and honorable way.

Profoundly sympathizing with Mexico and desiring her welfare and advancement, I hope that the relations between the United States and Mexico will always be cordial and intimate and that in the future, as in the past, we may have opportunity to demonstrate to Mexico and to the world that this Republic,

highly favored by Providence, wishes to be of service and benefit to the peoples of all lands and to wear the crown of their confidence and affection.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I shall take only a minute. I certainly should not have voted for a favorable report of this resolution if I had had the impression of the effect of it that is entertained by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and several other Senators who have just spoken. I can not conceive that this resolution, which is simply the announcement of an ancient policy and doctrine of this Government, can have any disastrous effect in Mexico. I can conceive, however, when a Senator on this floor who has discussed Mexico so freely is willing to declare that it is his opinion that under no circumstances will the Congress of the United States declare war to protect the lives of its citizens in foreign countries, that a foreign government might be encouraged to all kinds of excesses.

I would not vote for this resolution if I considered it an interference with the Executive power, as some Senators who have argued here think it is. I would not vote for this resolution at the present time if I considered it an instruction to the Executive power as to what to do in this emergency. The resolution does not deal with anything on earth except a controversy with regard to property rights. It is even limited to petroleum property rights. It does not even advise the President of the United States to resort to arbitration. It simply reminds the Executive Department that the old doctrine of arbitration of controversies with regard to property rights is a sound doctrine still. It may seem strange that it should be necessary to announce that doctrine again in this body. It is just as strange as it is that a Senator in this body should oppose the doctrine and yet agree to vote for it.

As a matter of fact, the chaotic conditions, and the uncertainty, and the misrepresentations, and the lack of knowledge of the attitude of our Government with regard to the controversies involving the petroleum lands in Mexico led some Members of this body to believe that it was wise to call attention to the fact that we do have a doctrine for the arbitration of controversies with other governments with regard to property claimed by our nationals. The announcement of that simple old doctrine has brought forth all kinds of speeches to-day with regard to Mexico and Central America.

This resolution does not involve any condition in Mexico except that controversy. If the Mexican Government is the character of government that some here think it is, the remedy is not to be found in this resolution. It is to be found in the power and authority of the Chief Executive to discontinue diplomatic relations with the Mexican Government. We are not interfering with that. This resolution does not deal, except indirectly, with the right of life and other human rights. It deals with a controversy with regard to property; but this resolution does see fit to reassert, in the very beginning—

That while by virtue of sovereignty, the duty devolves upon this Government to protect the lives and property of its nationals in foreign countries, which duty is not to be neglected or disregarded—

This is a reassertion of a policy of this Government that has always been upheld and always will be upheld, and will be upheld no matter what necessity there may be for force.

I am disappointed when I hear any Senator on this floor say that the people of this country and their representatives in the Congress of the United States have degenerated to such a state of cowardice that under no circumstances would they declare war against a foreign country on account of the mistreatment—probably murder—of our citizens in that foreign country. Such a prediction as that is absurd. Such a prophecy is without foundation. There never was a country that ever for one short period of time believed in the cowardice of this country but that regretted it very soon afterwards, and the next country that makes that mistake will regret it.

We are not dealing with human beings in this resolution; we have reasserted that we will protect human beings, but we are dealing with a specific land trouble in Mexico. We are dealing with some oil claims in Mexico. We are dealing in this resolution with some controversies over oil claims in Mexico by suggesting arbitration, because the controversy has been allowed to wander to such an extent that it threatens the peace of these two countries.

This resolution was essential at this time, and when the Senator from New Jersey says he hopes it will do some good, we join him, but I would like to know what his hopes are based on. He is against it, but he is going to vote for it. It is an interference, possibly, with the Chief Executive, he says, yet he hopes it is going to do some good. It is an interference with the Chief Executive, probably, according to his argument, and yet he is going to vote for it. He is going to vote for it for the

same reason that everybody else in this body is going to vote for it—because the time has arrived when it is proper simply to reannounce not a new doctrine but the old, ancient doctrine of this country with regard to controversies over property; that is, that the first way to try to settle them is without force, without bloodshed—by arbitration. That is all this resolution does.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. President, I wish, as a member of the committee, very briefly to state why I shall vote for this resolution. It is not because I believe it is necessary, or that I think it will be of any practical effect, because I have confidence that both the President and the Secretary of State are fully sympathetic with the spirit of the resolution, and will themselves, of their own motion at any feasible and safe time, carry out its purpose.

It is not that I doubt that the conduct of the Mexican Government toward American citizens and their property has been outrageous, confiscatory, and indefensible, part of it so unjust that we could hardly, with self-respect, submit the questions to arbitration. But nevertheless I do believe that in this, as in every case where the United States, a great and powerful Nation, is concerned with a smaller nation, it ought, if possible, to declare itself on the side of arbitration, and where any influential body of men, like the Senate, are ready to say that they are in favor of the principle of arbitration, I am glad to join.

I particularly favor it toward the nations of this hemisphere, because toward them we ought to occupy the position of an elder brother, acting for their good as much as for our own. We can not conceal from ourselves the fact that through racial prejudices, and through instinctive differences in principles of government, they are not sympathetic with us, and they look on us with suspicion and distrust. We ought to do all we can to make sure that it is no act of ours that prevents the best of feeling on their part toward us. They ought to know by this time—I rather think they do—that the United States has no purpose of aggrandizement, that they have not a foot of territory we covet. Many of our citizens have made investments there and the results have generally been quite as advantageous to Mexico as to us. It would seem preposterous to allow such financial relations to result in war between the two countries, and though we may feel that we have been much abused and our rights disregarded, I favor submitting it all to arbitration although the chances are that any arbitrators will be biased against us—but that is part of the price we pay for our wealth and strength.

I do not mean that we ought to be so absurdly and quixotically pacific as to invite aggression and imposition. There may be times when even toward the weakest nation it is necessary for us to make a show of force. I am sure that all remember how a great President sent a thrill through the country, when his patience was exhausted by the evasions of a weak country, by his message, "Perdicaris living or Raisuli dead." Such incidents may again arise to demand that spirit. But the United States, whenever it can, ought to walk softly; and, whenever feasible, no matter how much it could accomplish by force, it ought to resort to arbitration.

So I think our citizens residing in the foreign countries to the south deserve and should receive our protection; they should everywhere feel that the solicitude of a powerful Nation is watching over them and will guard them; and yet at the same time we ought to carry with that a spirit of arbitration.

It is for the reasons I have stated that I shall vote for the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations in the nature of a substitute.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Deneen	Hefflin	Means
Bayard	Dill	Howell	Metcalf
Bingham	Ernst	Johnson	Moses
Blease	Ferris	Jones, N. Mex.	Neely
Borah	Fess	Jones, Wash.	Norbeck
Bratton	Fletcher	Kendrick	Nye
Broussard	Frazier	Keyes	Oddie
Bruce	George	King	Overman
Cameron	Gillet	La Follette	Pepper
Capper	Glass	Lenroot	Philpps
Caraway	Gooding	McKellar	Pine
Copeland	Hale	McLean	Pittman
Couzens	Harris	McMaster	Reed, Pa.
Curtis	Harrison	McNary	Robinson, Ark.
Dale	Hawes	Mayfield	Robinson, Ind.

Sackett	Smith	Trammell	Warren
Schall	Smoot	Tyson	Watson
Sheppard	Steck	Wadsworth	Wheeler
Shipstead	Stephens	Walsh, Mass.	Willis
Shortridge	Stewart	Walsh, Mont.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll on agreeing to the substitute amendment.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT], which I transfer to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], who is necessarily detained by reason of illness, and I vote "yea."

Mr. OVERMAN (when Mr. SIMMONS's name was called). My colleague, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], is absent on account of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], who is necessarily detained from the Senate, but I am reliably informed that if he were here he would vote as I shall vote, and I therefore vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BAYARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is necessarily absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

I also wish to announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDWARDS] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Further, I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSELL] is necessarily absent, and that if present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to announce that the following Senators are necessarily absent, and if present would vote "yea": The Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]; the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE]; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF]; the Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD]; the Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE]; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD]; the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STANFIELD]; and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLER].

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—79

Ashurst	Fletcher	McKellar	Sackett
Bayard	Frazier	McLean	Schall
Bingham	George	McMaster	Sheppard
Ellese	Gillett	McNary	Shipstead
Borah	Glass	Mayfield	Shortridge
Bratton	Gooding	Means	Smith
Broussard	Hale	Metcalf	Smoot
Bruce	Harris	Moses	Steck
Cameron	Harrison	Neely	Stephens
Capper	Hawes	Norbeck	Stewart
Caraway	Heflin	Nye	Trammell
Copeland	Howell	Oddie	Tyson
Cibizens	Johnson	Overman	Wadsworth
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Dencen	Kendrick	Pine	Warren
Dill	Keyes	Pittman	Watson
Ernst	King	Reed, Pa.	Wheeler
Ferris	La Follette	Robinson, Ark.	Willis
Fess	Lenroot	Robinson, Ind.	

NOT VOTING—16

du Pont	Goff	Norris	Stanfield
Edge	Gould	Ransdell	Swanson
Edwards	Greene	Reed, Mo.	Underwood
Gerry	Harreld	Simmons	Weller

So the amendment reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

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

The resolution as agreed to is as follows:

*Resolved*, That while by virtue of sovereignty the duty devolves upon this Government to protect the lives and property of its nationals in foreign countries, which duty is not to be neglected or disregarded, it is nevertheless sound policy, consistent with the honor and best interest of the United States and promotive of international peace and good will, to submit to an arbitral tribunal, which shall apply the principles of international law, the controversies with Mexico relating to the alleged confiscation or impairment of the property of American citizens and corporations in Mexico; the arbitration agreement to provide for protection of all American property rights pending the final outcome of the arbitration.

That in good will and friendliness efforts should be made and persisted in to effect arrangements which will commit the two Governments to the policy of abiding by and executing awards that may be made in consequence of such arrangements to arbitrate.

Mr. REED of Missouri entered the Chamber and said:

Mr. President, has the resolution been disposed of?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not intend to delay the Senate with reference to the resolution. I intended to support the resolution as it was written. But there are some observations which I desire to make on the Mexican situation, which I shall postpone until to-morrow or some more convenient occasion. So far as the resolution is concerned, I had not intended to oppose its passage, and had I arrived in the Senate a moment earlier would have voted for it; but I do want to submit to the Senate some remarks touching the Mexican situation generally. Because I do not want to delay the Senate at this time, I shall postpone what I have to say.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I understand it is desired to have a brief executive session. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.), under the order previously entered, the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 26, 1927, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 25, 1927*

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

*To be Chief of Bureau of Navigation*

Rear Admiral Richard H. Leigh, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, in the Department of the Navy.

*To be captain*

Commander Aubrey K. Shoup.

*To be commanders*

Lieut. Commander Worrall R. Carter.  
Lieut. Commander Frank T. Leighton.

*To be lieutenant commanders*

Lieut. Arthur T. Emerson.  
Lieut. Gail Morgan.

*To be lieutenants*

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John A. Waters, jr.  
Lieut. (Junior Grade) John M. Eggleston.  
Lieut. (Junior Grade) John F. Grube.  
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Dwight H. Wilson.

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

Ensign Cecil C. Adell.  
Ensign Ralph F. Bradford, jr.  
Ensign Jesse G. Coward.  
Ensign Anthony Kennedy, jr.  
Ensign John H. Parrott.

*To be medical directors*

Medical Inspector Ralph W. Plummer.  
Medical Inspector Robert G. Helmer.  
Medical Inspector Edward H. H. Old.  
Medical Inspector John B. Kaufman.

*To be medical inspectors with the rank of commander*

Surg. Howard F. Lawrence.  
Surg. John G. Ziegler.  
Surg. Edwin L. Jones.

*To be medical inspectors*

Surg. Edward V. Valz.  
Surg. William H. Short.  
Surg. Harry R. Hermesch.  
Surg. Gordon D. Hale.  
Surg. Alexander B. Hayward.  
Surg. Lawrence M. Schmidt.  
Surg. Reginald B. Henry.  
Surg. Chandler W. Smith.  
Surg. William E. Eaton.  
Surg. Jasper V. Howard.  
Surg. Lester L. Pratt.

Surg. Chester M. George.  
Surg. Robert F. Jones.  
Surg. John T. Borden.  
Surg. Carroll R. Baker.  
Surg. Daniel Hunt.  
Surg. Frank H. Haigler.  
Surg. Frederick Ceres.  
Surg. Jesse B. Helm.

*To be pay director*

Pay Inspector Noel W. Grant.

*To be paymaster*

Passed Asst. Paymaster Vernon H. Wheeler.

*To be passed assistant paymaster*

Asst. Paymaster Melbourne N. Gilbert.

*To be chief machinists*

Machinist Walter H. Wilson.  
Machinist Francis R. Good.

*To be chief pay clerk*

Chief Pay Clerk Howard N. Walling.

*To be a lieutenant (junior grade)*

Ensign Frederick K. McElroy.

MARINE CORPS

*To be lieutenant colonel*

Maj. Benjamin S. Berry.

*To be majors*

Capt. James L. Underhill.      Capt. Keller E. Rokey.

*To be second lieutenants*

Corpl. Richard J. DeLacy.      Corpl. William W. Benson.  
Corpl. Carroll Williams.      Corpl. Sol E. Levensky.  
Corpl. Bernard H. Kirk.      Corpl. Raymond C. Scollin.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Frank M. Hume to be collector for customs collection district No. 1, Portland, Me.

Philip Elting to be collector for customs collection district No. 10, New York, N. Y.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Clinton O. Richardson to be comptroller of customs in customs collection district No. 13, Baltimore, Md.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF SUPREME COURT OF HAWAII

Charles F. Parsons to be associate justice of the supreme court, Territory of Hawaii.

SECOND JUDGE, FIRST CIRCUIT OF HAWAII

Albert M. Cristy to be second judge, first circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Dr. Albert T. Morrison to be assistant surgeon.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

James W. Oglesby, jr., Gravette.  
William D. Swift, Lincoln.

CALIFORNIA

Mabel A. Head, Garden Grove.

CONNECTICUT

Norman C. Krueger, Shelton.

IDAHO

George T. Hyde, Downey.  
Clyde Hanson, Malad City.  
Claude A. McPherson, Wilder.

MINNESOTA

Nels E. Nelson, Fergus Falls.

NEVADA

John C. Foster, Lovelock.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Alice R. Thompson, Antrim.  
Edson M. Barker, Plymouth.

NORTH CAROLINA

R. Jennings White, Conway.

PENNSYLVANIA

Edward A. P. Christley, Ellwood City.  
Harrison J. Kromer, Merion Station.  
Bess L. Thomas, New Bethlehem.  
Clarence A. Majer, Pocono Pines.  
Maude McCracken, Volant.

TEXAS

McDougal Bybee, Childress.  
Murt J. Sullivan, Comanche.  
Pierce Mayer, Corsicana.  
Henry C. Kramp, El Paso.  
Alfred W. Orr, Livingston.  
Ethel Milligan, Pittsburg.  
Simpson I. Dunn, Port Arthur.  
Tilmon Y. Allen, Rice.  
Surry S. Boles, Thorndale.

WEST VIRGINIA

Ralph L. Teter, Belington.  
Harry R. Adams, Spencer.  
George C. Smith, Yukon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, January 25, 1927

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O God, whose bounty and mercy fill all the earth, we thank Thee for that love that will not let us go! Be Thou unto us the hidden source of abiding hope, and with humble hearts may we accept that which Thou dost ordain. Bestow upon us the peace of conscience, the joy of duty, and the spirit of consecration to the truth. Invigorate us with wisdom and clear vision to serve our country that gives us the great blessings of free citizenship. At all times may we have the spirit of Him who was most pitiful, merciful, and loving toward all men. In the blessed name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CORRECTION OF A PRESS REPORT

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday an incident occurred in the House which, I think, demands an explanation from myself. Yesterday, one of the pages answered to the name of Mr. BROWN. The morning press states that he did so at the request of Harry J. Brown, a newspaper correspondent. I desire to state to the House that Mr. Harry J. Brown was in no way to blame for that incident; that I myself was solely to blame. While I was talking with Mr. Brown in the lobby the page told me a roll call was going on, and I jokingly told him to answer to my name, Harry J. Brown. I regret the incident very much, but wish to state to the House that Mr. Harry J. Brown was in no way to blame for it. [Applause.]

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, once more I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business for this week be dispensed with in order that the appropriation bills may go forward.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business for this week be dispensed with. Is there objection? There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon makes the point of order that no quorum is present. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. TILSON. 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:

[Roll No. 17]

Aldrich	Deal	Hudspeth	MacGregor
Anthony	Dempsey	Hull, Morton D.	Madden
Ayres	Eaton	Hull, William E.	Major
Barkley	Esterly	Johnson, Ill.	Michaelson
Begg	Fitzgerald, Roy G.	Kendall	Montague
Bel	Free	Kiess	Montgomery
Berger	Golder	Kindred	Mooney
Bixler	Goldsborough	King	Moore, Ohio
Brand, Ohio	Gorman	Knutson	Moore, Va.
Britten	Graham	Lee, Ga.	Morin
Clary	Hall, N. Dak.	McFadden	Nelson, Wis.
Curry	Harrison	McLaughlin, Mich.	Newton, Mo.

O'Connell, R. I.	Spearing	Taylor, N. J.	Welsh, Pa.
O'Connor, La.	Sproul, Ill.	Taylor, W. Va.	Williams, Ill.
Penney	Stalker	Thompson	Wingo
Phillips	Stedman	Tillman	Winter
Reed, Ark.	Stephens	Tincher	Woodyard
Reed, N. Y.	Stobbs	Vare	Yates
Reid, Ill.	Strong, Pa.	Voigt	
Rouse	Swoope	Wefald	
Sears, Fla.	Taylor, Colo.	Weller	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-one Members are present, a quorum.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

#### TAXATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] for 10 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, the leader of the minority, in his proposal to require the Committee on Ways and Means to report the bill of the gentleman from Texas, has made a graceful but perfectly idle gesture. On the 11th day of last December that committee adopted a resolution declining to consider any question of revenue rates at this session. At that time the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD] announced that an attempt would be made to overturn the decision of the committee. Nearly six weeks passed and nothing was done until yesterday.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I prefer not to yield.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In view of that statement I am sure the gentleman will yield. I filed the motion on the first day it was possible under the rules themselves.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman may have filed the motion, but he did not take it up until yesterday, when it was too late to make the required petition effective even if signers enough could be obtained. Ten days earlier would have been in time. Why all this delay if the gentleman was really in earnest?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield again? I want to show there was no delay. The rules provide that the motion can not be entered until 30 days have elapsed, and under the recent ruling of the Speaker that means 30 legislative days. Last Saturday was the first day it was possible to make the motion and I proposed it at that time. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No, no; the gentleman is in error. It is 30 days from the time the bill was filed and not from the time of the action of the committee, and 30 days from that time would have put it back at least two weeks before this.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Not legislative days, let me say to the gentleman. I meant there had been just 30 legislative days at the time I entered the motion.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, the gentleman's explanation is, after all, no explanation whatever. The rules say 30 days. Was it because the gentleman from Tennessee, as it seems to me, was reluctant to follow the leadership of the gentleman from Texas? He might well be. Is it as I suspect, that the gentleman from Tennessee realizes that while he can get his Democratic followers to file a meaningless and useless petition it would be a very different thing to get a large number of them to stultify themselves by voting for the bill proposed by the gentleman from Texas? They would not do it, and this is the reason why the arrangements for the funeral were put off until yesterday. They were afraid they might not have enough votes at the end to make the burial of the bill look respectable. They preferred that the child should not live at all.

Mr. Speaker, the present situation is only another example of the inability of the Democratic Party to handle great financial matters. [Laughter and applause.] Gentlemen smile. Let me cite some instances to you. I remember quite well, shortly after the war, when the Democratic Party was proposing to pay our bonds, which by their terms were payable in gold, in depreciated currency. I remember well, further on, when they became infected with the greenback craze and wanted to issue any amount of irredeemable and fiat currency. Still later, following the leadership of the peerless orator from the Platte, they indorsed the principle of free silver on the heaven-born ratio of 16 to 1. The extravagance and wastefulness of that party during the recent war is too well known for me to make any reference to it. I am reminded at this time of a speech made on this floor by the lamented gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Kitchin, a man for whom I had not only the greatest respect but an affectionate regard. In February, 1919, just before his party went out of power, he said:

Never again will this Government get along any one year on less than \$4,000,000,000. It ought to be less. Our annual expenditure will be much more than \$4,000,000,000, unless the President and Congress take a firmer hold on appropriations than heretofore.

Undoubtedly he was correct under a Democratic administration, but the Republican Party brought forward a President and elected a Congress, which had the grasp of affairs, the efficiency of management, and the capacity for wise legislation required to reduce the expenses of running the Government far below the figure set by Mr. Kitchin; and this was done notwithstanding the fact that the Government activities have been expanded beyond anything even dreamed of before. This is the reason we have this surplus to-day.

Mr. Speaker, it is not at all strange that the Democratic Party has become muddled over the surplus. It has never had any experience with a surplus when it was in charge of affairs. [Laughter.] Deficits and bond issues have been its specialties. This has been true from as far back as the days of Grover Cleveland. Nobody ought to expect it to know what to do with a surplus and hardly anybody does. We have only to take the advice of the Democratic leaders to end with the usual Democratic accomplishment—a deficit. But, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the distinguished leader of the minority—no; I will take that back because the gentleman from Tennessee has not been so free in expressing himself on the subject as some others, so I will withdraw his name from the list. But I congratulate some of the other members of his party upon the ease and agility with which they can execute a political back somersault. Time was, and not very long ago, when the gentlemen on the other side were, on the stump and on this floor, declaiming on the iniquities of Wall Street, and denouncing the bloated profits of corporations. I remember quite well when we introduced the revenue bill of 1921, which reduced corporation taxes nearly \$200,000,000 by repealing the excess-profits tax and shifting part of it into additional corporation income taxes. At that time there was hardly anyone on the Democratic side who wanted the corporation taxes reduced in any form. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD] were conspicuous in their opposition. They wanted the excess-profits tax retained in addition to the corporate income tax, and proposed no reduction. Later, when the 1924 bill was up, the gentleman from Arkansas made an impassioned speech attacking what he alleged to be the unreasonable profits of the big corporations and wanting the excess-profits tax restored.

Corporations' profits were very low in 1921 compared to what they are now, and I am at a loss to understand how so much animus at that time has been turned into so much tender solicitude for the Steel Trust, the Standard Oil, and numerous other great corporations whose extraordinary profits the preceding year are the main cause of the existence of the surplus to-day. I would not, of course, intimate for a moment that it was political expediency. It must be that the gentlemen, in spite of themselves, have become encircled by the slimy tentacles of the octopus about which they have talked so much.

I can imagine the surprise and gratification with which the Secretary of the Treasury learns that these gentlemen who have been so long belaboring him now want to go further than he does in respect to the matters of which they have been complaining that he went too far. In fact, the gentlemen on the other side now not only want to get into the band wagon but they are trying to climb into the front seat and take the reins out of the hands of the driver. We welcome them to the good old Republican wagon and will take care of them, but we can not let them take charge. If we did, they would soon have it into the ditch. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] recently made a speech showing in detail the probable receipts of the Treasury and the probable surplus in event our Budget estimates were not increased.

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

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I interrupted the gentleman, and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Iowa is recognized for two additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

On account of the reduction in receipts from nonrecurrent sources in the next fiscal year he estimated the surplus at \$150,000,000, which is little more than the balance which ought to be in the Treasury, and that the reduction of \$335,000,000

proposed by the bill of the gentleman from Texas would result in a deficit of \$185,000,000. There were not many present when he made his speech, but I recommend that every Member who did not hear it read it, as it gives a complete résumé of the official figures as given out by the Treasury. I recommend it especially to our Democratic brethren, who can acquire much information by a study of it.

Mr. Speaker, we ought not to make a leap in the dark. The new law has not yet been tested. We do not know how much it will produce in normal times, nor do we know that the present most highly prosperous times will continue and profits remain at the peak. A mere slackening in trade would cause a loss of revenue amounting to \$200,000,000 or \$300,000,000. If we find after trial that we can reduce rates nothing is more necessary than we should have an opportunity to consider fully how such reductions should be apportioned.

I have for a long time been in favor of reducing the levies on the small corporations, which I have thought were unduly burdened. Any flat reduction that can be made would help them but a little. These and other matters need to be studied most carefully, and above all we need to make sure that in reducing rates we do not follow the Democratic example and produce a deficit. The time to pay debts is when we are prosperous. [Applause.] The surplus is being applied to the public debt, and for the present no better use can be made of it. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] for 10 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in order that the parliamentary situation may be clear the rule expressly provides that a motion to instruct can only be entered as to a bill which has been for 30 days before the committee. On the 3d day of January, upon the reconvening of Congress after the Christmas holidays, the Chair made a ruling which influenced me in my action upon this motion. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] called up a resolution of inquiry which he had introduced and insisted it was in order under the seven-day rule. The Speaker, in his ruling, held that that meant seven legislative days. This was the effect of the ruling. I anticipated that if I filed this motion earlier than 30 legislative days that some ingenious parliamentarian on that side—of course, the gentleman from Iowa would not have done it [laughter]—but some of the ingenious parliamentarians on that side would immediately meet me with a point of order and place me in a somewhat ridiculous attitude before the House and the country. I escaped that by waiting the 30 legislative days, and filed the motion immediately on the expiration of the 30 days.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly every intelligent man in the House knows that the minority leader used every parliamentary opportunity to bring this piece of legislation before the House; and let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I want to refer in this connection to the great Speaker now deceased, Speaker Cannon, as he would have said to this House that if 218 Members of the House desire to bring about legislation they can do it regardless of the rules.

You let 218 men follow me or follow the minority leader or the majority leader, and you can set the rules aside and enact the legislation in 24 hours, regardless of the rules of the House of Representatives; and I assume, and every gentleman has the right to assume, that if 218 Members request in writing that the House consider a piece of legislation the majority will have the decency to give the House an opportunity to consider such legislation. Refusing a direct request in writing of 218 Members of the House that they may have an opportunity to consider a piece of legislation would be nothing short of indecent treatment.

I now want to say a word about Mr. Kitchin. Mr. Kitchin was a wise man, and I agree with the gentleman from Iowa that he was a good man, a splendid legislator, and a delightful personality. He was quite correct when he said that the expenditures of the Government would never be less than \$4,000,000,000; and while the gentleman from Iowa does not know anything about appropriations and at times knows less about taxes, I now challenge him or any member of the Committee on Appropriations on the Republican side to point to a single year when the expenditures have been less than \$4,000,000,000. I yield to any gentleman to correct this statement, because I want to show you that the gentleman from Iowa does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman mean to say that the expenditures for running the Government have been \$4,000,000,000 every year? I said nothing about appropriations.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Absolutely; there has not been a single year—not one—when the Government has not spent \$4,000,000,000. If it is not so, I will give you a good suit of clothes; and if I am correct, you give me a box of cigars. [Laughter.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is in error about what I said. I was talking about the actual expenses, not about interest and debt payments.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa gives you a history of their efforts in reference to taxation. What happened? You had an election in November, and the Democrats increased their membership in this House; the country, as it were, went Democratic. What happened? The Republican President, in order to get the American mind off the results of the election, made a gesture with reference to tax reduction or for a rebate. Seven days after the election, in order to get their minds off the election and get it onto finances, which always is of interest to the general public, the President suggested a rebate to be paid on December 15 for all taxes due for 1926. Stop and think about it! He is going to give you a rebate on December 15 of 10 per cent of the taxes due in 1926, when he did not know what those taxes were until January, 1927. Now that was a—I was about to say asinine suggestion; but it was absolutely impossible, physically and financially.

Now, what happened on that day? The story in the press was that Uncle Andy went up to see him three times that day. The result was he suggested to him that he better make it March and June, 1927, since he could not make it work for 1926 on December 15. So they changed the plan to March and June for a rebate. That was the story.

Now, how much support did he get from Republican side? Why, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS] said, "Me too." No other one except the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. I challenge you to find in the record of Congress or the press of the country where one single Senator, Republican Senator, or a single Republican Member of the House supported the proposition except the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Then what happened with reference to tax reduction? We knew that there was going to be a surplus of \$500,000,000 this year. The Democrats of the Ways and Means Committee got together and prepared a bill and introduced it. The Republicans saw that the country was bringing pressure to bear and there was no opportunity to get from under except for the Republicans of the Ways and Means Committee to pass a resolution that they would not pass any tax reduction at this Congress.

Then we came out with a petition signed by the entire Democratic membership of the House, with a few Republicans, and then the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS] made a speech on the floor of the House. What did he say? He said that we were going to have a very large surplus this year, more than \$380,000,000, as suggested by the President, but we are afraid at this time to reduce the taxes; but Mr. MILLS said

I will tell you what we are willing to do. We are willing to take up the income tax and reduce it if you will confine it to the reduction of corporation taxes.

That is what he said in the RECORD. That statement was from the gentleman from New York, speaking for the Republican organization, I take it, or at least the executive branch, or at least for the Treasury. He made the proposition that if you gentlemen on the Democratic side will take up corporate taxes and reduce them, the Republicans will join you.

Mr. MILLS, I accept your bluff. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I accept your challenge; I will accept your challenge in the name of the minority leader. I will accept your challenge in the name of 10 Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee. We will join you in the reduction of the taxes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, sir, I ask the gentleman from New York are you in earnest? Were you in earnest when you stated that yesterday?

Mr. MILLS. I can only speak for myself, and speaking for myself, I will join with the gentleman to-morrow, provided we can limit it to one specific tax, reduce the corporate income tax from a half to 1 per cent.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. We will determine on the amount of the rate when we get to it, and will you agree to bring a bill in to-morrow?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa rose.



Mr. GARNER of Texas. I see the gentleman from Iowa is up. What does he say about it?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is no telling what the Senate is going to do.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Are you willing to pass it through the committee to-morrow?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Not on the gentleman's rates.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Will the gentleman fix the rates and pass it through the committee to-morrow?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; I will not. You would not let me and I am unwilling to make any permanent reduction until I know what the last bill will produce in ordinary times.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. What do you say, Mr. TILSON? Are you willing to reduce the corporation tax?

Mr. TILSON. I am not willing to make an attempt to do it, because we should not be able to stop with that.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. We would confine it in this House to the corporation tax.

Mr. TILSON. Oh, yes; but that is as far as the gentleman could go.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Then the gentleman is not willing for this House at this time to pass a bill reducing the corporation tax?

Mr. TILSON. I am not under the present circumstances willing that this House should pass such an act.

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

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Then I shall now go to headquarters and yield to the Speaker to say what his position is. I have the Treasury Department on record by its representative, who will soon become an honored member of that organization and a very helpful one I hope and believe. I have that department saying that it wants a reduction of the corporation tax at this time. I have the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] saying that he will not agree to reduce it at this time, as well as the majority leader. I want to know whether the Speaker is of that same opinion, and I am going to yield to him now. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not regard that as a parliamentary inquiry. [Prolonged laughter.]

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that that was not a parliamentary inquiry, although it is a very pertinent one. We want to know, and the country is entitled to know, whether or not in all earnestness you really desire to reduce the taxes of the people of the country. We have met every proposition that you have made. Your spokesman yesterday said, "If you agree to confine your efforts to a corporation tax, we will join with you in that effort." I thought that was said in good faith. I thought he spoke for the organization, because he has been the organization on the Ways and Means since I have been there. He has been the main guy. You know it on the floor of this House also. While Brother WILLIAM GREEN has come in and has done the job, they had to get OGDEN to represent the administration. So the result was that I thought he then was speaking for the Republican organization, and I immediately went to the minority leader and said that we ought to accept it. I said to him, "We are in good faith; we are not camouflaging with the American people when we are trying to reduce their taxes, let us accept their challenge." He said, "Yes; let us do it." Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I interviewed every member of the minority on the Ways and Means Committee, and each one said, "Yes; we will join with them; we would like to reduce some of the taxes, and if we can not get what we want, we will give what relief we can that the Republican Party will permit us to give to the American people." [Applause on the Democratic side.] And I was authorized, Mr. Speaker, to come here this morning and say to the Republican side and to the American people that we are ready to reduce their taxes; that we are ready through a reduction in the corporation tax to reduce the cost of living in the country; and that all we ask is an opportunity from the Republican majority to consider legislation.

Mr. TILSON. Can the gentleman in all seriousness speak for the Senate?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. No. I can not, but I can come as near to doing it as the majority leader can; he does not seem to have much influence over there in that body.

Mr. TILSON. Yes; the gentleman can speak for the Senate just the same as I can, and that is not at all.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the duty of the House of Representatives under the Constitution to first act upon the problem and give the Senate a chance.

[Applause on the Democratic side.] You will not give the Senate a chance to act. You say, "We will not even trust the Senate to the point of consideration," although the Constitution says that unless we first act the Senate can not have that chance. So I say to the American people at this time that the Republican organization in the House of Representatives, although the President of the United States said in his message that taxes ought to be reduced or rebated, after it has the assurance of minority support and minority cooperation for the sole purpose of reducing the corporation tax, now declines to pass a bill of that kind. I merely want the country to know that, to show just exactly the difference between the two parties. One desires to perform service and the other desires delay for political purposes alone, though the people suffer for it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order now for me to call attention to the fact that the petition is still out there in the lobby? [Applause and laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, away back when I was a little boy I discovered that the judgment of all of us is usually better than the judgment of some of us. I am now in a position where I must needs come to my fellows of the House to ask their judgment, my own being wholly unable to solve a problem. Some weeks ago I was visiting among the Santee-Sioux Indians out in my district, and was asked to attend the meeting, where the Indians might lay before me some of their troubles and ask me to do what I could to alleviate their condition. I shall never forget an address, only a few words long, that was delivered by one of the Indian spokesmen on that occasion. He said to me in the Indian language:

[Here Mr. HOWARD delivered to the House in the Indian language the speech referred to above.]

Mr. Speaker, I presume that there are not more than three-fourths of the Members present who understood that address to me by my Indian constituent, as I have spoken it in the Indian tongue, and for their information I shall interpret it to them. I wish I might be able to interpret it using largely the sign language to help make it more plain to you, but because of my physical condition this morning I can not get my hands away from this desk very much; I must hold on to it lest I fall. But here is the interpretation. It is worth our while, and I do hope that after I shall have interpreted the speech of that wonderful Indian to my fellows here many of you will be kind enough to tell me how best to answer the question he asked, because all his address was a question. As nearly as I can interpret it into the English language, my spokesman said:

We do not understand. Our head men have told us many times that good days would come to our people, because the Great Father at Washington had said that we should have by Congress something to help our farmers. We are all farmers. None of us has anything to do with anything but farming. When our corn crop is small, or when the crop is large but sells for small price, we do not have money to live well. We ask you tell us how it is that Congress at Washington not do what Great Father ask Congress to do in making things better for farmer. We do not understand. Our head men tell us Great Father loves us and wants to help us, but bad men in Congress will not do what he wants them to do for us. Maybe you tell us why. I say no more.

Now, my friends, I ask for volunteers to help me answer that question by my Indian friend. Why is it this Congress refuses to do what the Great Father wants to do to help the farmer? He understands that our President is ready to accomplish legislation in behalf of the farmer, but that we, the Congress, will not permit him to do so. I can not wholly agree with that idea. My thought has been and is at this moment that the slightest intimation from the White House that any particular farm legislation desired would be granted by the Congress. That is my understanding of the situation, and may I have permission of the Members of the House in telling my Indian constituent that the Congress would quickly grant relief to the farmer if the President would ask the Congress to do so? Your silence gives consent, gentlemen. I shall tell my Indian that the reason why no legislation has been enacted in behalf of the farmer is simply because the Great Father in the White House has not intimated that he wanted any. [Applause.]

#### DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 16576) making appropriations for the Departments of States and Justice, and so forth, and, pending that motion, I would like to ask

the gentleman from Alabama if we can not agree upon time for general debate.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that as so few availed themselves of the opportunity to speak on Saturday afternoon and in view of the requests I have, I suggest that 4½ hours will accommodate the requests for the gentleman as well as myself.

Mr. SHREVE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be limited to 4½ hours, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 16576, and pending that asks unanimous consent that general debate upon the bill be limited to 4½ hours, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER]. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman expect to start on the reading of the bill to-day?

Mr. SHREVE. We expect to finish general debate and possibly read a paragraph of the bill.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 16576, with Mr. LEHLBACH 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. 16576, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16576) 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, 1928, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN].

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee: This bill makes appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor. The amount it carries is more than the entire expenses of the United States Government in any one year up to the time of the inauguration of President Abraham Lincoln in 1861. That was more than three-quarters of a century after the founding of the Republic.

In the preparation of it the chairman of your subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] has added another splendid measure to his already long and creditable record of appropriation legislation.

He was ably assisted by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], the ranking minority Member, who also has an enviable record in the handling of measures of this kind. These two excellent collaborators with their wide experience, resourcefulness, and capacity for details led the committee straight to the essentials of each item. This was accomplished easily and speedily by their deft, searching, critical, terse examination of those who appeared as witnesses before the committee.

I am not going into all of the details of the bill—time would not permit—but would like to bring to your attention some of the things this bill either does or makes possible of achievement.

It contains nearly 150 items. These cover all the functions of the Departments of State and Commerce with their far-flung activities, and the Departments of Justice and Labor with their important domestic relations.

I have given special study to some of the economic gains and advantages which accrue from the work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Bureau of Standards, and the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. In fact, my talk to you will almost be confined to items covered in the Department of Commerce section.

Many of you are interested in the work to establish and define the boundaries between Alaska and Canada and the United States and Canada. We considered the item for this work.

Others have a very lively interest in the work of the diplomatic and consular establishments. Just now in some sections of the world the tasks of these men are most delicate and trying. We went into the various features of their duties and have allowed what we deem adequate and necessary for the proper performance of those duties.

Your committee had the privilege of hearing about the plans for further expanding the usefulness of radio communication with its attendant possibilities for entertainment and pleasure

to countless numbers of our people in all sections of the United States.

We also gave what might be termed "rapt attention" to the carefully and scientifically planned program for the further development of the use of the airplane in commercial activities. It will not surprise many of you to see in a few years lighted transcontinental airways, as it is entirely within the possibilities of the service, according to those devoting themselves to its development, to maintain 24-hour service in this kind of transportation.

In fact, the diversity of the items in this bill makes it almost necessary to select but a few of them for extensive consideration unless one has almost unlimited time.

Even to embark upon an itemized enumeration of all of them would cover a journey through the length and breadth of the universe, making use of every known means of conveyance and communication and observing every known agency for the advancement of society, world and domestic commerce.

Col. E. Lester Jones, Director of the Bureau of Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, has given me a statement relative to some of the outstanding economies and progress effected during 1926. Some of the high spots are as follows:

The Coast and Geodetic Survey has been serving the interests of the public for 110 years. During the past year it has rendered service greater in volume and variety than ever before and rendered it with an efficiency never before attained. The present high tide of national prosperity, with its augmented industrial activity, naturally results in a great increase in the demands made by the public upon a Federal agency such as the survey, which is related so closely to economic development and the flow of commodities.

As the manufacturer of charts which are indispensable to foreign and domestic shipping, the survey increased its output 20 per cent during the past year and has doubled its output in the last 10 years. This increased production of charts indicates increased service to the public in protecting lives and property on the seas.

On land the control surveys made by the Coast and Geodetic Survey are being used more and more generally to insure the accuracy of local surveys. In the past two months alone more than 100 local surveyors have stated that they are making use of the survey's control markers, and this represents only a fraction of the number of surveyors who have been furnished assistance during the year. This acquires importance in view of the fact that only a few years ago surveyors generally were more or less apathetic to the value of using the results of control surveys in their work.

A recently added service of the survey to the public is the collection and dissemination of information concerning earthquakes. Though this service has but begun, various public agencies are making use of the data and their amount and value are increasing rapidly.

The progress of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in the execution of its work is vitally affected by the character of its instrumental equipment. Study is constantly being made to increase the accuracy of instruments and to decrease the cost of production and operation.

The theodolites used to-day are only about one-half the size and weigh only about three-fifths as much as those used only a few years ago, while in accuracy they are far superior. Decreased size and weight mean lower transportation charges in field work, while increased accuracy means that more work can be accomplished for a given expenditure.

One of the first essentials of the survey's work is the determination of longitudes. Formerly this was a laborious and expensive operation. To-day, by the adoption of the radio and the development of certain automatic recording apparatus, the determining of longitudes is exact, easy, and inexpensive.

Experience has demonstrated that the prices quoted by outside manufacturers for producing the special instruments and apparatus needed in the survey's work are, in general, about 50 per cent higher than the cost of producing them in the survey's own shops. As much as possible, therefore, the survey produces its own instruments.

An example of the savings thus made is shown in the case of certain apparatus used in sonic sounding. The lowest quotation for the three units required, plus accessories, was \$15,120.40 and six months' time for delivery. The apparatus was built in the survey's own shops for a cost of \$4,481.57, a saving of \$10,638.83, and in less than two months' time. In other words, the survey built this apparatus in less than one-third the time and at less than one-third the cost of similar apparatus purchased from an outside manufacturer.

Another saving is shown in the replacement of typesetting by photolithographic methods in the production of certain publications of the survey, and in blue printing some reports instead of typing them. These result in a saving of \$3,315 a year. By eliminating some of the steps in preparing certain data for publication, a further saving of \$2,895 has been effected.

The major activity of the Coast and Geodetic Survey is the production of charts for mariners. These charts are of the highest accuracy,

and the demand for them has steadily increased. In the last year the total issue of charts was 232,286, an increase of 29 per cent over the previous year and more than double the number issued 10 years ago.

More efficient methods now in use make it possible to produce these charts at 25 per cent less cost and in one-third the time it required in 1920. The average cost of producing a new chart in 1920 was \$1,771, while the elapsed time required was 27 months. For 1926 the cost was \$1,395, while the elapsed time required was 8½ months. This, in spite of the fact that the division making these charts has had no increase in personnel and the further fact of a 41 per cent increase in salaries due to the reclassification act of 1923.

In the last year the sale of Inside Route Pilots alone increase 79 per cent. Almost as many of these pilots have been sold in the last 10 years as were sold in the 100 previous years of the survey's existence.

By building up contracts with Federal, State, municipal, and private agencies at work along various parts of the coast line of the United States, the survey has greatly decreased the cost of securing data for the production and correction of its charts. These data from outside sources supplement the data secured by the survey's own field parties.

So large is the volume of data secured from outside sources, through carefully maintained contacts, that it is conservative to estimate that double the existing appropriation would be required to obtain it by special surveys by the Coast and Geodetic Survey itself. The total volume of data received in 1925 represented an increase of 245 per cent over the amount received in 1919, and this increase did not cost the Coast and Geodetic Survey a penny for field work.

The cash receipts from the sale of charts and nautical publications last year were the largest for any year in the history of the survey. These receipts totaled more than \$64,000. In connection with this it is interesting to note that the general expense of the survey for the year, 40 per cent of which was expended for materials used in producing charts, was approximately \$63,000. Thus, in one major item of its appropriation the Coast and Geodetic Survey is more than self-supporting.

One of the most interesting bureaus in Washington is that of the Bureau of Standards. I asked the director, Doctor Burgess, for a few of the outstanding achievements of the past year, and he transmitted to me a statement wherein he says that some 300 researches are in progress touching almost every phase of the measured control of the processes of industry.

Naturally only a brief comment can be made here even of the few examples cited, as follows: Making motoring safe; efficient starting of automobile engines; building noiselessly; making radio more effective; prolonging the life of underground piping; accurate temperature measurements for ceramics; economy and safety in the construction of dams; perfecting a remarkable alloy; perfecting mapping cameras; prolonging the life of paper currency; increasing the holding power of screws; improving dental materials; and prolonging the useful life of printing plates.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will my friend yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. TILSON. I regard the Bureau of Standards as one of the most important and useful bureaus of all our executive departments. I wish to ask the gentleman in regard to the buildings and equipment generally for the use of this great bureau. Have we now the proper buildings for housing and the necessary equipment needed for the conduct of the very valuable and useful experiments carried on there?

Mr. ACKERMAN. In answer to the gentleman from Connecticut I will say that the chairman of the subcommittee will go into that more in detail. But I remember distinctly when Doctor Burgess appeared before us he gave us an idea of what was contemplated in order that these experiments might be more properly housed and results more quickly obtained.

Mr. TILSON. I regard expenditures properly made in connection with the Bureau of Standards as an investment of great value, because of the returns resulting from improved methods and standardization.

Mr. SHREVE. Supplementing what Mr. ACKERMAN said, I wish to assure the gentleman that we are gradually building up the Bureau of Standards. Every year there are some new developments. In this bill we are carrying appropriations of \$200,000 for a new power plant that is to take the place of two or three other smaller power plants. We fully realize the great work the Bureau of Standards is doing. Last year we gave money for additional ground, and it is our purpose as long as this committee has charge of the bill to continue this policy in regard to the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. TILSON. I am very glad to know of the favorable attitude of the committee toward that institution.

#### MAKING MOTORING SAFE

Mr. ACKERMAN. Automobiles now in use could carry our entire population at one time. This industry, with an annual output of \$3,000,000,000 worth of cars and trucks, is a phenomenon of our age. Its tragic aspect is the loss of human life by accidents. Congested traffic calls for skilled engineering. Before adequate traffic control and brake requirements can be codified experimental data must be obtained. Among the Bureau of Standards services to automobile progress is a recent investigation of brake efficiency. The bureau devised an instrument to measure the rate at which a car can be stopped. One hundred passenger vehicles and 350 trucks were stopped from a 20-mile speed and the "decelerometer" measured the rate of stopping. Tests showed that one car in four could not stop within 50 feet and one in seven could not be stopped in 100 feet. The bureau has obtained data for drafting effective safety codes for brakes and brake testing, and for planning traffic regulations upon a scientific basis. In such ways the Bureau of Standards is contributing scientific methods of minimizing accidents and making motoring as safe as it is expeditious and convenient.

#### EFFICIENT STARTING OF AUTOMOBILE ENGINES

To make it possible to increase the number of startings, even at freezing temperature, from 20 to 100 starts per gallon of gasoline will be welcome news to every motorist. This achievement of the Bureau of Standards is the result of a recent cooperative research on the starting characteristics of motor fuels. A series of bureau researches has aided in increasing the efficiency of operation. Jointly with the Automobile Chamber of Commerce, the Society of Automotive Engineers, and the American Petroleum Institute, a research program is under way to increase car efficiency, how to get the most miles out of a barrel of crude oil, the highest efficiency in fuel and its use in our 21,000,000 motor cars. Data and methods are now assured for the manufacturer of motor cars to specify a fuel which will give reasonably good starting at any temperature. The data are also being given to the makers of liquid fuels.

The bureau has found that the fuel requirements for starting depend on the temperatures which are given for various localities in Weather Bureau publications. It was found practical to specify two points on the distillation curve to secure a specific fuel. The knowledge of the fuel requirements for each season in any locality and two points on the distillation curve permit the rating of fuels with respect to starting properties. Too valuable a fuel increased evaporation loss, both in production and distribution. A poor fuel however, would consume excessive amounts during starting, thus constituting avoidable waste.

The bureau has shown how engine design may be modified to improve starting and what fuel characteristics are required for easy starting at any temperature. Easy starting means fewer engine revolutions in starting, economy in fuel, saving the battery, minimum dilution of the lubricant, and convenience to the motorist. The results are being furnished to the automotive engineering profession for use in perfecting the ideal automobile of to-morrow.

#### BUILDING NOISELESSLY

The bureau cooperated in a test of the efficiency of noiseless steel construction, in which welding takes the place of the noisy riveting process. Quiet is now a rated asset in life and industry, as the design of noiseless machines and processes indicates. Voiceless mufflers for motors, noiseless gears for machines and innumerable silencing devices are introducing an era of relative quiet which will go far toward relieving the tension of city life.

The success of the new process depended upon whether it served equally well the uses for which structural girders are designed. With the cooperation of a large manufacturer of girders and bridges tests were made at the Bureau of Standards using its giant 10,000,000 pound compression testing machine. The results were most gratifying and give the welcome promise to the construction industry of a new procedure, more rapid fabrication, installation at lower cost, and a welcome relief from the distracting din of the pneumatic hammer in the riveting process.

#### MAKING RADIO MORE EFFECTIVE

Radio, now a great industry with over a billion dollars yearly output, is a direct product of pure science and laboratory experiments. Its ever accelerating progress depends upon further scientific research. In this field the Bureau of Standards has recently made a series of notable contributions. The efficiency of radio is being enhanced by the accuracy of the

bureau's frequency standards and standard procedures for their dissemination and application. The bureau has reduced interference between broadcasts by holding broadcasting to the assigned frequencies. The bureau has shown by investigation that high power is now detrimental, a conclusion contrary to current opinion. During the past year new conclusions were reached on the nature of fading, the great obstacle to the progress of radio. The bureau's discovery of the direction finder leads to many new uses of radio, both in marine and air navigation. The frequency range in which it is possible to do accurate direction finding has recently been greatly extended. The first radio beacon just completed near Washington, at College Park, is an example of fundamental service to the art of aviation, laying down as it does the first airway or lane of radio along which the airplane can be guided day and night on a straight-line course unaffected by wind or fog. This is perhaps the bureau's most important achievement in that it makes possible safe, speedy, and continuous navigation of the air.

#### PROLONGING THE LIFE OF UNDERGROUND PIPING

The life of iron and steel in underground piping is estimated at four years, according to the Bureau of Standards. Every four years on the average our supply of iron and steel products must be renewed for want of technical knowledge to control corrosion and other factors of waste. This enormous waste might be largely saved and the useful life of iron and steel prolonged indefinitely by researches such as those now in progress at the Bureau of Standards.

One example is the pending investigation of the subsoil corrosion of iron and steel pipes in which the bureau attacked this problem from several angles. The field and laboratory researches involved were placed upon a scientific basis which would permit a program covering a number of years of actual exposure tests. In this research 900 specimens of pipe have just been taken up from 46 kinds of soil after four years of exposure, and 1,400 specimens of pipe, galvanized with bituminous protective coatings were taken up after two years' exposure. The effects have been studied with a view to providing remedies, and the results are to be published for the benefit of all manufacturers and users of iron and steel pipe.

#### ACCURATE TEMPERATURE MEASUREMENT FOR CERAMICS

Until recently the burning operations of the clay-products industries were conducted, not on the basis of temperature readings but by the use of cones which softened and collapsed when the burning of the clay product was presumably complete. The bureau has recently standardized these cones by accurate temperature measurements of their yield points. A series of 60 pyrometric cones was thus measured. The object is to give the clay-products industries the perfect measured conditions in terms of temperature measurements. From such means the clay industries will be able to more effectively assure uniform high quality in their products.

#### ECONOMY AND SAFETY IN CONSTRUCTION OF DAMS

In the bureau's work for the construction industries it has measured the strains in skyscrapers, bridges, and other structures to find whether they agree with those computed from the known stresses. Safety and efficiency depend upon such researches. Recently a large experimental dam was built in California in order to test it to failure by allowing the waters to rise beyond the safety point. Probably never before has a full-scale experimental dam been constructed solely for scientific study during intentional overload. While the observations are not complete, the actual measures taken by the bureau's expert of the failing dam have located the maximum load at a point vertically midway on the dam.

The high cost of dams and the loss of life and property through their failure made it desirable to furnish the designers of such structures with data to aid them in designing dams with safety, efficiency, and economy. One principal object of the experimental dam has been accomplished; namely, to show that a lighter construction may be used without loss of safety.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. I would like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey if the bureau has undertaken any investigations as to stores of wood pulp other than those now on hand?

Mr. ACKERMAN. It has.

Mr. BRIGGS. I notice that our forests which have been supplying wood pulp have been very materially depleted. Our importations from Canada have been greatly increased, and the Canadians have in many ways combined to reduce their consignments as much as possible, and it looks to me as if the United States ought to devote some attention to that subject.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Yes. I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] is going to speak later on that particular subject.

#### PROTECTING A REMARKABLE ALLOY

The technical world hailed with delight the advent of the new light alloy "duralumin," as strong as steel and half as heavy. Its lightness and strength made possible the giant airships and the reduction in weight of automobiles and airplanes. Its success, however, was threatened by evidence that it became brittle with time. The work on protecting duralumin from corrosion, fatigue, and embrittlement is peculiarly important, because in designing aircraft the minimum weight of materials must be used, since every surplus pound reduces by so much the power available for propulsion. In fighting planes, especially the factor of safety, must be much smaller, even with some hazard to the aviator.

The bureau took up promptly the study of the cause and cure for such brittleness. Experiments in the laboratory and outdoors are under way on the protective value of various coatings. The partial results already obtained assure a great improvement and prolonged useful life for this remarkable alloy.

#### INCREASING THE SPEED OF MAPPING BY AIRPLANE PHOTOGRAPHY

Reducing by one-half the time for mapping a given district by airplane photography is a recent achievement of the Bureau of Standards. The rapid expansion of the new art of airplane photographic surveying and map making gives special importance to this very practical research in applied optics. The simplicity of the method is striking. Knowing the laws of light involved, a plate of clear glass of computed thickness was placed in the camera between the lens and plate. Distortion of the image was eliminated and flying time required was reduced one-half. This example is one of many which might be cited in which efficiencies in a given field are increased from 50 to 100 per cent and more in a single research.

#### PROLONGING THE LIFE OF PAPER CURRENCY

The Bureau of Standards research on a more durable currency paper for our paper money has developed a paper of greatly extended useful life and double the strength of the older papers. This saves more than paper, since it cuts equally the printing costs of our paper money. Adding 50 per cent to the useful life of such paper by technique developed at the Bureau of Standards is effected without increased cost. It should be emphasized that the replacing of 1,200 tons (billion bills) of worn-out paper currency costs more than \$3,000,000 a year. This gives some conception of the saving involved.

The bureau's improvement of the new currency paper covered only one out of five principal processes in paper making, namely, the beating of the pulp. Improvements in the new pulp-beating technique developed at the Bureau of Standards is responsible for the double strength and prolonged life of the new currency paper. The new pulp is a three to one linen-cotton mixture. The bureau's experts have aided in amending the mill procedure accordingly and is continuing the investigation in an equally scientific manner with regard to the process of cooking, bleaching, calendaring, and sizing. Equally interesting improvements may be expected from the further work now underway.

#### INCREASING THE HOLDING POWER OF SCREWS

The story of 10,000 screws is an interesting example of practical work by the Bureau of Standards, helping as it does every woodworker and factory producing woodworker. In the research 10,000 screws were driven into seven kinds of wood—poplar, cypress, sycamore, Georgia pine, North Carolina pine, hard maple, and white oak. The holding power of each screw was measured accurately by tests scientifically planned in cooperation with the screw industry.

The bureau has shown how the design affects the gripping power and how the manufacturers can make screws with greater holding power at a lower factory cost. As a result of this research the users are advised also to select unpolished screws with thin sharp threads, full diameter under the head, and shallow slot. They also were given the best size of the lead hole for each size of screw. The results were obtained by accurate measurement, in a thoroughly scientific manner, and may be relied upon as the latest word on screw technique. The increased strength of all woodwork produced with the use of the most suitable screws will be a notable by-product of this research affecting every household or other user of woodwork.

#### IMPROVING DENTAL MATERIALS

In cooperation with a dental research organization, the Bureau of Standards is conducting basic research on the quality of dental materials and the technique of their use. Beginnings

have been made and the major problem is already solved with astonishing success. The American Dental Association has just shown its approval by contributing toward the cooperative work subject to the continuance of the bureau researches.

The head of one dental research laboratory estimates that the bureau's past two years of research on gold inlays for teeth has made possible the more rapid and more perfect fitting of inlays and amalgams, with a net saving to the country of more than \$50,000,000. In this investigation the bureau made it possible to govern the conditions for producing almost perfect cast inlays where before the ill-fitting inlays was a matter of loss of time to the dentist and short and unsatisfactory service to the patient.

The bureau can now classify the materials and will soon be able to specify the quantity of the filling gold and amalgams with which permanent fillings can best be made. The work on amalgams is already the basis of Government specifications for dental materials, so that the dentistry for the soldiers with respect to material and technique is now in advance of that generally done for the American public. The bureau's results now make it possible for dentists to make perfectly permanent inlays or amalgam fillings.

Too often defective materials or lack of knowledge has led to continued loss of tooth material, injury to the pulp, removal of the nerve, infection, and loss of the tooth. Those unfamiliar with the situation may not realize the economic loss of millions of dollars annually. Figures can not, however, express the further loss in health—for the mouth is the gateway of disease—nor the distress of millions of our citizens headed for a toothless old age which the bureau's researches may mitigate by assuring suitable dental materials and technique in filling of teeth. Funds used in this work will return to the Nation permanent dividends hundreds of times greater than the investment.

#### PROLONGING THE USEFUL LIFE OF PRINTING PLATES

Through the Bureau of Standards research the engraved printing plates for printing paper currency and securities are now produced by alternate electroplating films of copper and nickel, with a final coating of chromium. This has doubled the useful life of such plates at one-fourth the cost of the case-hardened steel plates formerly used. Chromium is the hardest metal known, and the thin coating adds incredible durability. The resulting plates are finer than the original master plate, for the method deepens and narrows the channels which receive the ink. The finer lines make it more difficult to counterfeit. The 5,500 chromium-plated plates in service at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing are believed to be the first use of chromium plating on a commercial scale. These constitute about 80 per cent of the plates now in use for the printing of paper currency and Government securities. The full saving to be effected is believed to be of the order of a half million dollars annually. Not only are the chromium-plated plates cheaper, costing only one-fourth of the cost of the old plates, but surface-worn plates can be electrolytically de-coated and resurfaced for a dollar a plate, saving the replacement cost for a new plate.

As a result, chromium plating is being considered for stamping money at the mints and for use at the Government Printing Office. The experimental success of the money-plate development at the Bureau of Standards has already stimulated interest in the industries, which will find an astonishing variety of most useful industrial applications.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I have been following the gentleman's very interesting discussion of the Bureau of Standards, and in going over the report of the committee on the bill I have observed that the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, another very important bureau of the Department of Commerce, has a total appropriation in the bill of \$3,631,957, and a salary list of \$247,887, whereas the Bureau of Standards, for which you have provided a total appropriation of \$2,223,435, carries a salary list of \$572,060, a much larger appropriation for salaries in proportion to the total amount for the entire bureau than that of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. I was wondering what was the reason for the much larger appropriation proportionately for salaries in the Bureau of Standards than in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Mr. ACKERMAN. They are probably differently trained, more scientific men, in the Bureau of Standards. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] is probably more familiar with that than I am, and he can answer the gentleman.

Mr. SHREVE. The items referred to by the gentleman are scattered all through the bill. The services rendered are quite different. The men representing the Foreign Service have to travel about and live under high tension at high expense. The men employed at the Bureau of Standards are largely scientific men and live in Washington.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I was wondering whether there has been any investigation by the committee of the salaries in the Bureau of Standards. As the gentleman from New Jersey has pointed out, these scientists sometimes require larger compensation than men engaged in other business. Those salaries are determined in that particular bureau by what agency? Is it the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes. An inquiry and discussion of the subject with the director of the bureau and a careful analysis and study of the whole situation have led the committee to arrive at the conclusion it has reached.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will examine the hearings, he will find that perhaps in no other department of the Government do the number of scientific men constitute so large a percentage of its personnel as in the Bureau of Standards, and the pay of those scientific men is comparatively small when compared with that paid on the outside.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. That is what I wanted to find out, whether the Government was procuring this service at a low cost.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. A large percentage of the personnel in the Bureau of Standards are scientific men.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. ACKERMAN. To my mind, the investment we make in the appropriations for the Department of Commerce is a very profitable one. Reduced to a per capita basis, it is only 3 cents for each individual residing in the United States per year, and compared to what we spent during the war the amount required to run the Department of Commerce a whole year was consumed in two hours' time just prior to the armistice.

Every Member of the House must be interested in the trade of the State which sent him here. I am appending herewith the comparison of what each State did in the exportation of products originating therein during the first nine months of 1926. The figures for these months are the latest ones available.

Without taking up time of the committee at this point by reading these compilations, I would like to ask for the privilege of revising and extending my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Here are some notes concerning the States where our exports are weak:

Alabama during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$27,111,972 worth of products produced therein.

Alabama during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 10 States, Alaska, and the District of Columbia combined, namely: District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, and Arizona. These States combined exported a total of \$27,095,433 worth of original products.

Arizona during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$5,362,661 worth of products produced therein.

Arizona during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from three States, Alaska, and the District of Columbia combined, namely: District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Idaho, and Vermont. These States combined exported a total of \$5,224,283 worth of original products.

Arkansas during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$20,256,633 worth of products produced therein.

Arkansas during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from nine States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, and Colorado. These States combined exported a total of \$19,257,853 worth of original products.

California during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$203,372,757 worth of products produced therein.

California during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 22 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, Arizona, South Dakota, Montana, Rhode Island, Nebraska, Florida, Arkansas, Kansas, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Alabama. Combined they exported a total of \$203,086,773 worth of original products.

Colorado during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$3,666,923 worth of products produced therein.

Colorado during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from three States, Alaska, and the District of Columbia combined, namely: District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, and Idaho. They combined exported a total of \$3,586,296 worth of original products.

Connecticut during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$34,490,943 worth of products produced therein.

Connecticut during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 11 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, and Arizona. They combined exported a total of \$34,408,972 worth of original products.

Delaware during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$2,947,261 worth of products produced therein.

Delaware during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from four States, Alaska, and the District of Columbia combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, and New Mexico. They combined exported a total of \$2,947,361 worth of original products.

Florida during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$19,576,311 worth of products produced therein.

Florida during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from nine States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, and Colorado. They combined exported a total of \$18,948,029 worth of original products.

Georgia during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$68,725,718 worth of products produced therein.

Georgia during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 15 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, Arizona, South Dakota, Montana, and Oklahoma. They combined exported a total of \$67,787,544 worth of original products.

Idaho during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$1,807,763 worth of products produced therein.

Idaho during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from two States, the District of Columbia, and Alaska combined, namely: District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, and Utah. They combined exported a total of \$1,778,533 worth of original products.

Illinois during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$159,506,266 worth of products produced therein.

Illinois during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 20 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, Arizona, South Dakota, Montana, Rhode Island, Nebraska, Florida, Arkansas, Kansas, and Alabama. They combined exported a total of \$158,620,467 worth of original products.

Indiana during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$50,556,093 worth of products produced therein.

Indiana during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 14 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, Arizona, South Dakota, and Montana. They combined exported a total of \$47,032,307 worth of original products.

Iowa during the nine months ended September 1926, exported \$26,810,363 worth of products produced therein.

Iowa during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 10 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, and Montana. They combined exported a total of \$25,620,120 worth of original products.

Kansas during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$20,725,975 worth of products produced therein.

Kansas during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from eight States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, and Arizona. They combined exported a total of \$20,643,717 worth of original products.

Kentucky during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$24,627,467 worth of products produced therein.

Kentucky during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 10 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware,

Wyoming, Colorado, New Hampshire. They combined exported a total of \$24,522,910 worth of original products.

Louisiana during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$179,263,351 worth of products produced therein.

Louisiana during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 21 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, Arizona, South Dakota, Montana, Rhode Island, Nebraska, Florida, Arkansas, Kansas, Oklahoma, and South Carolina. They combined exported a total of \$175,974,801 worth of original products.

Maine during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$4,833,275 worth of products produced therein.

Maine during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from five States, Alaska, and the District of Columbia combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, and Idaho. They combined exported a total of \$4,755,124 worth of original products.

Maryland during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$50,904,803 worth of products produced therein.

Maryland during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 13 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, Arizona, South Dakota, and Rhode Island. They combined exported a total of \$50,796,719 worth of original products.

Massachusetts during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$85,251,670 worth of products produced therein.

Massachusetts during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 16 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, Arizona, South Dakota, Montana, Rhode Island, Nebraska, and Florida. They combined exported a total of \$85,163,276 worth of original products.

Michigan during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$201,004,608 worth of products produced therein.

Michigan during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 22 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, Arizona, South Dakota, Montana, Rhode Island, Nebraska, Florida, Arkansas, Kansas, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Kentucky. They combined exported a total of \$200,602,268 worth of original products.

Minnesota during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$50,787,284 worth of products produced therein.

Minnesota during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 12 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, Arizona, South Dakota, and Rhode Island. They combined exported a total of \$50,486,895 worth of original products.

Mississippi during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$34,740,672 worth of products produced therein.

Mississippi during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 12 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, and Arizona. They combined exported a total of \$34,718,796 worth of original products.

Missouri during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$32,381,664 worth of products produced therein.

Missouri during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 11 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, and South Dakota. They combined exported a total of \$32,172,151 worth of original products.

Montana during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$6,362,267 worth of products produced therein.

Montana during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from four States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, New Mexico, Idaho, and Hawaii. They combined exported a total of \$6,205,459 worth of original products.

Nebraska during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$11,982,827 worth of products produced therein.

Nebraska during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from six States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, and Delaware.

They combined exported a total of \$11,865,194 worth of original products.

Nevada during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$309,824 worth of products produced therein.

Nevada during this period exported products valued at less than any other State.

New Hampshire during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$5,265,057 worth of products produced therein.

New Hampshire during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from four States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, and Hawaii. They combined exported a total of \$4,995,843 worth of original products.

New Jersey during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$162,737,479 worth of products produced therein.

New Jersey during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 19 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, Arizona, South Dakota, Montana, Nebraska, Florida, Arkansas, Kansas, Oklahoma, and South Carolina. They combined exported a total of \$162,232,596 worth of original products.

New Mexico during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$859,004 worth of products produced therein.

New Mexico during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from one State and Alaska, namely: Alaska and North Dakota. They combined exported a total of \$838,378 worth of original products.

New York during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$576,034,266 worth of products produced therein.

New York during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 32 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, Arizona, South Dakota, Montana, Rhode Island, Nebraska, Florida, Arkansas, Kansas, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Iowa, Alabama, Missouri, Connecticut, Mississippi, North Carolina, Indiana, Minnesota, and Maryland. They exported a total of \$571,977,581 worth of original products.

North Carolina during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$39,277,451 worth of products produced therein.

North Carolina during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 12 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: District of Columbia, Nevada, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, South Dakota, and Arizona. They combined exported a total of \$38,862,277 worth of original products.

North Dakota during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$437,631 worth of products produced therein.

North Dakota during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from one other State, the District of Columbia, or Alaska. Namely, more than Nevada, District of Columbia, or Alaska.

Ohio during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$125,644,077 worth of products produced therein.

Ohio during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from eighteen States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, Arizona, Montana, Rhode Island, Nebraska, Florida, Arkansas, and Kansas. They combined exported a total of \$125,557,251 worth of original products.

Oklahoma during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$20,755,237 worth of products produced therein.

Oklahoma during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from nine States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Colorado, and Maine. They combined exported a total of \$20,675,216 worth of original products.

Oregon during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$54,979,256 worth of products produced therein.

Oregon during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 14 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, New Hampshire, Arizona, South Dakota, Montana, Rhode Island. They combined exported a total of \$54,133,474 worth of original products.

Pennsylvania during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$223,964,066 worth of products produced therein.

Pennsylvania during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 22 States, Alaska, the District of

Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, Arizona, South Dakota, Montana, Rhode Island, Nebraska, Florida, Arkansas, Kansas, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Kentucky. They combined exported a total of \$223,108,573 worth of original products.

Rhode Island during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$11,934,442 worth of products produced therein.

Rhode Island during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from six States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, and Delaware. They combined exported a total of \$11,865,194 worth of original products.

South Carolina during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$23,711,069 worth of products produced therein.

South Carolina during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from eight States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii, combined, namely: District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Hampshire. They, combined, exported a total of \$23,614,939 worth of original products.

South Dakota during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$5,951,244 worth of products produced therein.

South Dakota during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from four States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii, combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, Idaho, and Hawaii. They, combined, exported a total of \$5,944,602 worth of original products.

Tennessee during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$24,314,068 worth of products produced therein.

Tennessee during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from nine States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii, combined, namely: District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Hampshire. They, combined, exported a total of \$24,213,086 worth of original products.

Texas during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$407,132,492 worth of products produced therein.

Texas during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from 26 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii, combined, namely: District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, Arizona, South Dakota, Montana, Rhode Island, Nebraska, Florida, Arkansas, Kansas, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Kentucky, Iowa, Alabama, Missouri, Connecticut, and Massachusetts. They combined exported a total of \$406,942,055 worth of original products.

Utah during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$598,147 worth of products produced therein.

Utah during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from the following: Nevada, North Dakota, Alaska, or the District of Columbia.

Vermont during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$2,236,134 worth of products produced therein.

Vermont during this period, exported products valued at more than the original exports from three States, Alaska, and the District of Columbia combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, and Utah. They combined exported a total of \$2,088,357 worth of original products.

Virginia during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$96,919,207 worth of products produced therein.

Virginia during the period, exported products valued at more than the original exports from 17 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, Arizona, South Dakota, Montana, Rhode Island, Nebraska, and Kentucky. They combined exported a total of \$95,577,043 worth of original products.

Washington during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$79,345,287 worth of products produced therein.

Washington during this period, exported products valued at more than the original exports from 16 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, Arizona, South Dakota, Montana, Nebraska, and Florida. They combined exported a total of \$78,591,445 worth of original products.

West Virginia during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$60,796,829 worth of products produced therein.

West Virginia, during this period, exported products valued at more than the original exports from 15 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, Arizona,

South Dakota, Montana, and Nebraska. They combined exported a total of \$59,015,134 worth of original products.

Wisconsin during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$70,959,518 worth of products produced therein.

Wisconsin, during this period, exported products valued at more than the original exports from 16 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Hawaii, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, Arizona, South Dakota, Montana, Rhode Island, and Nebraska. They combined exported a total of \$70,949,576 worth of original products.

Wyoming during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$3,415,912 worth of products produced therein.

Wyoming during this period, exported products valued at more than the original exports from four States, Alaska, and the District of Columbia combined, namely: Nevada, District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, Utah, and New Mexico. They combined exported a total of \$2,947,361 worth of original products.

Alaska during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$400,747 worth of products produced therein.

Alaska during this period, exported products valued at more than the original exports from either Nevada or the District of Columbia.

District of Columbia during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$342,008 worth of products produced therein.

The District of Columbia during this period exported products valued at more than the original exports from Nevada.

Hawaii during the nine months ended September, 1926, exported \$2,048,482 worth of products produced therein.

Hawaii during this period, exported products valued at more than the original exports from two States, Alaska, and the District of Columbia combined, namely: District of Columbia, Alaska, North Dakota, and Utah. They combined exported a total of \$1,778,533 worth of original products.

Now, I just want to speak for a few moments in detail referring to the situation which Doctor Klein brought to our attention concerning an additional appropriation for the extension of the work of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. This map [indicating] which I hold in my hand shows the areas in various parts of the world, in the Near East, in India, in British Malaya, in the Netherland East Indies, in Australia, and in the Philippine Islands, to which cotton cloths are exported, and the total exports of cotton cloth in square yards in 1925, the last year for which they have statistics. Great Britain exported 4,433,745,300 square yards of cotton cloth in 1925; Japan, 912,000,000 square yards; and the United States only 543,317,000 square yards. While it would not be possible to dislodge the exporters, say, from Japan and Great Britain, who have a foothold in those areas, yet it is thought by the Department of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, judging by experience in other countries, that a very considerable amount of business along collateral lines can be built up in the areas where the proportion of the business done by the United States at the present time is indicated by the small red dot in the center thereof.

I was talking to Doctor Klein only this morning, and he says he is assured that a very large amount of additional business will be obtained for the textile industry in consequence of the appropriations that have been granted for that purpose.

Now, let us for a moment see what other countries do in regard to fostering foreign trade.

Take the United Kingdom, comprising England, Scotland, and Wales, having an area of 121,633 square miles, or a little over 4 per cent of the area of the United States, and having about one-third of our population. That country has now allotted to its department of overseas trade the huge sum of £111,844,907 for the promotion of commerce, a large proportion of which constitutes a revolving fund backing up exporters.

The following is from the French budget for 1927:

Total appropriation for Ministry of Commerce and Industry 210,093,875 francs (\$6,777,222), comprising 40,882,635 francs for commerce and industry and 169,211,240 francs for aeronautics and air transports.

Included in the appropriation for commerce and industry are the following items relating more specifically to trade promotion:

	Francs
French commercial offices abroad.....	2,743,000
Commercial attachés and commercial agents, salaries.....	1,909,500
Commercial attachés and commercial agents, installation expenses, travel, and miscellaneous expenses.....	2,828,000
Commercial attachés and commercial agents, indemnities to compensate for loss in exchange.....	9,800,000
Commercial attachés and commercial agents, indemnities to compensate for cost of living and revalorization of money in countries of depreciated exchange.....	2,000,000
	19,280,500

	Francs
National office of foreign commerce.....	1,530,000
Subventions to French chambers of commerce abroad and to commercial museums, commercial missions.....	650,000
Total (\$692,274).....	21,460,000

[NOTE.—The budget was figured on the basis of 31 francs to the dollar; the franc is now, however, at 3.95 cents.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Are those the amounts expended by the governments or by the industries interested?

Mr. ACKERMAN. By the governments, as I understand it. They seemed colossal to me at first blush, but upon examination and questioning the Department of Commerce they say those are the funds that are available for those engaged in foreign commerce.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. That is, in comparison with the amount we expend through the Department of Commerce?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Yes. That was my idea in making the comparison.

Italy, for example, with an area of one twenty-fifth that of continental America, is expending 4,000,000 lire in promoting foreign commerce, which is proportionately the same as that which the United States is spending at the present time.

Germany is speeding up her foreign commerce, and Czechoslovakia also is appropriating a considerable sum for the promotion of her foreign trade.

Japan's budget for 1927-28 contains an item of 2,755,000 yen for trade-promotion activities, or a per capita amount equal to that which we are spending.

When I had the pleasure of addressing the committee on a former occasion I adverted to the fact that importation of articles we could produce here is increasing. This is further borne out by the fact that in pre-war dollars, for the 11 months of 1926, our imports of finished manufactures exceeds all previous records that I am able to obtain for any other corresponding period of time. The increase from 1921 to 1926 was 263,000,000 pre-war dollars, or 42 per cent.

If such a large amount of foreign goods had been lessened from entering the United States, a corresponding amount of industry would have benefited here, and not the least would agriculture have shared generously in such additional production, by reason of having had to feed the multitudes of those engaged in the industry of making these goods.

As these figures were prepared in the Department of Commerce, they may be useful to the membership of the House for future reference.

*Imports of finished manufactures*

	General price index	Amounts
Years ended June 30—		
1910.....	100.9	\$368,000,000
1911.....	93.0	361,000,000
1912.....	99.1	390,000,000
1913.....	100.0	468,000,000
1914.....	98.1	449,000,000
Total, 1910-1914.....	98.2	389,000,000
Years ended Dec. 31—		
1919.....	206.4	493,203,000
1920.....	226.2	876,725,000
1921.....	2146.9	620,051,000
1922.....	2148.8	662,947,000
1923.....	2153.7	771,300,000
1924.....	2149.7	749,346,000
1925.....	2158.7	785,733,000
1926 <sup>1</sup> .....		883,000,000
1910-1914, average.....		389,000,000
1921-1925, average.....		720,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Estimated from 11 months' figures.

<sup>2</sup> Average about 150 (exactly, 151.6).

Estimated increase of 23½ per cent on basis of dollars of same buying power (1910-1914 prices taken as 66% per cent), increase 1910-1914 to 1921-1925 computed as follows:

One hundred divided by 150=0.66%; 389,000,000 divided by 0.66%= \$583,000,000. Increase from \$583,000,000 to \$720,000,000=23½ per cent, or \$720,000,000 divided by 1.50=\$480,000,000. Increase \$389,000,000 to \$480,000,000=23½ per cent.

As will be seen from the above, years 1919 and 1920 were abnormal both as to prices and amounts.

Increase 1921 to 1926 was \$263,000,000, or 42 per cent.



From time to time it has been stated that our tariff duties have prevented an increase in our imports. To demonstrate that this statement is not exactly founded on basic facts I append herewith tables prepared for me at the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. They show that in spite of those statements our imports from Europe and Canada are increasing. I think a perusal of these figures will not only be of great interest but will be highly illuminating, and testimony in concrete form of the fact that our so-called tariff walls are easily and frequently scaled by our foreign competitors. In fact, if revision is required it should be upward, not otherwise.

Comparison of exports and imports of average for five postwar years with average for pre-war years, using 66 2/3 cents as the value of a postwar dollar

	Postwar average, 1921-1925	Value at 66 2/3 cents	Pre-war average, 1910-1914	Per cent change from pre-war average to post-war average, dollar valued at 66 2/3 cents	
				Increase	Decrease
Exports.....	\$4,397,027,000		\$2,165,818,000		
Total.....	2,770,341,000	\$1,846,894,000	1,583,351,000	17	
United Kingdom.....	1940,868,000	627,245,000	567,592,000	11	
Germany.....	383,219,000	256,479,000	304,098,000		16
Belgium.....	111,284,000	74,189,000	53,117,000	40	
France.....	265,196,000	176,797,000	138,841,000	27	
Italy.....	185,237,000	123,491,000	65,966,000	87	
Greece.....	17,153,000	11,435,000	873,000	1,210	
Netherlands.....	138,228,000	92,152,000	104,575,000		12
Denmark.....	42,615,000	28,410,000	15,393,000	85	
Norway.....	28,081,000	18,721,000	7,819,000	139	
Sweden.....	39,443,000	26,295,000	10,033,000	162	
Canada.....	619,017,000	412,678,000	315,044,000	31	
Imports.....	3,450,103,000		1,688,874,000		
Total.....	1,319,133,000	879,422,000	852,690,000	3	
United Kingdom.....	1,356,035,000	237,357,000	278,897,000		15
Germany.....	132,496,000	88,331,000	176,462,000		50
Belgium.....	68,335,000	38,890,000	40,360,000		4
France.....	147,875,000	98,583,000	130,130,000		24
Italy.....	79,141,000	52,761,000	51,149,000		3
Greece.....	22,255,000	14,837,000	3,329,000		346
Netherlands.....	70,625,000	47,083,000	34,937,000		35
Denmark.....	6,929,000	4,019,000	2,597,000		55
Norway.....	18,498,000	12,332,000	8,086,000		53
Sweden.....	34,073,000	22,715,000	9,530,000		138
Canada.....	393,771,000	262,514,000	117,213,000		124
Ratio:					
Exports..... per cent..	63		73		
Imports..... per cent..	38		50		

<sup>1</sup> Irish Free State for 1925 included in average for United Kingdom.

As the operations of the United States Tariff Commission frequently figure in public discussions, I herewith attach data concerning rates of duty and amounts collected under various tariff acts of the United States for over 100 years on an ad valorem basis.

Another table shows equivalent ad valorem rates for certain articles in terms of total imports under the tariff act of 1922 for the years 1923, 1924, and 1925, while a third table shows for the years 1913 to 1920, 1921, 1923, and 1924 imports for consumption of certain outstanding articles arranged according to amounts imported in 1924.

The last table has been compiled to provide statistical material for those interested in a general survey of the sources of customs revenue for a period of years. The basis for comparison is the classification under the tariff act of 1922, as reported in Foreign Commerce and Navigation for the calendar year 1924.

The commodities are arranged by groups, such as cotton manufactures, woolen manufactures, and so forth, in the order of the amount of duties collected in 1924, and in many cases the principal items in the groups have been tabulated. Care has been exercised to keep the groups comparable through the years under consideration. This has required a deviation from group totals as reported in Foreign Commerce and Navigation in many cases, since the statistical classification under the act of 1922 is quite different from that under the acts of 1913 and 1909. It was necessary to record the free imports, whenever they occur, because of the shift from the free to the dutiable list, or vice versa, in the tariff acts represented.

Since the analysis of some groups had no significance or proved unsatisfactory and difficult, it was thought best to attempt only what could be done with certainty and with a reasonable amount of work. In the case of manufactures of iron and steel, for example, only the items of wire and cutlery were segregated.

Average ad valorem rates of duty on imports entered for consumption into United States, 1824-1921

[Average for period covering each tariff act]

Years	Average ad valorem rate of duty on—	
	Dutiable imports	Free and dutiable imports
Year ending Sept. 30:		
Period 1824-1828—		
1824.....	Per cent (1)	Per cent (1)
1825.....	37.10	35.13
1826.....	36.06	33.43
1827.....	41.35	39.20
1828.....	39.36	36.99
Average.....	38.468	36.188
Period 1829-1833—		
1829.....	44.30	41.39
1830.....	48.88	45.31
1831.....	40.81	38.19
1832.....	33.83	30.86
1833.....	31.96	23.95
Average.....	39.956	25.940
Period 1834-1842—		
1834.....	32.67	17.48
1835.....	36.04	18.95
1836.....	31.65	17.55
1837.....	25.36	13.94
1838.....	37.84	20.84
1839.....	20.90	16.38
1840.....	30.37	15.45
1841.....	32.20	16.22
1842.....	24.00	17.37
Average.....	31.114	17.131
Year ending June 30:		
Period 1843-1846—		
1843 (9 months).....	25.73	17.70
1844.....	35.13	28.65
1845.....	32.57	27.37
1846.....	31.45	25.85
Average.....	31.220	24.892
Period 1847-1857—		
1847.....	26.89	22.98
1848.....	24.97	22.22
1849.....	24.73	21.97
1850.....	25.85	23.16
1851.....	25.44	23.07
1852.....	25.96	22.94
1853.....	26.93	23.37
1854.....	25.61	23.52
1855.....	26.82	23.36
1856.....	26.05	24.68
1857.....	22.45	19.09
Average.....	25.515	22.750
Period 1858-1860—		
1858.....	22.44	17.33
1859.....	19.56	15.43
1860.....	19.67	15.67
Average.....	20.556	16.143
Period 1861-1864 <sup>2</sup> —		
1861.....	18.84	14.21
1862.....	36.19	26.08
1863.....	32.63	28.28
1864.....	36.69	32.03
Average.....	31.088	25.150
Period 1865-1871 <sup>2</sup> —		
1865.....	47.56	28.46
1866.....	48.33	41.81
1867.....	46.67	44.56
1868.....	48.63	46.49
1869.....	47.22	44.65
1870.....	47.08	44.89
1871.....	43.94	40.51
Average.....	47.104	43.053
Period 1872-1883—		
1872.....	41.35	37.99
1873.....	38.04	27.90
1874.....	38.49	28.29
1875.....	40.58	29.36

<sup>1</sup> Not available.

<sup>2</sup> Civil War acts.

<sup>3</sup> Revisions.

Average ad valorem rates of duty on imports entered for consumption into United States, 1824-1921—Continued

Years	Average ad valorem rate of duty on—	
	Dutiable imports	Free and dutiable imports
Year ending June 30—Continued.		
Period 1872-1883—Continued.		
1876.....	44.70	31.25
1877.....	42.84	29.20
1878.....	42.71	29.00
1879.....	44.82	30.33
1880.....	43.46	29.12
1881.....	43.27	29.79
1882.....	42.61	30.16
1883.....	42.41	30.04
Average.....	42.106	30.202
Period 1884-1890—		
1884.....	41.57	28.50
1885.....	45.83	30.75
1886.....	45.53	30.35
1887.....	47.08	31.52
1888.....	45.61	30.55
1889.....	45.11	30.02
1890.....	44.39	29.59
Average.....	43.589	30.182
Period 1891-1894—		
1891.....	46.26	25.65
1892.....	48.69	21.65
1893.....	49.56	23.79
1894.....	50.00	20.56
Average.....	48.629	22.912
Period 1895-1897—		
1895.....	41.75	20.44
1896.....	39.95	20.67
1897.....	42.17	21.89
Average.....	41.290	21.000
Period 1898-1909—		
1898.....	48.80	24.77
1899.....	52.07	29.48
1900.....	49.24	27.62
1901.....	49.64	28.91
1902.....	49.79	27.95
1903.....	49.03	27.85

Average ad valorem rates of duty on imports entered for consumption into United States, 1824-1921—Continued

Years	Average ad valorem rate of duty on—	
	Dutiable imports	Free and dutiable imports
Year ending June 30—Continued.		
Period 1898-1909—Continued.		
1904.....	48.77	26.29
1905.....	45.24	23.77
1906.....	44.16	24.22
1907.....	42.55	23.28
1908.....	42.94	23.88
1909.....	43.15	22.99
Average.....	47.115	26.925
Period 1910-1913—		
1910.....	41.52	21.11
1911.....	41.22	20.29
1912.....	40.12	18.58
1913.....	40.05	17.69
Average.....	40.728	19.417
Period 1914-1922—		
1914.....	37.60	14.88
1915.....	33.43	12.49
1916.....	30.67	9.62
1917.....	27.18	8.31
1918 (fiscal).....	24.11	6.30
1918 (July-December).....	24.39	5.09
1919.....	21.27	6.20
1920.....	16.40	6.38
1921.....	29.45	11.43
1922.....	38.07	14.68
Average.....	26.97	9.10
Period 1923-1925—		
1923.....	36.17	15.18
1924.....	36.54	14.89
1925.....	37.61	13.21
Average.....	36.76	14.38

\* Calendar years 1919 through 1925.

Source: Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States; Fiscal year 1900, vol. 1, p. 83, for years 1824-1836, inclusive; calendar year 1921, p. LVI, for years 1837-1921, inclusive; 1922-1925 compiled in the statistical division of the United States Tariff Commission.

TARIFF ACT OF 1922

Rates of duty reduced to equivalent ad valorem rates for certain dutiable imports and per cent that these imports are of total dutiable imports

Commodities	1923 to 1925		1925		1924		1923	
	Ad valorem equivalent	Per cent of total	Ad valorem equivalent	Per cent of total	Ad valorem equivalent	Per cent of total	Ad valorem equivalent	Per cent of total
Total—all dutiable imports.....	36.76	100.00	37.61	100.00	36.54	100.00	36.17	100.00
Total—commodities shown below.....	38.09	82.60	39.74	80.98	37.64	83.19	37.02	83.56
Chemicals:								
Coal-tar intermediates.....	71.84	.06	56.68	.08	87.69	.05	81.26	.04
Coal-tar finished products.....	57.11	.37	50.67	.48	58.72	.31	65.01	.31
Medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations.....	22.78	.24	20.76	.29	26.86	.23	21.06	.19
Acids and anhydrides.....	34.75	.10	34.97	.11	36.31	.10	32.93	.09
Ammonium, calcium, potassium, and sodium compounds.....	20.05	.40	19.54	.39	24.05	.32	17.96	.48
Paints, pigments and varnishes.....	31.43	.21	31.77	.22	31.41	.20	31.12	.21
Fertilizer.....	9.96	.04	10.04	.09	9.82	.02	9.69	.01
Soap.....	21.23	.05	21.26	.06	21.10	.05	21.34	.04
Perfumery, cosmetics, etc.....	69.69	.29	67.47	.31	70.50	.29	71.18	.28
Nonmetallic minerals:								
Glass.....	28.66	.94	34.31	.70	26.78	.87	26.89	1.23
Glassware.....	55.43	.42	56.15	.49	54.64	.45	55.41	.34
Clays and earthenware.....	22.34	.26	23.55	.26	22.09	.27	21.35	.23
Pottery—								
China.....	68.27	.69	68.36	.73	68.35	.73	68.07	.62
Earthenware.....	48.41	.42	48.55	.44	48.33	.42	48.33	.40
Diamonds.....	18.40	3.95	18.40	4.04	18.02	4.03	18.78	3.78
Metals and manufactures:								
Iron and steel—								
Pig iron (including ferromanganese, ferrosilicon, and spiegeleisen).....	24.67	.94	21.80	.99	23.81	.62	24.90	1.19
Bar iron, bars, ingots, wire rods, sheets, and plates.....	19.70	.38	23.56	.40	20.11	.34	15.79	.40
Tin plates, structural steel, rails, tubes, wire, nails, bolts and screws, castings and forgings.....	22.73	.74	21.93	.80	23.62	.87	22.57	.50
Cutlery.....	107.10	.09	96.75	.09	105.97	.09	116.44	.09
Household and hospital utensils, tools, and needles.....	53.53	.05	49.45	.01	64.01	.08	53.80	.07
Antifriction bearings; hoops and hoop iron; galvanized wire; engraved plates; iron in slabs and blooms; anchors; anvils; baling wire; bands or strips of iron and steel; horse, mule, or ox shoes; twist drills; reamers; dies; and metal cutting tools, n. s. p. f.....	36.41	.11	37.85	.12	31.81	.12	41.04	.08
Firearms.....	92.40	.04	84.30	.04	97.87	.04	93.87	.05
Miscellaneous—Hinges, locks, builders' hardware, chains, railway fish plates, wire staples, hollow-ware, n. s. p. f., and manufactures of iron and steel, n. s. p. f.....	39.29	.09	38.80	.09	38.75	.09	40.20	.09
Aluminum in crude form, scrap and alloy.....	23.38	.54	21.47	.66	23.34	.46	25.74	.61
Clocks and watches, and parts of.....	42.04	.84	43.29	.88	40.62	.89	42.21	.77

TARIFF ACT OF 1922—continued

Rates of duty reduced to equivalent ad valorem rates for certain dutiable imports and per cent that these imports are of total dutiable imports—Continued

Commodities	1923 to 1925		1925		1924		1923	
	Ad valorem equivalent	Per cent of total	Ad valorem equivalent	Per cent of total	Ad valorem equivalent	Per cent of total	Ad valorem equivalent	Per cent of total
Wood and manufactures, cork and manufactures	27.57	.12	28.35	.16	25.94	.13	28.52	.08
Animals and animal products:								
Wool and hair	45.20	5.44	35.87	6.13	44.70	3.94	54.15	6.19
Animals	25.96	.53	21.75	.66	27.32	.54	30.82	.40
Meat and dairy products	21.38	2.58	20.44	2.56	21.62	2.64	22.02	2.55
Eggs	39.76	.40	39.06	.58	39.15	.40	40.23	.24
Fish	19.27	1.53	18.36	1.64	19.67	1.69	19.88	1.28
Leather	20.02	.10	20.00	.10	20.05	.09	20.00	.10
Leather manufactures	46.69	.67	45.14	.76	46.17	.66	49.07	.59
Furs, dressed and manufactures	22.12	.59	20.59	.80	22.45	.48	24.14	.49
Feathers and manufactures	25.10	.21	25.64	.16	25.85	.23	24.11	.25
Vegetable food products, oil seeds, oils and other vegetable products:								
Grains and preparations	28.52	.80	27.09	.50	28.20	1.10	29.73	.82
Fodders and feeds	17.41	.63	14.89	.70	18.39	.75	19.57	.45
Vegetables	29.69	1.53	28.46	1.93	28.88	1.88	32.23	1.30
Fruits and nuts	36.94	3.29	34.85	3.69	37.57	3.16	38.70	3.04
Oil seeds	18.72	3.02	16.11	3.13	20.75	2.46	19.58	3.44
Vegetable oils	37.97	1.28	37.03	1.34	38.52	1.20	38.41	1.30
Cane sugar	45.67	19.53	68.58	13.72	41.29	22.44	36.55	22.26
Extracts for dyeing and tanning	15.01	.28	15.00	.30	15.04	.21	15.00	.32
Nursery and greenhouse stock	9.49	.54	8.85	.66	9.68	.51	10.19	.43
Tobacco and manufactures	51.99	4.51	50.65	4.77	50.26	4.64	55.22	4.14
Textiles:								
Manufactures of cotton—								
Thread and yarn	24.96	.56	24.90	.60	24.91	.53	25.06	.55
Cloth	28.07	2.47	26.83	1.82	27.34	2.68	29.44	2.87
Hosiery	50.25	.09	50.55	.12	50.99	.09	48.94	.07
Gloves	70.29	.30	74.09	.38	71.46	.30	63.23	.24
Laces and embroideries (except wearing apparel)	87.82	1.12	88.11	.98	87.17	1.34	88.35	1.04
Manufactures of jute—								
Burlaps and bagging	8.27	4.87	7.36	6.01	8.68	4.24	9.08	4.40
Bags or sacks	19.42	.27	18.25	.39	20.66	.20	20.31	.22
Manufactures of flax, hemp, and ramie—								
Yarns, thread, twine, or cords	25.73	.16	26.08	.18	27.01	.15	24.27	.16
Fabrics—								
Flax, hemp, and ramie	40.89	2.07	41.01	2.00	40.51	2.40	41.22	1.81
Wearing apparel	48.82	.03	54.36	.03	44.83	.03	48.76	.02
Handkerchiefs	57.05	.28	57.50	.28	57.24	.33	56.27	.23
Laces and embroideries	78.25	.36	78.38	.42	78.08	.38	78.30	.30
Towels and napkins	43.74	.22	43.67	.21	43.48	.23	44.02	.23
Hats, bonnets, and hoods, etc.	37.88	.89	41.98	.91	38.33	.81	33.87	.96
Artificial silk and manufactures	48.91	.67	49.68	.75	47.65	.43	48.83	.53
Wool and manufactures—								
Cloth (over 4 ounces per square yard)	72.98	1.25	71.35	1.33	74.02	1.27	73.66	1.18
Dress goods (not over 4 ounces per square yard)	68.13	.14	66.48	.17	69.07	.14	69.46	.10
Wearing apparel	59.23	.70	58.64	.87	58.22	.65	61.11	.58
Carpets and carpeting	53.47	1.01	53.47	1.20	53.59	1.01	53.35	.84
Blankets	61.86	.02	60.47	.02	62.12	.02	63.70	.02
Pile fabrics	70.47	.03	67.91	.03	69.27	.02	72.61	.04
Felts (not woven)	57.63	.01	56.49	.01	58.30	.01	58.24	.01
Manufactures of silk—								
Spun silk or schappe silk yarn	44.51	.29	44.81	.34	44.11	.26	44.53	.27
Broad fabrics	55.00	.99	55.00	.99	55.00	.93	55.00	1.03
Pile fabrics	60.00	.33	60.00	.23	60.00	.32	60.00	.42
Wearing apparel and handkerchiefs	70.15	.50	69.21	.55	70.57	.57	70.85	.38
Laces and embroideries	85.45	.29	84.23	.25	85.43	.31	86.38	.31
Paper and manufactures:								
Paper, except printed matter	31.58	1.10	31.58	1.09	32.84	1.14	30.37	1.00
Books and printed matter	19.28	.27	21.29	.38	17.56	.22	17.42	.20
Sundries, etc.:								
Toys, dolls, etc.	70.00	.39	70.00	.29	70.00	.37	70.00	.52
Buttons and button molds, forms of lastings, etc.	46.38	.09	45.85	.11	47.67	.10	45.33	.06
Beads and bead ornaments (excluding fabrics, etc.)	48.22	.39	50.20	.30	47.99	.48	47.04	.38
Bristles	4.13	.56	4.03	.51	3.98	.53	4.32	.64
Brushes	45.00	.14	45.00	.11	45.00	.11	45.00	.19

IMPORTS FOR CONSUMPTION
Chief sources of revenue, arranged according to their magnitude in 1924
(1913, 1920, 1921, 1923, 1924)

Table with 16 columns: Commodity, 1924 (act of 1922) [Value, Duty, Equivalent ad valorem rate], 1923 (act of 1922) [Value, Duty, Equivalent ad valorem rate], 1921 (act of 1913) [Value, Duty, Equivalent ad valorem rate], 1920 (act of 1913) [Value, Duty, Equivalent ad valorem rate], 1913 (act of 1909) [Value, Duty, Equivalent ad valorem rate]. Rows include categories like Cane sugar, Cotton manufactures, Tobacco, Woolen manufactures, etc.



Mr. ACKERMAN. During the month now drawing to a close the country has been treated to a series of commercial reports for 1926 which show that year to have been the best business year in the history of our Nation.

Astute and usually accurate judges of future conditions are forecasting an equally prosperous year for 1927. Plans are accordingly being made in all lines of industry and commerce. Those engaged in the formulation of these plans in many instances have been greatly aided through the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the Bureau of Standards, and Bureau of Coast and Geodetic Survey, as well as all other departments of the Government. Everyone should realize that the facilities of these bureaus are at their disposal at any time in assisting them departmentally if upon due consideration it seems that advice from these quarters might be productive of helpful results.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. A moment ago the gentleman said the provision which the committee has made for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in the present bill would be particularly helpful to textiles, and the department thought it would result in a considerable increase in the foreign consumption of American textiles.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. I am glad to hear that. I would like to ask the gentleman whether this provision will also be adequate to meet the needs with reference to the products of other industries which may be in need of the development of foreign markets in continental Europe and particularly South and Central America.

Mr. ACKERMAN. I will say that is the very idea the committee had in mind, that the appropriations are being made for no one specific industry, but to help every industry wherever that trade commissioner or commercial attaché goes. I thank the committee. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 15 minutes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the very instructive speech of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN] as to a number of the activities carried on by the Government and provided for in this bill. I was particularly interested in what he had to say with reference to the work being done by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. I have taken the floor for the purpose of discussing in a brief way the work which is being done by this bureau and particularly the necessity for its extension to one very great industry in this country—in other words, the tobacco industry—and I mean by that the tobacco growers, who are not confined to a few States but who are found in many States of the Union.

Before I refer to that, however, I wish to say that I have always been a very earnest advocate of liberal appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. I say to you frankly that in my opinion the Government and the people of the United States receive as great and possibly a greater return for the money expended for the work of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce than in any other service of the Government. I have been an advocate of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce from its inception. I recall when it was under the supervision of Secretary Redfield, of the Department of Commerce, and I wish to say in all sincerity, fully recognizing his ability and his initiative, that it has never been more ably and efficiently supervised than it is at the present time under Mr. Hoover, the Secretary of Commerce, and particularly under the present efficient, capable, and able head of that service, Dr. Julius Klein. Doctor Klein is a man of splendid ability, a man of great initiative; he is doing splendid work and rendering a great service to the people of this country as the head of that great bureau. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I am very glad to have that expression from the gentleman as to the ability of Doctor Klein, and I think every member of the subcommittee shares the same feeling. It is with very great regret that we learn there is a very strong probability that we may lose the services of Doctor Klein during the year, owing to the fact that outside business, recognizing his great usefulness, is making some very attractive offers to him. I really think that with Doctor Klein, familiar with the duties of the office, as he is, and since this is one of the great growing bureaus, Congress should give some consideration to some raise in the salary of a man of his experience so as to retain him. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. I am very sorry indeed to hear of the possibility of Doctor Klein leaving the service. I hope in the interest of the business of this country it will not occur. It is one of the great misfortunes of the Government that many of our most efficient public servants are frequently compelled, because of the smaller salaries paid by the Government to highly experienced experts, to go into private business where the emoluments are larger and leave the public service.

#### CRITICAL CONDITION OF AGRICULTURE

We hear a great deal, gentlemen, about the condition of the farmers of this country, and we all recognize the fact that agriculture has been going through a very serious depression, and that there is an imperative need for Congress to give such relief as it can to agriculture in general. I want to say to you that there is no class of farmers in this country who are in a more critical situation, so to speak, than the growers of tobacco. Something must be done to extend the markets for our export tobacco. We find that many of our old markets in Europe have been either lost or that they are disintegrating, and unless something is done through some agency of the Government to discover new markets and to extend the demand for our tobacco in other sections of the world, very soon this great industry is going to suffer very seriously.

#### TOBACCO INDUSTRY

The United States at present has the greatest tobacco industry of the world. Fully one-third of the raw leaf and the major portion of the tobacco produced is of American origin, and the United States is the only country producing a sufficient variety of types to operate its factories independently of foreign raw material.

As a source of revenue, in 1925, the tobacco industry returned to the United States Government \$395,552,000, more than a million dollars a day. The United States in 1925 produced 1,349,660,000 pounds of tobacco, consumed 689,424,000 pounds in the manufacture of tobacco products, and exported, including tobacco products, approximately 506,472,000 pounds.

In the actual volume of production tobacco ranked eighth among farm products. In the value of farm products it ranks seventh, and in the export value of raw farm products it ranks second, being exceeded only by cotton.

From the standpoint of economic fitness the United States could meet every need of the world's tobacco situation, but the welfare and the development of the domestic industry are being menaced by many factors arising in foreign countries. First among these factors is the substitution of foreign-grown tobacco which is taking place in nearly every country in the world. Since American manufacturers consume only one-half, the production and health of the industry demand, of course, that the other one-half be exported. Exports at present, however, amount to little more than 38 per cent of the production. Moreover, as domestic consumption is confined largely to one or two types, exports to foreign countries must be spread out over all the remaining types. This variety of our export types offers, on the one hand, the advantage of creating a greater number of markets, and, on the other hand, it is characterized by the disadvantage of affording foreign buyers greater opportunities for substitution.

#### DISINTEGRATION OF TOBACCO EXPORT MARKET

The disintegration of the Italian and Spanish markets is illustrative. For many years these two countries have been the principal buyers of our dark-fired Kentucky and Tennessee tobacco. The enforced policy of the present Italian Premier—that Italy must use Italian tobaccos whether fit or not—has reduced our sales to that country from 42,000,000 pounds before the war to 10,000,000 pounds in 1925. Spain, which has always been an outlet for American low grades, reduced American purchases to 18,000 pounds in 1926 from 15,000,000 pounds in 1925. Algeria apparently has been the substitutional source of Spanish raw material during the current year.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARE. That is a very interesting statement, and I wonder if the gentleman can enlighten us in any way as to the cause of this great reduction in our exports of tobacco to Spain?

Mr. BYRNS. I think possibly it was due to several causes. In the first place, as the gentleman knows, during the war the price of tobacco, like everything else, increased greatly. These European countries, which before that had been taking our tobaccos, after the war found themselves in a situation where they did not have much gold. They did not have the money. In addition to that, tobacco was bringing a big price, and in some of the countries they began to grow it, and in the countries like Spain, where they did not grow a great quantity of it, they began to look around for a cheaper tobacco, and Spain being just

across the Mediterranean from Algeria and north Africa, naturally sought tobacco from that source. It is, of course, of a greatly inferior quality. The gentleman understands, of course, that in a number of these countries, like Spain and Italy, there is a government-controlled monopoly. The Government buys the tobacco and then sells it to its citizens, and therefore the Government is in a position to force its citizens to buy just such tobacco as the Government determines they shall buy.

Mr. HARE. Then I gather that the primary cause is due to the failure on the part of our Government agencies to use the same activity as our competitors have used in trying to locate markets.

Mr. BYRNS. Of course, the situation is more acute now than ever; in fact, it has become acute in the last year or two, but unless the Government does do something toward finding new markets for our tobacco the situation is going to be extremely critical for the tobacco industry of this country, and it is not only going to affect the tobacco growers, but it is going to affect this great revenue of \$395,000,000 which is paid into the Treasury every year as a result of the production of tobacco.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield to me in this connection?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. As the gentleman knows, his sister State of North Carolina is quite a tobacco State, and I am wondering if the gentleman, with his powerful influence here in the House, while we are considering appropriations for the Department of Commerce, does not think it would be a good idea for the Government and for the Congress in this discussion to call to the attention of Mr. Hoover and his department that now is a very appropriate time for this Government to say to Mr. Mussolini that in view of the fact we have been so liberal with him in the settlement of the Italian debt, that it would be just as well for him to consider the matter of handling some of the American tobacco. I would like to hear the gentleman on that subject.

Mr. BYRNS. I, of course, would like to see that done; but my understanding has been that Mr. Mussolini, to say the least of it, is a power all unto himself in Italy. It is a matter over which our Government has no control.

Mr. ABERNETHY. We are financing him at this particular time.

Mr. THATCHER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. THATCHER. I do not know whether the gentleman has stated it or not, but does the gentleman know what percentage of the dark tobacco from Kentucky and Tennessee has been going to Italy?

Mr. BYRNS. I could not tell the gentleman exactly. As the gentleman knows, about 80 per cent of the entire production of the dark-fired type is exported, and up until two years ago there was as much as 25 to 33½ per cent which was exported and sold in Italy each year.

Mr. THATCHER. I think it was nearly one-half.

Mr. LARSEN. What is this dark-fired tobacco—is it smoking tobacco or chewing tobacco?

Mr. BYRNS. It is used for all purposes. It is a dark tobacco that has to be fired or smoked in the barn, and the soil of Kentucky and Tennessee, from where I come, is peculiarly adapted to that particular type of tobacco. The gentleman understands there are quite a number of different types.

Mr. LARSEN. It is not used for cigarettes?

Mr. BYRNS. No; it is not used for cigarettes, but it is used for cigars and chewing tobacco and smoking tobacco generally. As I have said, only about 20 per cent of it is used in this country. It is almost entirely export tobacco.

SOIL OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES NOT ADAPTED TO THE GROWING OF GOOD TOBACCO

With a few exceptions, foreign countries are not adapted to the culture of good tobacco. Climatic and soil conditions in most instances are conducive to the production of inferior leaf, yet the good prices which obtained for American leaf subsequent to the war started tobacco-production campaigns in nearly every country of the world. The result has been that European markets are glutted with a harvest of low-grade production. American warehouses are stocked up with similar qualities and production continues.

It is a fact well established in the tobacco trade that the European tobacco market is getting away from us, and that unless palliative measures are taken the tobacco industry will reach a crisis. Prior to the World War Europe bought 84 per cent of the total exports of American leaf; in 1925 Europe bought only 65 per cent of the total exports. The necessity of developing and maintaining new foreign markets is therefore

most impelling. China and Australia are two interesting markets for cigarette leaf tobacco that have been developed since the war. South America and the Scandinavian countries also offer worth-while possibilities.

WHAT THE BUREAU IS NOW DOING FOR THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY

The bureau functions primarily as a promoter of foreign trade. Economic and industrial conditions, statistics concerning trade, stocks, production, and consumption in foreign countries are made available to the American tobacco industry by means of a weekly circular known as Tobacco Markets and Conditions Abroad, released by the tobacco section of the bureau.

Just here, I wish to say that there is at the head of the tobacco section in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce a gentleman who has grown up practically with the industry, Mr. Ben E. Hill, a man of splendid intelligence, who understands the trade and the growth of tobacco, and who is rendering great service to the tobacco grower.

This service helps to maintain a better trade balance by affording a greater perspective to the exporter and manufacturer.

Particular attention is given to the development of new markets and the protection of markets already existing. Actual sales are often effected in foreign countries through special information disseminated to the trade. In coordination with other divisions of the bureau, sales information is furnished on foreign firms or assistance rendered American exporters in collecting accounts.

Information concerning the intelligent marketing of the crop is deemed essential to the grower, consequently indirect aid of a valuable nature is supplied him through close cooperation with the growers' associations. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. What part of the tobacco crop is consumed here?

Mr. BYRNS. A little over one-half of all types.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. And the balance is exported?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes. In 1925 out of 1,349,000,000 pounds, 506,472,000 pounds were exported, which includes tobacco products. I will insert here a table showing the number of pounds and the value of the leaf tobacco exported from 1920 to 1925, inclusive:

Exports of leaf tobacco  
[Raw material]

	South America	Europe	Asia	Total	Value
1920	4,050,204	371,759,960	29,376,737	467,662,124	\$244,897,187
1921	3,997,712	433,495,249	22,652,591	515,353,067	291,743,186
1922	2,192,439	343,488,496	36,601,555	430,907,978	145,931,896
1923	3,860,784	359,345,379	51,859,174	476,500,139	152,303,061
1924	3,398,876	388,268,315	92,646,755	546,555,416	163,034,624
1925	3,480,575	304,104,239	100,302,682	468,455,613	153,350,777

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. The application of the tariff would not afford any relief?

Mr. BYRNS. Oh, no; I am anxious that the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce shall take up this work to a greater extent in foreign countries. I wish to read from the hearings what Doctor Klein had to say on the subject:

Mr. OLIVER. Have you submitted any recommendation with a view to providing some office that would look out especially for the tobacco interests?

Doctor KLEIN. In the original recommendation as to this fund, we expected to have a specially trained commissioner in Latin America on two commodities, one for lumber, to which you referred a moment ago, and the other on tobacco. We have felt for a long time that there should be some special commodity trade commissioners in Latin America on those subjects, and we still feel that it is most necessary.

Mr. OLIVER. What is the condition of the tobacco business at this time which suggests the importance of a commissioner to look after the foreign market?

Doctor KLEIN. In Latin America?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Doctor KLEIN. The situation there is this: The export tobacco business is being hampered seriously in certain European markets by native competition. For instance, the Italian Government has adopted the policy of favoring domestic production, as far as possible, in carrying out its policy of national economic independence. A similar tendency is evident in Spain and in one or two other countries. The only way in which we can readjust our tobacco export business to that new condition—and tobacco is one of our most important ex-

ports—is by searching for other markets, and the feeling is that those new markets can probably be found in the Far East and in Latin America. I have every reason to believe that intensive effort by some expert tobacco man can accomplish the same result for tobacco that has already been accomplished in the Far East for lumber.

Mr. OLIVER. Is this national policy on the part of some European countries, to which you refer, now being reflected back here, in that tobacco people are having difficulty in finding a foreign market?

Doctor KLEIN. Yes, sir. The trade has found these obstacles in important markets of Europe. They now suddenly find that they are without a market in those countries. I do not wish to be understood as criticizing that policy on the part of European countries because it is quite in keeping with the policy followed in different parts of the world. However, that is the condition that is facing us, and the only way in which we can readjust the tobacco trade to it is to discover new markets. We do feel that something can be done to relieve that condition in the Far East, and especially in Latin America. In the matter of lumber there are certain major needs in Latin America.

WHAT THE BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE CAN DO FOR THE TOBACCO GROWERS

In my section of the country and in other tobacco-growing sections there are cooperative associations organized for the purpose of securing a fair and reasonable price for the tobacco grower. If we had three tobacco trade commissioners, one in Europe, one in Latin America—where I have stated there are great possibilities for the extension of the market for all types of tobacco—and one in the Far East we would have efficient men with whom the heads of these associations could communicate, and who would be able to advise the tobacco growers through their associations as to the availability of markets, and be of the greatest assistance in disposing of our export tobacco to the greatest advantage. Such services would be of tremendous value to the growers. This is a great service this bureau can render, and when you consider that this great industry pays into the United States Treasury over \$395,000,000 every year, it seems to me that it is asking very little of the Government to expend, say, \$50,000 of that amount for the purpose of promoting the extension of our foreign markets. If we do not do that, you are not only going to find that the tobacco growers will be seriously affected, but you will find that the revenue of the Government will be seriously affected. [Applause.]

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I will.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I understand there are not sufficient funds appropriated in this bill or in previous bills to take care of that work.

Mr. BYRNS. The bureau has not been doing this particular kind of work in foreign fields. But I will say to the gentleman that I appealed to the subcommittee and also to the full committee, of which I am a member, to increase the Budget estimates for this purpose. The committee has recommended the increase and if it is approved by Congress, I am informed by the head of the bureau that it will be sufficient to provide for trade commissioners in Europe and Latin America, and I hope in the Far East, if conditions over there become more settled.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is there any law that will justify an additional appropriation if necessary?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Would the gentleman favor an amendment to the present bill?

Mr. BYRNS. I would if necessary. But the bureau states that this appropriation will provide sufficient money to carry on the work.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I hope the gentleman will offer an amendment to the bill, if it is not sufficient.

Mr. BYRNS. I will if it is thought to be necessary. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP].

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia makes the point that no quorum is present. Evidently there is no quorum present, and the Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 18]

Aldrich	Berger	Clague	Douglass
Anthony	Bixler	Cleary	Doyle
Appleby	Bloom	Colton	Eaton
Arentz	Brand, Ohio	Connery	Englebright
Arnold	Britten	Cooper, Ohio	Evans
Ayres	Brownne	Curry	Frear
Begg	Carew	Davis	Fredericks
Bell	Carter, Okla.	Dempsey	Free

French	Leatherwood	Oliver, N. Y.	Swartz
Gasque	Lee, Ga.	Parker	Sweet
Gifford	Luce	Peavay	Taylor, Colo.
Glynn	Lyon	Phillips	Taylor, N. J.
Golder	McFadden	Porter	Taylor, W. Va.
Goldsbrough	McLaughlin, Mich.	Pou	Thompson
Gorman	McReynolds	Prall	Tilman
Hale	McSweeney	Purnell	Timberlake
Harrison	Madden	Quayle	Tincher
Hawley	Manlove	Reed, N. Y.	Tucker
Hayden	Michaelson	Reid, Ill.	Underhill
Jones	Mills	Scott	Vare
Keller	Montague	Smith	Wefald
Kendall	Montgomery	Sasnowski	Weller
Kiess	Mooney	Spearing	Welch, Calif.
Kindred	Moore, Ohio	Sproul, Ill.	Wheeler
King	Moore, Va.	Stalker	White, Me.
Kirk	Morgan	Stedman	Wingo
Knutson	Nelson, Wis.	Stephens	Wood
Kurtz	Newton, Minn.	Stobbs	Woodyard
Lampert	Newton, Mo.	Strong, Pa.	Yates

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LEHLBACH, 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. 16576) 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, 1928, and for other purposes; and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 317 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he handed in a list of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I regret the inconvenience that has been caused you by calling you here from your offices when I am about to speak, but I am frank to say that I am glad to have you present because in what I am about to say I shall not talk for home consumption nor for the gallery but shall earnestly endeavor to explain to you the bipartisan farm relief bill that I have had the honor to introduce in the House, contrasting it with the other two prominently mentioned farm relief bills pending before Congress, the Haugen bill and the Aswell bill.

At the outset, let me say that I do not claim the authorship of the bill. It is a composite bill. It is a bill embracing what those who collaborated with me believe to be the best features of each of the other bills, eliminating the objectionable and controversial features. Some of my friends on the Democratic side of the House and on the Republican side of the House have spoken of this bill as the administration bill. I wish I could say that it is an administration bill, because with the administration in control of all branches of the Government, if I had the backing of the administration, I would feel sure the bill would pass; but I can not say that it is an administration bill. Last December some of my Republican colleagues came to me and asked if I would collaborate with them in an endeavor to formulate a farm relief bill that stood some chance of being enacted into law, because every Member of this House, I am sure, is anxious to have some practical, workable, beneficial farm legislation passed. I am convinced that the Haugen bill can not pass. Therefore, I agreed to collaborate with those friends.

Permit me to say further that until the bill was introduced I had never talked with the Secretary of Agriculture, nor with anyone connected with that department, and the Secretary of Agriculture never saw the bill until after it was introduced, when he telephoned my office and I told him that if he would send a messenger I would send him a carbon copy of the bill, which I did.

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

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. RAINEY. Did my colleague see the plan of N. I. Drummond, of Kansas City, which very much resembles the plan outlined in the gentleman's bill?

Mr. CRISP. I did, and there are certain sections taken from the Drummond bill. When I appeared before the Agricultural Committee to explain the bill, I pointed out to that committee the different sections taken from the Haugen bill, from the Fess-Tincher bill, from the Aswell bill, and from the Drummond bill, and certain suggestions incorporated in it that were advanced by ex-Governor Lowden as to the character of farm legislation. The bill also contains much new matter.

Mr. RAINEY. Does the Drummond bill meet with the approval of Secretary Hoover?

Mr. CRISP. I could not answer that, because I do not know.

Mr. RAINEY. Does it meet with the approval of Secretary Jardine?

Mr. CRISP. I can not answer that, because I do not know.

Mr. RAINEY. Does it meet with the approval of the head of the Grain Corporation?

Mr. CRISP. I can not answer that, because I do not know.



Mr. RAINEY. I want to say that they have all approved of the Drummond plan.

Mr. CRISP. I am glad to know it. I stated in the Committee on Agriculture that I myself would vote for the Drummond plan if given an opportunity to do so, because I am not concerned with pride of authorship, and I consider it a good relief bill and a constitutional one.

My sole desire is to get some practical farm-relief measure through this Congress. [Applause.] Resuming, last Friday I addressed a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture and asked the department's views as to the Crisp-Curtis bill and asked, if his reply should be favorable, if I might be at liberty to use the reply if I saw fit to do so. Yesterday I had a reply from his assistant, Mr. Russell, stating that the Secretary was out of the city and would not return until the 2d of February. Therefore, up to this moment I do not know the views of the Department of Agriculture as to the bill. I say to you that the bill was drafted in the House Office Building by myself and other friends desiring agricultural relief. I would be delighted to give you their names and refrain from doing so only because they insist on not being mentioned; but I say to you that if this bill should become a law I shall see to it that all who had a part in drafting the bill are given full credit for the part that they played in its preparation. [Applause.]

There were three or four drafts of the bill made. I carried one of them home with me during the Christmas recess. When we got back it was rewritten one or two times. The bill is not perfect, and I have never known a piece of constructive legislation to be passed that was perfect. All great structural legislation has had to be amended and perfected. I can not hope that this bill is perfect, but there is this difference between those who are backing this bill and those who are backing the Haugen bill: The proponents of the Haugen bill say that we must not dot an "i" or cross a "t," that the bill must be passed just as written; it is the Haugen bill or no farm-relief legislation shall pass. Oh, gentlemen, to get legislation we must compromise differences. We who are backing this bill welcome, we invite constructive criticism. Wherever it is wrong we ask you to point out the error, and you will find us anxious to perfect it, to better it, to benefit it, to get it into shape where a majority of this House can support it, because we are actuated by no other motive on earth than the motive and desire to do something that will help distressed agriculture.

Let me briefly outline the bill to you and then contrast it with the other two bills, and when I have done so I shall be delighted to yield to any question and to answer it to the best of my poor ability. My sole purpose is to endeavor to explain the bill to the House and impress you with its economic soundness, its justice, its merits, so that you will approve it. If you pass it and the Senate passes it, while I am not authorized to speak for the Executive, I feel sure the Executive will approve it. I do not see how he can approve, in view of past utterances from his spokesman, the Haugen-McNary bill. Now what does the Crisp bill do? It creates in the Department of Agriculture a farm loan board consisting of 12 members, to be selected by the President, confirmed by the Senate, one from each of the 12 Federal land-bank districts, and they must be experienced as producers or in the cooperative markets. The bill gives each of them a salary of \$10,000 a year and traveling expenses, and the Secretary of Agriculture is chairman of the board. Now some friend may say, Why put the board in the Department of Agriculture? The Government has created this great Department of Agriculture to look after the interests of agriculture; therefore, to me it seems a wise thing to concentrate all Government activities looking over agriculture in this one great bureau.

When that board is created then they have a right to appoint an advisory council for each of the agricultural commodities to which the bill is made applicable. That is a provision of the Haugen-McNary bill. When the board and advisory council are appointed then they are to investigate the conditions of agriculture, but let me point out one marked difference between the Haugen-McNary bill, the Aswell bill, and the Crisp bill. The Haugen and Aswell bills name certain basic commodities which only can receive the benefits of the act. The Crisp bill makes this board of 12 a forum before which the producers of any agricultural commodity can appear when that commodity is in distress and make out a case, if they can, showing that an emergency exists in that commodity, and if a majority of the board decides that there is an emergency, then the bill applies. You will note, my friends, that does not discriminate against any agricultural commodity. Every agricultural commodity is given its day in court. It is given the right to appear before this board, make out its case, and the board will be enabled to act as to cottonseed as well as cotton, to cottonseed-meal cake, to cranberries, to tobacco, to rice,

wheat, corn, swine, cattle, any basic agricultural commodity. When the board is appointed then great duties will devolve upon it, great responsibilities; and in a law of this character its administration must rest on human beings, and we believe that the men appointed by the President, and the board must be a bipartisan board of not more than six from any one political party, whose appointment has been confirmed by the Senate, the 12 representing every section of the United States, familiar with every kind of agricultural product produced in the United States, will see that all are given a fair hearing. When it begins to function, if any agricultural commodity is distressed, any cooperative marketing association dealing with that product, or the board, of its own motion, may investigate and determine if that commodity is selling below the cost of efficient production with a reasonable profit to the producer.

Mr. RAINEY. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CRISP. I prefer, my friend, to run over the bill before answering questions.

Mr. RAINEY. I just wanted to ask, How do you determine a world surplus? I call the attention of my colleague before he answers the question to the fact they are taking in an ever-increasing amount of our agricultural products and taking more now than they ever did before. We never had a surplus, because it was quickly absorbed, so I desire to ask the gentleman in what year was there ever an agricultural surplus, within the meaning of this bill, and how is the gentleman going to determine it?

Mr. CRISP. I intend to deal with that later, but I desired the House should see the picture of the bill as a whole, but I will now take up the gentleman's question. Whenever any country produces more of a commodity than it consumes itself, and the excess must be sold abroad, that is a world surplus; and if all countries producing a commodity have an excess over what they normally consume, and the excess must be sold in the markets of the world, it is a world surplus.

Mr. RAINEY. Can my colleague tell me what year in the world that condition ever occurred?

Mr. CRISP. I think it occurs whenever there is an exportable surplus. The Savior said, "The poor you have with you always"; and my friend from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], in criticizing that provision of the bill, stated as long as there was a hungry mouth in the world, as long as there was a naked back to clothe, you would not have a surplus. It is unfortunate that condition obtains, but it always will obtain. And when you are dealing with legislation or law, when you are defining a surplus, you mean an excess over that which is usually consumed or when more of one commodity is produced than the world normally uses.

And I may add right here that I understand my able and beloved friend from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] is a very strong proponent of Governor Lowden in his aspirations to the Presidency, and I understand he nominated Governor Lowden on one occasion as a suitable candidate for President. Now, my good friend from Iowa criticizes the provisions of my bill which provide it shall function when there is a world surplus, and when agricultural associations are sufficiently organized to handle the surplus. He ridicules both propositions. It may interest him to know that, in substance, those provisions were incorporated in the bill because his candidate, Governor Lowden, suggested them as a basis on which the board should act to furnish agricultural financial relief.

I hold in my hand a copy of a speech delivered by Governor Lowden at the eighth annual meeting of the A. F. B. F.—whatever that is—on December 8, 1926, in which Governor Lowden said:

We have proposed that such board shall be vested with the power of inquiry into certain facts. Those facts are: "If there is a surplus of some basic farm commodity," "Does this surplus reduce the price below the cost of production and a reasonable profit?" "Are the growers of that product sufficiently organized cooperatively as to be fairly representative of all the producers of that commodity?"

Now, three of the provisions that my friend from Iowa criticizes as a basis as to when an emergency exists are in substance those three tests laid down by Governor Lowden, his candidate for President and a great advocate of the Haugen bill. We have enlarged it in the interest of the farmers by saying "or threaten to reduce the price." Under Governor Lowden's plan you would have to wait until the surplus was raised and marketed to see whether a surplus existed.

We have gone one step further and take his test and say, "The board can act even if it is estimated that a large crop threatens to reduce the cost below the cost of production." We have used in substance his own language in the paragraph "Are the cooperating associations sufficiently organized to be

fairly representative of the producers of the commodity?" Now we have put in two other tests which common sense dictated, which good business required, to wit, the third—"are the conditions of durability, preparation, processing, preserving, and marketing such commodity adaptable to the storage and future disposal of such commodity?"

Of course, we would not advocate it for a surplus that would spoil in a few days, which was not suitable for storage and future use, like peaches, fruits, vegetables, and perishable produce. And we put in another provision, which I say is using some brains, for we say "Are such cooperative associations sufficiently organized to handle the marketing of such commodities?"

Now, we believe that the leaders of these great cooperative marketing associations are intelligent men. We believe that they are good men. We believe that they have brains. We believe that they are capable of assisting in the orderly marketing of commodities, and so we put those two additional paragraphs in.

Now, when this board finds that there is an emergency as to any basic agricultural commodity and that the bill should apply to it, then the board is authorized to have the cooperatives, or one cooperative dealing in that particular commodity, to organize a holding corporation. Now, the condition of all agricultural products is not the same at the same time. There may be an emergency as to wheat and not as to corn; as to cotton and not as to swine; so each of these commodities is dealt with separately. I am more familiar with cotton, and, therefore, for my illustration I shall take cotton.

If the board finds that cotton is selling below the cost of efficient production with a reasonable profit to the producer, the board can authorize the organization of a cotton-holding corporation. The capital stock of that corporation is to be nominal; a thousand dollars is sufficient. The same principle, of course, applies to wheat and to these other basic commodities. But when that corporation is organized, then the board is authorized to loan that corporation out of the revolving fund money with which to go into the market and buy the surplus of cotton and store it and hold it and take it off the market.

The corporation can not do that unless the board authorizes it. It further provides that if private credit can be obtained at reasonable interest, the board shall cease to loan money, but the board can authorize the corporation to hypothecate the commodity it has bought as security for additional loans. But the corporation can not do that unless the board authorizes it. The Government will have a first lien on the commodities purchased out of the revolving fund by the holding corporation unless the board waives its first lien and takes a second lien.

Now, my friends, in my judgment, if that is enacted into law the corporation would have to buy but very little or none of the commodity. Why? If this Government board announced that an emergency existed in a commodity—and the bill makes it mandatory upon the board when it finds an emergency exists in any commodity to announce to the world that the board has found that such an emergency exists—and that they are going to furnish the finances to go into the market and take off the market the surplus, what would follow?

The corporation would only have to buy a very few bales of cotton before the price would at once jump up to the cost of production, and probably above it, because the speculators and the spinners of Europe and of America would not know exactly what that price would be. They would go into the market and begin to buy and they would at once run the price up and your poor farmer would not be required to be ground down and paid the very lowest possible price for his cotton or any other agricultural commodity, because, as soon as the corporation functioned, the price paid would jump up to the cost of efficient production, and the farmer would be sure, at least, of getting the cost of efficient production; whereas now the only way the cooperatives can act, with a limited number, is to go in and let the members of the cooperative hypothecate their cotton, borrow 70 or 80 per cent of its value, pay interest for the money they get, pay storage, pay insurance, pay overhead charges, and when they obtain the loan they do not know whether the price will ever go up. Under this plan the poor farmer will get the cost of production, for when it is known to the spinners of Europe, who take 60 per cent of the cotton raised in the United States, that the Government, through one of its agencies, will see that it goes to the cost of efficient production, does not common sense tell you it will go there at once? I have no doubt of it. The cooperative holding the cotton of its members and marketing it gradually—the surplus off the market held by the holding corporation—will raise the price above the cost of production and insure the farmer a reasonable profit on his cotton.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. There is a point which I would like to have the gentleman make plain. Does the gentleman believe that if this corporation bought this cotton it would affect the market, as you say, because those who are in the market to purchase would know it was purchased by this corporation?

Mr. CRISP. Absolutely; and I will tell you what I think the bill will do more than anything else. The bill is not intended as a price depressant, it is not intended to inflate prices; but it is intended as a price stabilizer, which is essential to the producers, to the spinners, and to the consumers. The bill is not intended to interfere with the law of supply and demand except with this one limitation. Here is the only effect it is intended to have over the law of supply and demand: It will peg the price to the cost of efficient production, and it will do no more so far as the operation of this corporation is concerned.

Now, say the next year there is a normal crop of that commodity. The corporation will not function at all when there is a normal crop, because the law of supply and demand will insure a price that will make a profit to the producer. So the corporation stands in being. It does not go in and out of existence, as my friend, Mr. DICKINSON, said in his speech. That is true of the corporation provided in Doctor ASWELL'S bill, but this corporation remains in being all the time and ready to act at a moment's notice. But if there is a normal crop, it does not function. Therefore the law of supply and demand will control and the producer will get a profit. But say the next year there is a very short crop which, of course, would mean very high prices. Then this bill would represent a stabilizer. Whatever surplus this corporation has will be fed to the market; it will hold down the price to the extent that this surplus fed to the market makes up the deficit in production and will supply the deficiency. To the extent that the surplus fed to the market makes up the shortage of the world's need, it will hold down the price to that extent only and tend to stabilize it. Of course, if there is a very short crop, even with this carry-over surplus fed to the market, the price will still go higher, for again the law of supply and demand will operate. The bill intends to hold the surplus of bumper crops and sell it in lean-crop years to help make up the deficit.

The bill also provides that when one holding corporation is created for any commodity no other holding corporation for that same commodity can be created; nor can any loans be received out of the revolving fund by cooperatives, but they must deal with this one agency fixed to deal in that particular commodity.

The bill authorizes, as did the Tincher-Fess bill, the loaning of money, not to exceed \$50,000,000, out of the revolving fund for the purpose of building storehouses, warehouses, and so forth, in which to hold the commodity.

The bill also authorizes, as did the Tincher-Fess bill, the loaning of money to cooperatives that are efficiently organized or which control any particular commodity in order to enable them to have orderly marketing. For instance, the cranberry association, or some of those associations out West that are highly organized which do not desire a holding corporation to purchase their commodity and hold it for the market. My bill would enable the board to give them financial aid for the orderly marketing of their products.

Now, gentlemen, this bill does not put the Government in business. The minority report of the Agricultural Committee has indorsed the bill, and I may say to you, my friends, this report says that in the Committee on Agriculture 10 of its members voted to substitute this bill for the Haugen-McNary bill and only 11 voted against substituting it, so the bill lost out in the Committee on Agriculture by the vote of 10 to 11. Therefore the bill is before you with practically as much indorsement from your Committee on Agriculture as the Haugen bill that was favorably reported. There is only one vote difference between them. What does the minority say about it, speaking of this bill?

We believe that the mere passage of such legislation would almost immediately stabilize the price of commodities at about production cost—probably slightly above—through trade buying, which would not risk the accumulation of great supplies by a powerful corporation whose purpose was to hold for a profit. We believe that over a period of years corporations so organized and financed will earn far more profits than losses, and thus make their dividends an inducement to men to join the cooperative associations. We know that such a bill does not put the Government in business; does not subsidize the American farmer, who wants no subsidy; and does not fly counter to all economic history.

My friends, I think this bill will aid cooperatives. Why? It provides that the corporation shall be organized by the

cooperatives. The bill provides that, if this corporation makes a profit, a certain per cent of the profit shall be set apart as a reserve for the corporation. It provides that the remainder of the profit shall be distributed to the cooperative or cooperatives organizing the corporation, with the mandatory provision that they shall distribute pro rata the dividend they receive to the members of their cooperatives who are marketing through those cooperatives.

The bill provides that if loss should be sustained, there shall be no individual liability against the stockholders of the corporation or the cooperatives, but any reserve acquired by the corporation and profits made in future operations shall be subject to pay the loss; but there is no assessment against the stockholders of the corporation or the members of the cooperatives forming the corporation. Therefore the cooperatives that form this corporation have this talking point to its members, and I believe it is a sound one; "If you come in and market through us, you stand a chance of getting a profit out of the profits of the corporation, and you do not hazard anything, for there is no liability upon you."

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question at that point?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. COLE. Under the McNary-Haugen bill the Government undertakes to pay no losses. What loss will the Government have to pay, probably, under the operation of your bill?

Mr. CRISP. I think the Government stands ninety-nine chances to lose under the Haugen bill where it stands one chance to lose under this bill; and why do I say that? Both bills create, as does the Aswell bill, a revolving fund of \$250,000,000. This is to finance the initial requirements of all the bills, to enable them to function. Then the Haugen bill provides you shall levy an equalization fee in the future to get money to pay the loss on the surplus that you are going to dump in Europe at any price, and the Haugen bill provides that you can make contracts with cooperatives; that you can make contracts with the packers—do you men from out West get that—you can make contracts with the packers to process and take the commodity off the market, and the bill provides that if these packers or these other agencies, to whom you are turning over the power and duty of buying and taking the commodity off the market, sustain a loss, the loss they sustain is to be paid out of your equalization tax. For the packers it is a game of heads I win, tails you lose. They can process and hold it, and if they lose their loss is paid out of the equalization fee.

How does the Haugen bill propose that this fund from the equalization fee shall be spent? First, there is to be paid the amount agreed to be paid by the board for losses, costs, and charges in respect of the operation in any basic agricultural commodity or its food products. That is paid to your packers or your private agents or anybody else you have told to go out and buy and hold.

Second, salaries and expenses of such experts as the board determines should be payable from such fund; and third, repayment to the revolving fund or to the United States. My friends, it would never revolve around so far that the Government would receive one cent back in the revolving fund for the amounts furnished, for the "equalizers" would garner in whatever tax the farmers paid to put the scheme into operation. The farmers would be taxed to save the packers and other private agents from any loss.

Under the bill I have introduced, you have the commodity there with a lien on it and they can only buy when the commodity is selling below the cost of efficient production. They can only buy when the commodity is capable of being preserved and stored. Does not your business sense tell you that if you buy any commodity below the cost of production that is capable of being stored and preserved and kept, it is bound to go up to the cost of production or above it within a reasonable time?

There is no loss, but, my friends, I am not squeamish about Government in business. I can not and will not vote for the Haugen bill with its equalization tax in it, because I believe it unconstitutional, and I have supporting me in that connection four of the outstanding lawyers in this House, Judge GRAHAM, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary; Mr. TUCKER, of Virginia, who has written several works on the Constitution; Mr. BURTON, of Ohio, who is recognized as one of our best statesmen; and R. WALTON MOORE of Virginia, one of the ablest of our Members. But I am not going into an argument as to that. For my part, I can not and I will not vote for it, for I believe it will work a hardship on my people and that it will give them no relief. I think it unjust to tax the farmers when the Government has so often given financial aid to industry.

Now, we all agree that there must be some check on production. We all agree to that, do we not? Now let us see which of the three bills furnishes the best check on production. May I say here that I have no rocks to throw at the bill of my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL]. It squarely puts the Government in business.

It provides for the Government to take the stock. It provides for the Government to appoint the directors, and it authorizes the corporation when it is organized to go out and sell its bonds, and so forth, to the amount of ten times the capital which the Government has furnished, and with all these bonds outstanding, I do not see much chance of the Government getting back the money it advances out of the revolving fund. But as I have said, I am not squeamish about the Government putting up the initial capital to aid agriculture in its present deplorable condition, and I will vote for the bill of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL]; but let me tell you now something about what the Government has done for others.

Mr. UPSHAW. That is, if the gentleman's bill is not agreed to.

Mr. CRISP. Yes; of course, if my bill is not adopted. I think my bill is the best one, and I do not claim it to be my individual bill, because it is a composite bill.

Let me tell you what the Government has done for other industries. You have the protective tariff law which aids the manufacturers. We have appropriated for the Emergency Fleet Corporation, making up a deficit from 1921 to 1926, \$238,000,000. For the railroads we have lent them through the War Finance Corporation over \$400,000,000, and to-day the United States holds the securities or notes of the railroads for money lent it amounting to \$299,000,000. We paid out to the railroads, under the guarantee provision of the Esch-Cummins law, from March 1, 1920, to October 31, 1926, \$532,000,000; I obtained yesterday from the Interstate Commerce Commission this statement. The estimated average earnings of first-class railroads in the United States for 1926 amount to 5.77 per cent, and they earned that by the Government, through the Interstate Commerce Commission, fixing freight rates. During Government control of the railroads they lost \$1,860,000,000, and the taxpayers paid the bill.

When you needed transcontinental railroad lines—and I agree that the railroads are the arteries of trade and just as essential to transportation as the arteries in the human body are essential to life—you gave them every other section of land through which the railroads ran, totaling hundreds of millions of acres of land. The War Finance Corporation has loaned to industry \$690,000,000. You have loaned the land banks and intermediate credit banks, you have set up a Labor Board to see that the laborers are given a fair wage, and you have appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars for agricultural extension work.

So there are abundant precedents for the Government to pay the initial capital and try to help agriculture to get on its feet. [Applause.] At least 30 per cent of our citizens are engaged in agricultural pursuits. And what I have said of these appropriations of course applies with equal force to the Haugen bill and to the Aswell bill. But, as I have said, the Government has nothing to do with the management of the corporations set up under my bill. They are owned and managed by the stockholders, who are private cooperating marketing associations.

The Government is to have the right of supervising the management of these corporations, just as it has the right, through the bank examiners, to examine national banks to see that they are efficiently managed and no overhead excessive charges made.

Now, I see that my time is running. Let me contrast the three bills as to the limitation on production. The Aswell bill has this check, and this alone—they will advise farmers as to the probable need of production, and advise them not to plant excessive acreage the next year because they already have a surplus on hand. The directors will say, "This is your surplus that will be on the market next year, and if you continue to overproduce you will destroy yourself." This is the only restraint the Aswell bill provides.

The Haugen bill gives advice, and then they say the equalization fee is a deterrent.

When I was before the Committee on Agriculture making a speech in support of my bill, Mr. HAUGEN, chairman of the committee, asked me a question, and he inserted in the hearing a table carrying out his question, which was perfectly proper, but he put in the table, which fixes the eye on his question. He said if this bill had been in effect in 1925 the raisers of wheat, butter, corn, lard, and beef would have received a

billion three hundred and forty-two million dollars more for their products. How do you city Congressmen like that? And he says the taxes on it would have been \$155,000,000, and therefore, he says, do you think that tax would amount to nothing? The farmers would have been so glad to pay it.

If you will take his idea, if the Haugen bill would increase the value of western products that much to the producer—which I do not admit, because it is based on two fallacies; one is, if you run the price too high there would be as much sold, which there will not; and the other, that it will curtail production, which it will not. In my judgment, it will increase production. If the farmers know that they are going to get so much more than world prices—in fact, a high price for their commodities—and that the surplus will be taken care of by being dumped abroad, do you suppose they will reduce? No.

Furthermore, have you thought of this—if you dump the surplus of the world to the extent that you reduce the world's price, you can reduce it so low that they will ship the produce into the United States and break your domestic price by underselling. Suppose the price of wheat in London is \$1. Under the scheme of the Haugen bill the board is expected to add the tariff and freight to world prices in fixing the domestic price on wheat, corn, etc. Suppose the price in the United States of wheat is \$1.50. The Canadian, to get his wheat to London, must pay about 20 cents freight, so he will get for his wheat, if he sends it to London, about 80 cents per bushel. He can get his wheat from Canada to the United States for about 5 cents a bushel. Suppose he pays the 5 cents a bushel and pays the tariff of 42 cents; he then can come into the United States and undersell your \$1.50 price. He can ship his wheat to the United States and sell it for \$1.40 per bushel. After paying the tariff of 42 cents and the freight, his wheat would net him 93 cents a bushel, whereas if he sends it to London he only gets 80 cents a bushel. Do you not think he would do it, and if he did, do you not think you would have a greater amount of American surplus wheat and the farmer would be penalized by heavy equalization taxes to pay the loss on domestic wheat dumped and sold abroad at world's price of \$1 a bushel? Gentlemen, the Haugen equalization plan is wasteful in its operation. The fundamental weakness of the equalization-fee plan is that it is based on the principle of waste. It would encourage overproduction, holding forth the hope that all excess agricultural commodities would be promptly disposed of abroad—at serious loss, of course, but a loss which could be made up out of the increased domestic prices.

The surplus products thus sent out of the country would represent the fertility of our soils, which has been accumulating throughout unnumbered centuries. This fertility will be needed by our own people in the Nation's to-morrow. Dread of hunger is inherent in the human race. Each individual is reminded of it daily. Memories of a thousand famines have accompanied the development of mankind; have been graven deep upon the conscious and subconscious mind. More nations have been conquered by hunger than by armed force. Food is the limiting factor in human progress. These things are elemental. Conservation of food supplies is necessary to national security—and the equalization fee plan contemplates exactly the opposite of conservation. Now, what does my bill do? It first gives advice as to the world's need and urges reduced production if there is a surplus carried over. We are all full of advice, and all three bills give advice. My bill provides as a second deterrent that, if a surplus is produced, the corporation, with Government aid, will only peg the price to the point of cost of efficient production. No one would care to raise a commodity if guaranteed only the cost of efficient production. It holds out no inducement for increased production. He would be better off in some other business. In my judgment, with the Government finance you can only protect the efficient producer. Wasteful, extravagant, and slothful producers must inevitably fail, just as wasteful and inefficient management of industry, banks, and all other commercial undertakings fail. While the bill only guarantees, where large surpluses are produced, the cost of efficient production, it does not mean, if the farmer curtails production and raises a normal crop required by the world, that he can only receive the cost of efficient production. If wisdom is followed and production is reduced, the farmer will receive, under the law of supply and demand, a handsome profit on his production. In the third place, what does the bill do?

It goes on further and says that when an emergency year has been declared by the board as to a commodity and the Government has aided through the corporation in taking part of the surplus off the market and holding it for the following year, and the producers plant an increased acreage over what they did in the emergency year, then the board can not ad-

vance any financial aid to them. There is a check, telling them that if they plant an excessive acreage they can not look to the board for aid, but must bear the consequence of their folly. There is another check. The only amount in the bill is \$250,000,000, the revolving fund. If they continue to produce big surpluses, they would soon consume that fund and there will be no other fund, and again they must bear the consequence of overproduction. The provision in the bill as to withholding financial aid where excessive acreage is planted after the board has declared that an emergency existed is ambiguous. My friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROWNING], called my attention to it. I welcome constructive amendments. I shall prepare an amendment clarifying the provision. My friend, Mr. JONES, of Texas, criticized the provision in the bill providing that the corporation could not buy commodities of inferior grades. Cotton would not be affected, but, as the bill is national in scope and intended to aid all agriculture, it might work a hardship on certain grades of wheat; therefore, I shall strike that provision from the bill. The gentleman from South Carolina, Judge HARE, and his colleague, Mr. McSWAIN, called attention to the fact that there was no provision in the bill providing punishment for the board or any of its employees giving out advance information as to when an emergency would be declared in any agricultural product. Advance information would be useful to speculators. I concede that their criticism is well-founded, and I shall prepare an amendment covering their suggestion. My friend, Mr. HARE, also suggested it would be advisable to have a provision giving the holding corporation immunity from the Sherman antitrust law, and I shall prepare an amendment covering that constructive suggestion. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. RAINEY, discussed with me the provision referring to the cost of efficient production and suggested that that provision be clarified, and I invited him to prepare an amendment of this character. We welcome constructive criticism and are prepared to accept any helpful amendment. In this respect we differ materially from the advocates of the Haugen bill who place "thumbs down" on any proposed change or amendment of that measure.

Which of the three bills, I ask you, fairly tends to hold down production, which all of us admit is essential? The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] criticized my bill, and I felt complimented to draw the criticism of the distinguished leader of the Haugenites, because I thought they must be afraid of my bill, afraid it would pass, when they leveled their heavy guns at it. He said that under my bill there could be no collective bargaining; that the farmer would have to take whatever this corporation would pay. Not so. This bill encourages the cooperative, this bill aids the cooperative, it lets the cooperative know that it can tell its members they are in a better position to obtain for them a good price if they will market their produce through the cooperatives, because the holding corporation authorized by the bill has purchased a part of the surplus crop and has it stored and is holding it until its market value reaches the cost of efficient production. Thus this corporation has withdrawn from the market the hurtful surplus. If the producers turn over to the cooperative associations their produce for orderly marketing, the amount so turned over to the cooperatives is also withdrawn from the open market for sale; therefore the spinners and processors must purchase their raw material either from the cooperatives or from nonmembers of the cooperatives. The cooperatives are thus in a position where they can better bargain with the spinners, brokers, and processors and require them to pay a fair price for the commodity. With my bill in operation, if a substantial number of producers join the cooperatives, they will be able to protect themselves and obtain a fair price for their product.

Much has been said about the cost of efficient production. By that is meant the bulk-line cost of any commodity, taking into consideration the cost of that commodity as raised over the entire United States. Of course, some parts of the country can raise any named commodity much more cheaply than another part of the country can, but the bulk line means the average cost of raising 80 per cent of that commodity in the United States, and that is what is meant by the cost of efficient production. The board would have to determine that. My friend from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] says that my bill stabilizing the cost of production means that Texas and other communities would produce much more cotton at a large profit, and the other parts of the South where they had to pay more to raise it would have to go out of business. I was amused when he went further and said that under his bill he would guarantee them 15 cents a pound. If they can raise it in Texas at 8 or 9 cents a pound, as he said in his speech,

do you not think that with his bill guaranteeing 15 cents a pound they would plow up the fence corners and bring into cultivation millions more acres of land and raise cotton on it?

The bill that I have introduced does not do that. The bill says that we will fix the price at the cost of efficient production. If you use judgment and do not raise more than the world needs, the bill will not operate, and you will get whatever price the law of supply and demand guarantees. If by reason of a favorable year you produce more than the world needs, we will take it off and hold it for you at the cost of efficient production, and if you have a very lean year we say to the consumers and the spinners, "We will feed this surplus to the crop raised in the lean year and will hold down the price for you to that extent." We will stabilize the price to that extent.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, a continued supply of food-stuff and raw material will be a godsend to the country. In 1923 you had a short crop of corn. The farmers the next year sold their hogs, because the corn was short. It was too high priced to buy for feed. That resulted in a shortage of pork, and pork went high. Suppose there had been a hundred million bushels of corn carried over from the fat year for the lean year, the farmers would not have had to reduce their surplus of hogs, because 100,000,000 bushels of corn in the market cuts a material figure in the price of corn, and they would have had a continued supply at a fairly stabilized price, and there would have been a large supply of hogs and meat would not have gone so high.

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

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] made the statement the other day, and I understand the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] made the same statement, that under the Haugen bill, in the operation in cotton, the board proposed to sell at a higher price in America and to dump the balance of the surplus crop abroad at a lower price. Did the gentleman make that statement?

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman did not make that statement, because the Haugen bill differentiates between cotton and the other commodities. According to every man perfect honesty of opinion, I can not see why the cotton men favor the Haugen bill, because the Haugen bill proposes to give all of these other commodities raised principally out West an increase over the world's price, and the Haugen bill does not intend to give the cotton producer 1 cent over the world's price, but provides only for an orderly marketing of cotton, and 60 per cent is sold in Europe, and Liverpool fixes the price. [Applause.]

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

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield one minute to the gentleman in order to ask a question.

Mr. CRISP. I will stay on the floor just as long as you will give me the time and answer any question I am able.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. How many cooperative associations has the gentleman's bill proposed that credit may be extended to in reference to any basic agricultural products?

Mr. CRISP. Only one. When one is organized all the dealings as to that commodity must go to that one corporation. Let me say here to my southern friends. Mr. HAUGEN, in the figures he gave showing how much his bill, if it had had the opportunity, would have increased the price of wheat, corn, lard, and pork, was as silent as the tomb as to what effect it would have had on cotton. It would not have helped it one cent and he knew it, so he did not mention it. The president of the Georgia Cotton Association has been to see me; he has telegraphed me that his association and his directors are 100 per cent behind my bill; that they believe it is the best and most efficient farm relief bill before Congress; and that he has submitted it to several Atlanta bankers, and that all of them said that it was sound economically and that it would work; that it would afford relief and not violate any economic law.

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

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. I would if I had the time. If I had the time I would stay here until night and answer any questions that I could.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN].

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. If our country is spared a war with Mexico and Nicaragua, the newspapers of the country should get the major credit. If the administration decided not to sanction the sale of arms and ammunition to Mexican rebels, it will be due to the patriotic and plucky opposition of both Republican and Democratic newspapers. The most hopeful

aspect of this Mexican situation, so miserably handled by our State Department, is the attitude of the press of the country in the part it has played and is playing through press dispatches and editorials.

At a White House press conference on December 31 President Coolidge expressed displeasure, if not resentment, over the fact that the press of the country was not solidly behind the President in the handling of the Mexican-Nicaraguan situation. According to the newspaper reports of that press conference, it was broadly hinted by the presidential spokesman that America's foreign relations policy was being misunderstood because of the attitude of the American press. The President is correct in stating that we are under suspicion abroad. A survey of the foreign press, namely, of England, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, and Central and South America, offers conclusive evidence that our foreign policy is looked upon with great distrust by these nations. I refer you to this week's issue of the Nation, that for January 26, 1927, pages 88 and 89, for a concise summary of the sentiments of this foreign press.

Many of the newspaper men present at the White House press conference of December 31 felt that the President was suggesting that it should be the attitude of the press to approve and follow blindly the administration's foreign policy.

It is fortunate for the country and for free institutions in America that newspapers generally refused to accede to the President's plea for unity. If the Editor and Publisher is representative of the newspaper point of view, the leading Washington correspondents, with the exception of David Lawrence, were opposed to the President's position. The issue of this publication for January 8, 1927, contains a résumé of statements made by the leading Washington correspondents on their attitude and opinions regarding this White House conference. Of the 15 correspondents who are quoted—and many of them represent republican newspapers—fully two-thirds of them refuse and resent the President's request for united support, holding rather to the doctrine that the press should carry both sides of the story and freely comment editorially on our foreign policy. In this collection of comments by Washington correspondents the following oppose the President's viewpoint:

Henry Suydam, the Brooklyn Daily Eagle.

M. F. Murphy, the Baltimore Sun.

George R. Holmes, head of the Washington bureau of the International News Service.

James L. Wright, Washington correspondent of the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Raymond Clapper, United News Service.

Robert Barry, Washington correspondent of the New York Evening World.

Charles Michelson, head of the Washington bureau of the New York World.

Charles G. Ross, head of the Washington bureau of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Paul J. McGahon, head of the Washington bureau of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

Those who were wholeheartedly or halfheartedly with the President were:

David Lawrence, president of the Consolidated Press Associations.

A. H. Kirchoefer, Washington correspondent of the Buffalo News.

Norman Baxter, of the Washington Post.

Robert L. Norton, of the Boston Post.

A few were noncommittal, among whom were Roy A. Roberts, of the Kansas City Star, and Kyle D. Palmer, of the Los Angeles Times.

That this was the attitude of the leading newspapers of the country may be gathered from the headlines of the metropolitan press on the following day, January 1, 1927. For instance, the headline of the New York Times reads: "Coolidge asks the press to back the Government in its foreign policies"; with a subheading, "Does not want the foreign nations to think we are divided." The New York World headline on January 1, 1927, reads: "Coolidge hints press errs on foreign policy."

The strongest statement editorially on this White House conference of Friday, December 31, appeared in the New York World on Monday, January 3, of which the following are the first and last paragraphs:

Speaking indirectly through his official spokesman, Mr. Coolidge on Friday delivered a lecture to the American press. It is not easy to tell from his unquotable remarks exactly what he objected to in the conduct of American newspapers, or exactly what he would like them to do that they are not doing. Most of the correspondents seem to have had the impression, however, that he resented the criticisms of the conduct of foreign policy in Mexico, in Nicaragua, and elsewhere, and many of them go so far as to suggest that Mr. Coolidge thinks it is the duty of the press to applaud dumbly any course of action which the State Department sees fit to take.

The conduct of a newspaper in a free country is a task that no man can take lightly. There can be no responsible government unless there is a press which is fundamentally disinterested in its motives, tireless in its search for truth, vigilant of abuses, tolerant and more than tolerant, hospitable to those who disagree, yet fearless in the expression of what it believes. A newspaper may be wrong. The truth is often hard to get. Judgments are often difficult to make. No one newspaper can pretend to know it all or to be right always. But any newspaper can, if it wishes, be honest with itself, and therefore honest with its public. And in that kind of honesty it can have opinions without pride of opinion, it can fight without fanaticism for its convictions, and when it is wrong it can say so. As long as there are newspapers which are afraid neither of dictation from the outside nor of corruption from within, a healthy public opinion is possible, for then all shades of opinion will be expressed, and in the test of open debate the right may ultimately prevail.

A still greater service was rendered by the press to the cause of peace and to the honor of American free institutions by the refusal of the press associations to be used by the State Department as agencies for disseminating propaganda against Mexico. I refer especially to the State Department press conference in November, 1926, in which Robert T. Olds, Assistant Secretary of State, sought to use the press of the country to paint Bolshevik pictures of Russia for the purpose of developing an anti-Mexican attitude in the minds of the American public. On that occasion the State Department refused to permit itself to be quoted, but tried to get the press to assume the responsibility. That the press agencies were wise in refusing to be used as a cat's-paw was subsequently demonstrated by the woefully pathetic statement made by our Secretary of State before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate with reference to Bolshevism in Mexico. The inside story of this attempt of the State Department to use the American press for propaganda purposes was set forth in a statement written by Paul Y. Anderson, the Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, published on the first page of that paper in the issue of Sunday, November 28. The Anderson version was reprinted in Editor and Publisher for December 4, 1926. The following is this inside story as Anderson tells it in his own words:

A week ago last Tuesday, the Washington bureau of the three national press associations, which supply virtually every daily newspaper in the country, received a telephone call from the State Department, saying that Olds desired to see the heads of the associations in his office at once on a matter of importance.

Upon their arrival, Olds pledged the newspaper men not to quote him on what he was about to say, and then proceeded to make a statement.

For more than a year, he said, the State Department had been concerned over the relations between the United States and Mexico, and those relations had now reached a very acute stage.

"It is an undeniable fact," he continued, "that the Mexican Government to-day is a Bolshevik government. We can not prove it, but we are morally certain that a warm bond of sympathy, if not an actual understanding, exists between Mexico City and Moscow.

"A steady stream of Bolshevik propaganda has been filtering from Mexico down through Central America, aimed at property rights and designed to undermine society and governments as they are now constituted. We feel that this picture should be presented to the American people, and I desired to ask for your advice and cooperation toward that end."

"It can very easily be done," one of the correspondents replied. "Let the State Department issue a statement to this effect, over the signature of the Secretary of State, and every newspaper in the country will publish it."

Olds recoiled with an exclamation of apprehension.

"Oh, that is utterly impossible," he said. "Surely you must realize why the department can not afford to be in the position of directing such a serious statement against a government with which it is officially on friendly terms."

The correspondents politely refrained from pointing out that the department seemed eager enough to have the statement go out, so long as the responsibility was laid at some other door. However, they did protest against being asked to take the responsibility upon themselves, especially in view of the fact that their only information on the subject came from Olds.

He explained that he was simply endeavoring to give them "the background" of Mexican-American relations, and he had supposed they would be able to work it into their news dispatches without attributing it to the State Department. He asked how, in their opinion, the statement would be received by the press of the country. One of them replied that it certainly would be ridiculed by the editors of the liberal newspapers.

"What would they do?" Olds then asked. "It were said that a Mexican-fostered Bolshevik hegemony in Central America was menacing our control of the Panama Canal."

One of the correspondents said he thought most of them would laugh at it, but another said it undoubtedly would cause great alarm among the American people generally, even though the statement were made as from unofficial circles.

It was then suggested that perhaps such a story could be tied onto the announcement that the State Department had decided to recognize the government of Adolfo Diaz in Nicaragua, President Diaz had appealed to the United States Government to aid in restoring peace in that country, and Secretary of State Kellogg followed with a warning that the United States Government was concerned over 'outside intervention' in Nicaraguan affairs. It was known that this warning referred to reports that arms were being shipped from Mexico to Nicaragua to aid the Liberal uprising there.

Accordingly, it was in connection with the announcement of the recognition of Diaz, made the following day, that the story of alleged Bolshevik activity by Mexico in Central America appeared in somewhat modified form. It was presented as the background which explained the present relations between the United States and Mexico.

The natural presumption that Olds acted with the knowledge and approval of Secretary Kellogg is strengthened by the fact that no repudiation of the story has since come from the department. It is further strengthened by the circumstance that Olds and Kellogg are former law partners and close personal associates. That Olds would take such an extraordinary action in such a grave matter without first consulting his chief and friend is inconceivable to those who are familiar with procedure in the State Department.

Whatever may be one's personal views on the Mexican-Nicaraguan situation, all Americans who love fair play should applaud the press and encourage it still further to continue this policy of presenting both sides of the story of our foreign relations, and to express fearlessly, and therefore patriotically, its views editorially, whether for or against the administration's policy. The New York Times rendered a great service in publishing in full the statements made direct to the American reading public, over their own signatures, by Diaz and Sacasa, the opposing leaders in Nicaragua.

The leading editorial in the New York Times of January 23 hit the nail on the head when it referred to "a triumph of public opinion" in the present Mexican-Nicaraguan situation. From that editorial I quote the following significant passages:

The whole story of the interplay of public opinion and official action during the past two weeks is of deep interest. It has a bearing on what might be called unwritten forms of government. The Constitution places the conduct of foreign affairs in the hands of the President. He can not be challenged or questioned in Congress or in court for any decision that he may see fit to make. If he chooses, he may act upon the maxim, "Get the thing done, and let them howl." When Theodore Roosevelt was President, he made the phrase a little more biting by telegraphing to Mr. Taft, who was then Secretary of War, to pay no attention to the "yelling" of Congress and the newspapers. But, of course, no President really does important things in that way. He can not withdraw himself into a sealed chamber and arrive at weighty judgments, which may be big with importance for his country, without seeking in some way to find out what his fellow countrymen are thinking about, and how far they would be prepared to go in backing up some line of foreign policy which he believes ought to be followed.

So that it may be said that if there was to be seen in recent events at Washington a triumph of public opinion, it was world opinion that triumphed. Such is the gain, such the assurance, of knowing to-day that the considerate judgment of mankind is on the side of peace and positively against war.

My purpose was to confine my remarks exclusively to the part which the press has played, is playing, and will continue to play in the shaping of our foreign policy in relation to Latin America. I would be unfair to myself and to you, however, if I did not let it be known what my own views are on this foreign policy. Personally, I feel that history is repeating itself, so far as Nicaragua is concerned. We are to-day seeking to do what we did in 1912, namely, maintaining a minority faction in power through the weight of our economic and political influence. The only fair way out of the Nicaraguan mess is an absolutely free election, supervised, perhaps, by some friendly third power. But the real difficulty, of course, is Mexico. There it is possible that we have a real grievance, but certainly not one serious enough to justify war or lift the embargo on the shipment of war materials into Mexico. It is only in a theoretical sense that Calles's government can be said to be confiscating the property of the oil producers. Furthermore, this debatable

question can be arbitrated by existing treaties with Mexico. At a time when European nations have agreed by treaty to submit even major disputes either to a court or to mediatory body it ill behooves the United States, professing peace, as it does, to follow a lower standard of international morality and international action. War, or even the severance of diplomatic relations, is a serious matter. To embark on a policy which leads in that direction at the present time would be an act of folly and a betrayal of the ideals of our great peace-loving Nation.

If the American press will continue its fair and nonpartisan attitude, presenting both sides of the question in dispatches and editorials, this Congress can adjourn on March 4 until next December with the assurance that the administration will not dare to offend a public opinion in the United States so crystallized by the American press against war with Mexico. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the gentleman from the great Empire State [Mr. JACOBSTEIN], who does not appear to applaud the attitude of our President in the Mexican situation. I am surprised to hear such words as he has just uttered come from the mouth of a Democrat from the great State of New York. I hope he may never have cause to regret them.

Much has been said in this and another branch of the legislative department of our Government concerning the duties and activities of the Chief Executive of the United States and the Secretary of State in reference to our foreign policy in Spanish America, the Philippines, and China. Some very extraordinary utterances have been made and some queer doctrines enunciated that must have made the founders of the Republic turn in their graves.

The grand old Commonwealth of Alabama, through two of its representatives on both sides of the legislative fence, has shown conspicuously in thundering the theory that when an American crosses a frontier or an ocean he ceases to be an American; he then ceases to be worthy of the consideration of protection of the United States and becomes a man without a country or a flag, a thing so defenseless and negligible that any yellow dog is warranted in mistaking him for a hitching post. Only the other day, it seems but yesterday, although 10 years have passed, amid the applause of this House, America squandered 100,000 of the flower of her youth and thirty billions of treasure to save a European phantom called democracy; but it would not spend a dollar or fire a shot to-day to save American life and property at our very door.

The adventurers and bandits who have disarmed and throttled a nation and plundered and destroyed a Christian church, who have transformed themselves into what they impudently call a republic and a government, are engaged in the congenial task of harassing, robbing, and outraging the easiest marks on the North American continent—the American citizens doing business on the other side of the Rio Grande. They are doing it in perfect safety, knowing that Senator Torrance of Alabama and another from Idaho and the clerical yellows of this Republic will applaud and defend them, and that every minus 100 per cent American, every red communist, every anti-American, every piffing pacifist, every propagandist on Andy Carnegie's Foundation pay roll, and every political eunuch in the community will cheer them and fly to the defense of Calles and his cutthroats.

What do 600 robbed and murdered Americans, more or less, amount to, anyhow? Why disturb the slumbers of our yellow friends of peace over a few dead Yankees, rotting by a Mexican roadside? They probably violated that sacred document, the Mexican constitution of 1917, written and promulgated by Carranza, Calles, Villa, Obregon, and other patriotic gunmen when they had a day off from cutting throats and purses—a noble instrument framed to make homicide and grand larceny easy and legitimate—in liberty-loving Mexico.

But, thank God, the chorus of partisans, parsons, and perverts is not universal, even though well-paid propaganda is hard at work and the international parades of subsidized parsons keep moving. I miss from the chorus the voice of Texas and the Southwest. When Texas forgets the Alamo, Goliad, San Jacinto, and Mier, then—and not until then—will you find the Lone Star State joining hands with Alabama and Idaho and acclaiming the good faith and honor of the Mexican butchers and bandits who are the political heirs of Santa Anna and Cos and Sesma. Texas still honors the names of Houston and Austin and remembers its own bloody story. [Applause.]

When one listens to the anvil chorus of America's yellow peril roaring round the White House, he is consoled by remembering that though Alabama, elsewhere represented, may specialize in lungs, Vermont breeds men with spines, with memories of revolutionary fathers, and with a full understanding of the meaning of the words "duty" and "Americanism."

When one recalls the peculiar preachments made in this House that an American citizen's right to the protection of his Government and flag ends at the frontier, he wonders what this Republic maintains an Army and Navy for, and he marvels at the counsels of cowardice flowing from the mouths of murder's mercenary allies.

The missionary mongers who demand action in China want hands off in Mexico. "Wherever a man's treasure is, there is his heart." Our good friends have colleges, hospitals, homes, and families well supplied by generous givers in China, and many converts—rice Christians and otherwise—and unless the patriots of China who now have constitutions and cannons are warned and warred on a number of good people will lose a good thing and have to come back home to work. It is a dreadful picture, and the Government is called on to do its duty, not even the most violent pacifist entering an objection.

But in Mexico the missionary has nothing to lose and has no standing, and will not have unless Calles and his patriots have a free hand to destroy the Christian religion that has been the faith of the Mexican people for 400 years. If that religion is destroyed, there is a chance for the missionary; and even if a few hundred Americans be slain and millions of American riches seized while the work of freedom and destruction is going on, what of it? Will not the coming of the meek missionary with his new brand of religion and the opportunity for jobs and subscriptions from the truly good be ample compensation for the loss of American lives and national honor? Perhaps!

Mexico and China! Tweedle dum and tweedle dee!

We save the missionary in China, where he evidently is not wanted, and get rid of a lot of fellows who are willing to fight for the flag and ram our peculiar brand of Christianity down the Chinaman's throat, and we destroy Christianity in Mexico by allowing the banditti to murder Americans and spit on our flag and thus give the missionary a chance to ram his religion down Mexican throats. Then, if Wayne Wheeler will follow his missionary brethren, he can banish the demon rum from Mexico and introduce the mixed glories of Moslem Turkey and Soviet Russia into that benighted country.

But here is the fly in our butter. We have a Monroe doctrine to sustain and the safety and integrity of America to maintain, and we object to Europeans warring on Mexico.

There are other foreigners in Mexico besides Americans—Englishmen, Belgians, Frenchmen, and others—and we are under obligations to protect them even if we permit all the Americans in Mexico to be robbed and murdered to the heart's content of Calles. These foreigners object to the things Americans are compelled to submit to, and if we do not protect them their own Governments will. You have got to hand it to John Bull. He will protect his nationals and his national honor as long as he has a gun and a cartridge, and he allows no person or pacifist to stand in his way. If Calles does not mend his manners, John Bull will put it up to us, and if we do not do it, he will in spite of Alabama and Idaho; and, of course, if we are too timid to tackle Mexico, what can we do with John Bull and La Belle France and martyred Belgium?

Is it not time for America to show whether it is man or mouse, whether the national bird is an eagle or an old hen?

Europe is not afraid of the clerics or the Ku-Klux Klan. It is not afraid of Calles and his cut-throats. It is not interested in the destruction of the Mexican Catholic Church and willing to degrade its honor to accomplish that purpose. Nor are we. But we have got to fish or cut bait in Mexico pretty soon. Watch Calles back away when he finds America is in earnest. We might as well stop camouflaging in this Congress and get down to brass tacks. [Applause.]

An American is an American wherever he goes and the flag and the fist of America are behind him wherever the sun shines, as long as he goes straight and obeys the law of the land in which he lives. Whenever we refuse to do so we might as well haul down our flag and go out of business as a Nation. Just as soon as American brain, blood, and brawn cease to count and this land and its policies are directed by its lungs and tongues, we are done; but before that day comes there will be a mighty shaking up in this country and a lot of yellow dogs scuttling for the cyclone cellars.

God knows there is no man in this House who wants war. I hate the sound of the word; but let us not forget there are worse things than war. We can pay too high a price for

peace—the loss of national honor. We do not have to go to war with Mexico to stop the outrages on religion, civilization, and American citizenship going on there. Let the Mexican people, the Mexican forces of religion, morality, and civilization do the job of Mexican house cleaning themselves.

Open our frontiers and give a disarmed and helpless nation a chance to throw off the burden of the bandits and buccaniers now strangling Mexico, and let decent American public opinion squelch the allies of misgovernment and inhumanity now clamoring on our soil. Above all things, do not permit our flag to trail in the mud; do not let American citizenship become a mockery and a reproach, a thing for the bigot and the traitor to make a stench in the nostrils of the world.

I speak for the cradle of American liberty, for a good old Commonwealth that has upheld the honor of the Republic in all its days, under all conditions, in every crisis, and has yet to learn the creed of Judas. I speak for a community and a constituency that knows war and what it means, and that has given, when the country called, a larger proportion of its youth and manhood than any other in America. My people are Americans; they love the land and the flag; they are jealous of their honor and they demand the fullest protection for all that American citizenship implies, no matter where threatened, at home or abroad; and they have only contempt for those who seem so ready to sacrifice all that Massachusetts stands for and would link us in companionship with the scum of the continent.

Wake up! Stand up and be counted for America and American honor if you count yourselves Americans.

There are countless graves all over this country where sleep the men who died for American freedom and integrity; there are thousands of little mounds all over Flanders, by the Marne, in the Argonne, that cover the bones of Americans who believed they were dying for liberty and democracy. They sleep in peace and honor and are not forgotten, and it is for us to keep their memories green and see that they did not die in vain. It is for us to show those who remain that the standards of American conduct and honor still remain intact, to be upheld and defended.

Whenever we forget our dead and what they died for, and permit a spurious pacificism to masquerade as patriotism, to hold fellowship with plunder and dishonor, and forget the duties and traditions of American citizenship, it will become time to haul down that unsullied flag of ours and tear up the charter of our freedom—to sell our heritage of democracy and humanity for the mess of pottage weakness and cowardice offer us. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] yields back the remainder of his time. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended making any statement, but the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] seems to indulge the belief that a Member of Congress or a Member of the Senate from Alabama in speaking his views upon any subject assumes to speak for the whole State needs some correction. If the gentleman from Massachusetts has grown so large that he imagines that his voice always represents the people of his State, down in Alabama we are still modest, and we who represent great constituencies there feel that we are voicing our own individual views when stating them frankly, as we always try to do, before either branch of the National Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. I said Alabama represented elsewhere.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I recognize the right of the gentleman to differ with views expressed here or elsewhere by any Member, but he must not mislead the people of the Nation by charging that the individual utterances of any Member speaks for the great State of Alabama. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COLE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, it is not my privilege to speak on the present occasion on a high and resounding subject. I want to speak instead about so simple a thing as pentosans. I dare say you never heard of them before. I had not, either, until I began to examine the subject I have assigned myself to-day.

The pentosans are the cellular substances of many plants, chief among which are cornstalks and corncobs, oat hulls and cottonseed hulls, the stalks of cotton and straw, and even the peanut shells. They are called pentosans because all of them yield what the chemists call pentoses, which in turn are sugars

of certain chemical formulas, having, so far as I can understand such matters, five carbon atoms in the molecule.

All these pentosans are subject to like chemical reactions and, largely, what is true of one is true of all, and what can be made of one can be made of all.

But I am not primarily interested in the chemistry of them, but rather in the utilization of them, and that is what I want to speak about.

These materials for the most part are now wasted. They are what we call the wastes of agriculture. We grow the corn. We gather the ears and throw the rest away. I think that in the Corn Belt we waste nine-tenths of the cornstalks, and I suppose you make about the same waste of your cotton hulls and cornstalks and peanut shells in the South.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. We feed our cotton hulls.

Mr. COLE. The question is, Can we not make something out of those wastes? Can these vast wastes be utilized? Is there anything that we can make out of them? I have been studying such problems ever since I have been in Congress. During all of my time here we have had what we know as our farm problems. I have been thinking that we could in part solve some of these problems by making more things out of our products.

To me the farm problem is almost more industrial than agricultural. The marketing of mere raw products, so called, will make of farmers hewers of wood and drawers of water, as spoken of in Scriptures. Cattle and hogs and sheep and butter and eggs are not raw products. I believe the farm must be coupled with the factory and the factory with the farm.

#### MUST FIND MORE USES FOR FARM PRODUCTS

We must find more uses for our so-called raw products. It was in that faith that I have sought to remove some of the restrictions on sugar made from corn and a new sugar which is now being developed from an artichoke which can be grown in every part of the United States, supplanting corn and wheat and cotton of which we are now producing seeming surpluses. The fight for these new sugars was won in this House last session and is now pending in the Senate. The fight for recognition for a new product is almost as hard to wage as is the fight for a new idea.

It was in connection with my investigations in sugar that I learned of the progress that had been made scientifically in the utilization of our long wasted pentosans. At Ames, Iowa, where Iowa College for agricultural and industrial education is located, I found they had successfully turned these wastes into valuable products, ranging all the way from precious chemicals that at one time were worth \$100 a pound, to print papers and substitutes for lumber.

I was told that all that was lacking was research on a commercial basis. That is something that exceeds the resources of a college laboratory. It occurred to me that we have in Washington the superlaboratory required for such work. The Bureau of Standards is such a superscientific workshop. It has national resources and national prestige. Why maintain such a plant if it is not for the solution of such problems?

Early in last December the chief engineering chemist in such investigations at Ames, Prof. O. R. Sweeney, accompanied by President Herman Knapp, came to Washington and it was my pleasure and my privilege to present them to Secretary Herbert Hoover, under whose department the Bureau of Standards functions. Mr. Hoover was so impressed by what he was told that he sent us to Dr. C. K. Burgess, director of the Bureau of Standards. Doctor Burgess was already familiar with all that had been revealed along such lines. In fact, he had discussed such achievements and the possibilities in his own annual report for the year 1926.

It was as the result of these conferences that the Bureau of the Budget recommended the appropriation which is carried in this bill for a survey of this field, the object being the utilization of these waste products of the farms. The appropriation is small, for only \$50,000. Let me say that it had the approval of the President. I am told that when Mr. Coolidge was told that others were already at work on these problems, he remarked that the field and the possibilities were so many and so large that we could not set too many minds working on them.

When the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture was under consideration I favored and voted for a somewhat similar appropriation to enable the scientists in that department to study new uses and new by-products of cotton. The Senate has added this appropriation and the House has accepted it. I am glad of that. There is nothing conflicting between that appropriation and this one. The Bureau of Standards will treat the matter as an industrial and



commercial problem. It will test out the results that have been achieved by the chemists. These surveys and tests will include the products of all the pentosans to which I have referred, those of cotton and peanuts as well as those of corn and oats. The work will be national in its scope and in its benefits.

STATEMENT BY PROF. O. R. SWEENEY, OF AMES

To show what we have in mind in seeking this appropriation and aid of the Bureau of Standards, and to show the scope of the field and the possibilities in it, let me quote a few paragraphs from the program outlined by Professor Sweeney for Mr. Hoover's information:

We have made products which seem suited as a feeding material for diabetics. Adhesive materials of remarkable qualities have been produced—paper, lumber substitutes, plastic materials, and many other materials have been developed in the laboratory, and in some cases on a small commercial scale.

What is needed is money to be expended in semicommercial scale research work, and for determining engineering and physical and chemical constants necessary for the erection of plants or for the making of estimates to put this material on a commercial basis.

What has been learned about cornstalks and corncobs will be applicable to the great agricultural regions of the South for their peanut and cotton crops.

What is emphasized, therefore, is that America's largest waste products have potential possibilities of being converted into materials of great value, that this research may lead not only to a solution of the baffling agricultural problem at the present time, but will create new and valuable industries within the country.

STATEMENT BY DR. C. K. BURGESS, DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF STANDARDS

What Doctor Burgess says in his last annual report on the same subject is equally pertinent and hopeful of results and benefits. From that I will quote the following paragraphs:

Looking ahead into the future the time will undoubtedly come when it will be necessary to utilize more effectively the enormous quantities of waste products of the farm, such as stalks and hulls and straw. I recommend that a survey be made of the possibilities in this field, and that, if it seems warranted, the Government take the initiative in this activity.

The United States loses annually about 100,000,000 tons of agricultural waste, such as wheat and oat straw, and hulls, corncobs and stalks, cottonseed hulls, sugar-cane stalks, peanut hulls, and so on. \* \* \* Every one of these materials is commercially available in large quantities at definite centers for industrial use.

The above is merely an outline of some of the proposed methods that are already well enough developed on a laboratory scale to warrant immediate semicommercial study. The way is open for exhaustive scientific and semicommercial and final plant application \* \* \* for the utilization of much of our present agricultural wastes for the benefit of the farmer.

The development of such a program will automatically establish in the large agricultural units of the West manufacturing industry, now lacking, to supply these needed products locally, thereby saving considerable freight as well as the present waste.

Although the raw materials to be considered by such a survey would come from the farms and forests, yet the problem itself is not an agricultural, but is an industrial, scientific, and economic one, for which the Department of Commerce and particularly the Bureau of Standards is the national agency of the Government to carry out such a survey.

It would seem to be the part of wisdom for the Government to take the lead in stimulating an extensive study of the possibilities of recovery of these waste products, and of their economic utilization, leaving the developing on a large scale to private initiative after the results of the preliminary survey have been correlated.

If the survey shows reasonable possibilities of success in any of the several fields mentioned there will undoubtedly be great economic savings to the country. The time does not seem far distant when the situation may become acute. It is therefore the part of wisdom for the Government to make a start at the present time in this highly promising field of activity.

I am sorry, indeed, that we do not have more than \$50,000 to devote to so big a field connecting agriculture and industry. If we should realize only a part of the prospects and hopes held out it would be worth fifty millions instead of \$50,000.

But personally I am so much of an enthusiast on the subject of eliminating the wastes of agriculture and utilizing them in the industries that I shall refrain from expressing that enthusiasm in millions of dollars.

I have been thinking and working along such lines ever since I came to Congress. I shall not go out of Congress satisfied—for all who come to Congress must go out again—unless I see something accomplished along these lines. I believe it will be accomplished. I hope to see factories dotting the corn fields

and the cotton fields, converting raw products into finished products, some of them old and others new, and, best of all, utilizing some of the many wastes that we now see in both the fields of cotton and the fields of corn.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE SO FAR

I shall make no attempt to enumerate the many products that have already been developed in the laboratories from these wastes on the farm, but I can not refrain from calling attention to a few conspicuous ones.

One of these is known as furfuraldehyde, familiarly known as furfural. This has been made from corncobs, oat hulls, peanut shells, and cottonseed hulls, all of them materials easily accessible. The Quaker Oats Co., at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, is now making furfural from oat hulls on a commercial basis, using, I understand, the processes developed in what are known as the Miner laboratories and based upon the investigations of Mr. F. B. LaForge, of the United States Bureau of Chemistry.

Furfural has many uses, and these uses are being extended with the cheapening of its production. Until recently it was worth \$20 a pound. It can now be produced and sold for as low as 14 cents a pound, and it is hoped to reduce even this price. Its uses are many and varied. Among these are the following: In plastics, in certain dyes, as an anesthetic, an antiseptic, and germicide. Recently it has been found that it can be used advantageously in embalming fluids. Investigations have been under way to determine its value as a motor fuel or in combination with other fuels. At the present time the price forbids such uses, but we are assured that "it may be of importance in the future" as a motor fuel.

What is known as oxalic acid has also been derived, and that in commercial quantities, from these now wasted hulls and cobs. This acid is used in the manufacture of celluloid, artificial silk, leather, calico printing, and for many other purposes.

The corncob has been successfully used as a substitute for wood in what is known as wood distillation. Millions of dollars' worth of this product is used annually. What is known as acetic acid has been derived from cobs in larger quantities than from like amounts of wood. This acid is an important element in what is known as acetone, of which there was a shortage during the last war. It is estimated that the corncobs available are equivalent to 900,000 tons of acetone, and so they may play an important part in time of war should we ever again be unfortunate enough to be drawn into such a catastrophe. It may be part of our program of national defense and preparedness.

All of these derivatives have been scientifically developed in the laboratories. Those who believe in their possibilities now want to apply to them the tests of commercial production with the cooperation of the Bureau of Standards, which, in their opinion, alone is equipped to carry on this superwork.

PAPER PULP AS THE MAJOR PRODUCT

But by far the largest possibility is in the making of paper pulp in commercial quantities. Such pulp has been developed from many of these materials on a laboratory scale, and the possibilities seem almost beyond comprehension. For this development especially the aid of the Bureau of Standards with its scientific equipment is desired. The samples of paper made in the laboratories at Ames, Iowa, are fine in texture and in tensile strength and of almost superwhiteness.

I need not call attention to the vanishing supplies of paper pulp. We are now largely dependent upon Canada, and we are getting some supplies from far-away Finland. The United States Bureau of the Census estimates that the demand for paper pulp will increase at the rate of at least 5 per cent per annum for many years to come. In 1900 about 2,000,000 cords of wood were manufactured into pulp. Now it is in excess of 5,000,000 cords. The Census Bureau estimates that before 1950 pulp consumption will be equivalent to from fifteen to twenty million cords of wood annually. It is a serious question whether the forests of the world will supply this demand.

So acute is this situation that scientists and manufacturers have been hunting the world over for new sources and for substitutes. So far the pentosans which we have under consideration in connection with this appropriation, and especially cornstalks, are holding out the most hope to supply these ever-increasing needs. Paper made from cornstalks has been found very satisfactory, so far as experiments have gone. In fact, the experiments are scientifically successful. The problem of commercial production is one for which we are now invoking the aid of the Bureau of Standards.

So far, the main problem has been the delivery of the stalks at the factories at a price to compete with wood. As the forests are depleted this problem will be automatically solved in favor of cornstalks. I am told that machinery has been

devised in the engineering department of the college at Ames, Iowa, which may solve this part of the problem. The machine under consideration, I understand, is one that cuts two rows of stalks at once, husks the ears, and shreds and bales the stalks all in one operation. If this can be done, it might incidentally solve the problem of husking corn, which is now done at a cost of 6 or 7 cents a bushel. With this machinery we are assured that the stalks can be delivered with a profit to the farmer at the factory for from \$4 to \$5 a ton, which is the price necessary to compete with wood on the present price basis.

It has been suggested that this machinery and the utilization of the stalks for making paper pulp might fit in with the contemplated warfare on the corn borer. The only method of exterminating this pest so far developed is complete destruction of the stalks in which the borers hibernate. If we could grind the stalks up to make paper pulp, the borers would be destroyed in the process. This is only a suggestion, but it may have important bearings on the borer-control problem.

I have enumerated these few items in order to show the extent of the field in which we are operating and to justify, in a measure, the use of public funds for research and commercial development of these now wasted products.

STATEMENT OF DEAN A. MARSTON, OF AMES, ON PAPER

On the subject of paper pulp from cornstalks—and what is true of these stalks is also true of cotton stalks—let me cite what Dr. A. Marston, dean of engineering in the college at Ames, said before the subcommittee which reported out this bill. And let me explain that Doctor Marston is not a dreamer but an eminent engineer, a man who deals in facts and in the realities. Speaking before the committee this man said:

The outstanding present development in research into the industrial utilization of agricultural waste materials is the development of the industry of making paper from cornstalks. In seven years of research at the Iowa State College, under Dr. O. R. Sweeney, head of our chemical engineering department, the research has been brought to the stage of actual factory production of some grades of paper from cornstalks, and from the same material many other grades of paper have been made on a laboratory scale. The preliminary laboratory work has been done in large degree. What we need now is to extend the researches on a larger scale intermediate between the laboratory and the factory. Our State board of education has just authorized the construction of a new laboratory for Doctor Sweeney for this specific purpose at a cost of approximately \$50,000, besides the equipment, and in that laboratory we propose to install this work on a stage which is intermediate in size between a laboratory set-up, such as we are working with at the present time, and an actual commercial factory. We do not propose to operate there a factory for the manufacture of paper, but we do propose to operate an industrial research institute, if I may describe it as such, for continuing the researches along this line. When the research work in that particular line has been carried far enough we will take down the research equipment and replace it with something else.

As I see this matter, it would be a very great benefit in the United States to be able to bring this particular research work to a point where it will be prudent to form companies to undertake to build and operate factories using these raw materials. One of the greatest difficulties at the present time is to keep people from rushing into forming stock companies and inducing people to put their money into the stock in a blind sort of fashion, before we have developed the research sufficiently to assure us of success. After that is done there will be no difficulty in securing capital to carry on the industry.

SOUTH AND NORTH EQUALLY INTERESTED

It is for that final and authoritative research that we are invoking the aid of the United States Bureau of Standards.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman made a very enlightening statement in the hearings on this question, and I would be very glad if the gentleman would extend his remarks to the extent of going into the details of just what this work will do. I think it is a very important matter, because it takes care of a great deal of waste matter and would be of very material help in agriculture all over the country. I want to commend the gentleman for the very splendid work he has done, and I heard the statement he made before this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. We folks from the South, particularly in the cotton section, the peanut section, and the corn section, are very much interested in the work the gentleman is trying to carry on, and I would be very glad if he would incorporate in his remarks the statement he made before this subcommittee.

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina. I had intended to discuss this subject more fully on the floor.

But the time originally allotted me has been reduced, to give opportunity for others to present matters in which they have an equal interest. In my revision and extension of these remarks I will embody the essential parts of what I said before the subcommittee, so that it may not be necessary to reprint that.

I think this is a matter of the very greatest importance. The whole farm problem is really wrapped up, according to my way of thinking, in these industrial developments. I have always been, and I am now more than ever, a believer in the industrialization of agriculture.

Much might be said about the bearing that the utilization of our agricultural wastes may have on the solution of what we now know so familiarly as our farm problems. It may be that we lack some prosperity on the farms because we waste too much.

It has been well said that if like methods were used in the industries they would all spell failure. In many industries it is the by-products that pay the dividends. The slaughterhouses are in point. Every part of the animal is used for something. Science has been applied to this industry. We must apply that kind of science to other products of the farms. That is what we are seeking to promote through this appropriation.

Our farm problems arise from what I may call an unbalance. For two generations, or ever since the enactment of the homestead laws and the land grant college laws, we have been stressing production. Under these enactments we have thrown open vast new areas of fertile lands and we have applied every effort to the increase of production. We now find that we can have overproduction, and overproduction creates the surplus that we are now seeking to deal with.

We must now put the stress on the other end. I mean on marketing and consumption. We have paid all too little attention to these essential things in the equation of prosperity. We must find new markets, and new markets may not mean going across the seas with shiploads of our products but in finding new uses for the abundant crops. It may be easier to use some of these products in new industries than to get rid of them abroad.

NO WARFARE BETWEEN AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRY

In solving what I have termed the unbalanced condition between production and consumption we must have a care to avoid illogical and uneconomic conclusions. Some have almost been led, or misled, into thinking of this solution as a warfare between agriculture and so-called industry.

I can conceive of no such warfare. There is no basis for it, and if it were waged it would be disastrous to all alike. It would be the agricultural Samson pulling down the temple. We shall in no wise help agriculture by weakening industry. It has been estimated that out of every \$1,000 spent in industry, \$380 of it is paid for foods which are derived from the soil. That \$380 is the stake that agriculture has in industry. The more prosperous industry is the more prosperous agriculture will be. And per contra, the more prosperous agriculture is the more prosperous the industries of the cities will be. The two share alike. The one is dependent on the other.

Instead of weakening the so-called industries, I would strengthen them. I would also industrialize the farms. The industrialization of agriculture, I repeat, is at the present time the one most important thing lacking and therefore the one most important thing we should be seeking.

I am tempted again to quote from Professor Sweeney's report to Secretary Hoover, to the effect that "what the Corn Belt farmer needs is more money for his total crop rather than more money for his corn," which is only part of the crop. He needs some money coming in from cornstalks and from corn-cobs, even. To get that additional money these now wasted products must be utilized.

PRECEDENCE FOR SUCH NATIONAL COOPERATION

If it were necessary, I could cite many precedents for the appropriation I am discussing and the cooperation that it provides for. The Bureau of Standards is now in various ways cooperating with other industries in the solution of similar problems. I think there is such cooperation now in behalf of both coal and oil.

There is now pending a recommendation of the President to the Bureau of the Budget for an appropriation of \$65,000 to provide cooperation between automobile manufacturers and exporters and our foreign trade commissioners under the Department of Commerce. This recommendation is based on the representations of the automobile men that they need such aid in gaining and holding foreign markets. I am for that appropriation. I think it will be a good investment for us all. Every time we sell a thousand dollars' worth of automobiles abroad

we keep employed men who will consume products of the soil. Our agricultural stake, theoretically, if not statistically, is about \$380 in every \$1,000 of such exports.

What we are doing for coal and oil and what we are going to do for automobiles we are asking the Government, through the Bureau of Standards, to do for agriculture, which some of us think is more worthy than any other industry and just now most in need of help.

Instead of complaining about having factories in the East, what we want to do is to move some of these factories to the West and the South. I repeat, we must bring the farm and the factory closer together, and we must utilize our own raw products. That is why I appeared here last year as an advocate of corn sugar and of a new sugar to be made from the Jerusalem artichoke. Instead of having these things made in Cuba let us make them in the United States of America. [Applause.]

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. To what extent is paper now being made from cotton stalks?

Mr. COLE. Not to any extent that I know of.

Mr. EDWARDS. But it can be done?

Mr. COLE. It can be done. It has been scientifically and chemically demonstrated that it can be done. Heretofore the main trouble has been with the cost of bringing the raw material to the mills, but, as I have already stated, I think we are in the way of overcoming that handicap by machinery. The idea is to have these paper-pulp factories scattered over the Cotton and Corn Belts and have the dry pulp made there and then hauled to the centralized factories, where the pulp will be manufactured into paper. [Applause.]

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 15014) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Quincy, State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 15642) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Michigan and Berrien County, or either of them, to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Joseph River.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA]. [Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to call the attention of the House to a very important human problem. I have purposely refrained from referring to it before. I did not want to make it appear that we from New York were unduly rushing the Members about it.

We have only a few legislative days left of this session. What impels me to speak at this time is that I have received letters and circulars anticipating the plea that we are compelled to make and rather ridiculing it as sob stuff and seeking to brush it aside. I refer to the division of families that has been brought about by the immigration act of 1924.

I am ready to concede that the great majority of this House is of the opinion that there should be no modification or change of the law. I would not make an appeal to this House for a modification of the law at this time which would increase in any degree the maximum number fixed by the act of 1924 because I realize that this House is firm in its conviction that there should be no lifting of the bars.

But, gentlemen, there is a condition that we can remedy. Some of you who are absolutely sincere in your support of the act of 1924, I am sure would not be as firm if you knew of the suffering and hardship that exist in hundreds and hundreds—I will say thousands and thousands—of families throughout the country. Because you are not in direct contact with the problem, you are firm in your belief that it is dangerous to make any change in the law at all.

What I am asking the House to do, without disturbing in the slightest the immigration policy which you have established by the act of 1924, is to give these good people some relief. All they are asking is an opportunity to send for their wives and children.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Is it not true that they chose between their families and the United States when they came here?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I have heard that argument raised, but, surely, having come here, having worked here, having declared his intention of becoming a citizen, we are not going to say to this man, "Because you did come here, because you elected to come here, because you went through hardships to come here, although we know you are a good citizen and we know you will make a good citizen, yet we are not going to give you the privilege of sending for your wife and children."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Immigration, of course.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In the gentleman's desire for relief, has the gentleman thought out the damage that such relief under the so-called Wadsworth amendment might do in disturbing the waiting lists in the consular offices in European countries?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. On the regular quotas?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Relief given to 35,000 prorated among foreign countries, according to the applications made here in the United States, would immediately disturb the waiting lists which already exist in the United States consular offices in foreign countries and probably create greater confusion and greater distress than we now have.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I understand that the Wadsworth amendment would admit these 35,000 over and above the regular allowance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But the amendment proposes to prorate the 35,000 among foreign countries according to applications made in this country.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is an administrative matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is provided in the amendment that the 35,000 opportunities are to be prorated in accordance with the applications on file in the Department of Labor. This becomes a vital point. If it is prorated according to the applications made here in the United States, what will happen to these waiting lists in the consular offices in foreign countries where certain wives have been told that they could start, we will say, on September 1 next, and who have sold their furniture and are ready to come here? What would happen if the Wadsworth amendment should become a law and the ones who are ready to start should find their places taken by those whose husbands had filed applications here in the United States? We would have more disturbance than we have dreamed of.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then, may I suggest that after all is it not up to this Government, and should we not have the first say as to who is to enter first or who is to enter at all? Could we not—and I am asking this of the chairman of the Committee on Immigration because I know he wants to be fair and I know he has made a study of the problem and knows just what the condition is—could we not between now and the time we adjourn pass a joint resolution to last until January 1, 1928, when we come back here, and take 90 per cent of the one-half that we now permit to enter as quota immigrants and let the Secretary of Labor issue preferential visas to wives and children of declarants? This would not increase by a single number the total number of immigrants who may enter under the law and this would give some relief; in fact, it would not only give relief, it would unite a percentage of the families that are now divided, and it would not increase the number who would come here and subsequently ask to send for their families.

This, gentlemen, is a human problem, and when you have a case where the man is here and is making good, and has been here perhaps three or four years, and it will take two or three more years before he can complete his naturalization, and the family perhaps is stranded in some port in Europe, or where you have the entire family here and an aged mother on the other side, gentlemen, you do not realize what that means. I know you want to be fair. I know you are kind. I know you all love your kinfolks, but you should at least consider that these people are human beings. You can not treat them as you treat a tariff question. You can not put an embargo on human affections as you put an embargo on plants to be administered under the Department of Agriculture.

Whatever your views may be on the question of immigration—I know we have not the votes to change that—whatever your ideas may be as to increasing the number of human beings who may enter, will you please consider the suggestion that out of the maximum number that you have fixed, we permit wives and children of declarants to come first and followed by parents, these to be preferred within the regular quota allow-

ance. Let us limit that one-half or 90 per cent of it to these relatives, to these children, to aged mothers, and to wives of declarants who are waiting to enter. This would not in the slightest increase the number now fixed by the law.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. In choosing the immigrants, why not say that in making up the quota they shall give preference to the relatives of American citizens?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The law does that.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. The law provides for that only to a limited degree.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Under the quota provision in the law, do we not provide that those that may come first are the relatives of those already in America?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Under the present law an American citizen may send for his wife and children under 18 years of age as nonquota immigrants, and that is all right. He may send for his father and mother as preferential quota immigrants, and they have a preferential status, but that preferential status in fact is no better than a regular quota immigrant because the waiting list is so long.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FLETCHER].

#### THE PEOPLE VERSUS LAME-DUCK DIPLOMACY

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, as a modest contribution to the public opinion that is impressively demonstrating its effectiveness in the crisis involving our relations with Nicaragua and Mexico, I ask permission of the House to quote and interpret briefly from messages that have come to me from friends of prominence who are well known to Members of both Houses of Congress.

One of the values possessed by the opinions of those who are remote from the scene of political turmoil is in the fact that such opinions may be considered as reasonably accurate indication of what the masses of the people are thinking on a given issue of vital public concern.

Members of the House will please note the widely different sections of the United States in which reside those distinguished citizens to whose statements I invite your attention.

A few of the most noted of those from whom I have received communications are Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, Brooklyn; Judge Ben B. Lindsey, Denver; Dr. A. E. Winship, Boston; Montaville Flowers, Pasadena, Calif.; Judge Florence Allen, Cleveland; Keith Vawter, Cedar Rapids, Iowa; former Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels, Raleigh, N. C.; Dr. Albert E. Wiggam, member of the editorial staff of the American Magazine, New York City; Charles F. Horner, Kansas City, Mo.

DR. S. PARKES CADMAN

Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, of Brooklyn, President of the Federal Council of Churches, has a reputation throughout this country and Europe as one of the foremost religious leaders of this generation.

By means of the printed word and the radio Doctor Cadman is said to reach the minds of more millions of people annually than any religious spokesman in the world. The opinion of such a man on any subject is of more than ordinary importance. From a letter received from Doctor Cadman, permit me to quote:

I sincerely trust—

Writes Doctor Cadman—

that we can show to the world, as I believe the President will do, that the United States does not propose to resort to physical force about matters which are eminently amenable to jurisdiction. I do not wish to appear even to dictate what our policy should be, but I am persuaded that the large majority of our citizens is bent upon an honorable position, based upon jurisdiction to all concerned.

JUDGE FLORENCE ALLEN

Judge Florence Allen is the first Ohio woman to be a candidate for the United States Senate. Miss Allen is the only woman judge in the country now occupying a seat on the bench of a State supreme court. She is also recognized as a representative spokeswoman, who expresses what a large number of enlightened women in this country feel and think of diplomacy that threatens to blunder toward war.

In her telegram Judge Florence Allen expresses herself as heartily approving the stand of Senator BORAH with regard to Mexico and Nicaragua.

In so far as Senator BORAH's attitude if adopted, means lessening the possibilities of war, I think no one in the House will wish to dispute that Judge Allen voices what is in the hearts of most of the informed women of the Nation.

DR. ALBERT E. WIGGAM

Dr. Albert E. Wiggam, New York, is a celebrated publicist, a student of national affairs, and a man renowned among scholars everywhere. Doctor Wiggam is a member of the editorial staff of the American Magazine and the author of a number of books, among which is the New Decalogue of Science, a volume that contains the message Doctor Wiggam addressed to Congress under the title, "The New Biology and the Old Statesmanship."

Telegraphing from New York, Dr. Albert E. Wiggam says, in part, that the Secretary of State in his initial attitude toward Nicaragua and Mexico blundered in a manner inconceivably stupid, to use Doctor Wiggam's own words. Then the doctor inquires:

Why do the American people have to endure at incalculable expense such an amiable blunderer as Secretary of State Kellogg?

Doctor Wiggam adds:

I have just talked with the editors of Collier's Weekly and the Century Magazine, and they agree with me. Collier's editor is mailing you advance editorial strongly condemning the Kellogg policy. My friends of all political parties are applauding Walter Lippman's powerful editorials in the New York World, and I hope you can support the policy as outlined by the World.

Doctor Wiggam, a gentleman of profound learning and the highest culture, is the mildest mannered of men. Yet, from expressions in his telegram which I have not included, it would seem that he, like multitudes of others, has had to struggle to be patient with diplomacy so grotesque as to attempt to prejudice the American people against a neighbor nation through misleading propaganda about a Bolshevistic menace.

MONTAVILLE FLOWERS

Mr. Montaville Flowers, eminent educator, author, and man of affairs, wires from his home in Pasadena, Calif., a reassuring message, including a few suggestions for the consideration of Senators and Congressmen.

The people of the Pacific coast—

Says Mr. Flowers—

knowing and understanding the peoples and politics of our neighboring states upon the south, are giving little serious attention to the present controversy. We look upon the incident as one of a long series of similar irregularities and have no thought or fear of its leading to war except as at present between ambitious brigadiers and said states contending for political control. Therefore we of the Pacific coast are content to rest the incident with the President and State Department, where under present status it properly belongs.

JUDGE BEN B. LINDSEY

In the message sent from his home in Denver, Judge Ben B. Lindsey states:

We should keep our hands off in Nicaragua and Mexico, for it seems to me a stupendous crime to involve this country in trouble with our neighbor Republics if any decent policy can be adopted to avoid it, and it seems to me such a policy can be found.

KEITH VAWTER

From Mr. Keith Vawter, of Cedar Rapids, whose business gives him an opportunity to get the point of view of Iowa and the Middle West, comes the statement:

My personal opinion is that a more consistently friendly attitude toward Mexico, rather than military gestures, would mean much for both countries. We landed marines in Mexico not long ago; we sent Pershing after Villa, with the result that the Mexicans look on us as bluffers. Let us establish and maintain an arms embargo, prevent organization of revolutionary parties north of the Rio Grande, and stick to such policies. Get at least one representative of the American people to offset Wall Street's representative in Mexico City, and the result, I believe, will justify the means. The Calles Government needs and deserves friendly encouragement. If the presence of a few marines will stop ruthless murder, send a few to Chicago.

HON. JOSEPHUS DANIELS, FORMER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

The analysis of the whole situation by former Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels, of Raleigh, N. C., as expressed in his letter, is enlightening and impressive.

Mr. Daniels writes there is a strong feeling in the South that the embarrassing situation in which we now find ourselves in relation to Nicaragua and Mexico could have been avoided or greatly mitigated had it not been for what he designates as "dollar diplomacy." Because of his distinguished service to the Nation as Secretary of the Navy during the World War, and because he doubtless voices the thought of most of the people of the South, therefore I ask unanimous consent to have

printed in the RECORD the letter from former Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels, sent from his home in Raleigh, N. C.:

Hon. BROOKS FLETCHER,

*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. FLETCHER: There is a strong sentiment in the South that the differences between this country and Nicaragua and Mexico could have been averted or lessened but for the practice of dollar diplomacy. There is a growing sentiment that there is no occasion for intervention or sending troops to either country, but that differences should be settled by resort to arbitration.

This country led in advocacy of arbitration. The time has come to determine whether we really believe in it enough to adopt it. This is particularly true in reference to the oil and like monetary disputes in Mexico. That country and Latin America have special claims upon our brotherliness because of our nearness, our superior strength, and our adherence to the Monroe doctrine. That doctrine was conceived to prevent European governments grabbing weaker countries on this continent. It imposed upon the United States the duty neither to grab them for ourselves nor to permit our nationals so to act for their own enrichment as to involve us in war.

The United States has so deported itself since Versailles that it has not a friend among the European nations. We are in grave danger of losing the friendship of every country on this hemisphere by the practice of dollar diplomacy. That policy is at the root of most of our differences with Central and South America, and it is because of it that those countries doubt our devotion to the principles that prompted the Monroe doctrine.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

DR. A. E. WINSHIP

Dr. A. E. Winship, editor of the Journal of Education, dean of educational publicists, and friend of President Coolidge, telegraphing from his home in Boston, states:

I have a daughter in Mexico. Her husband has been superintendent of a large silver mine for 20 years, and they have no fear of serious trouble with Mexico. Personally, I like the positive attitude of the President in Nicaragua. I can not speak for the public, but I am quite sure that the prevailing thought is in approval of a firm policy.

CHARLES F. HORNER

Charles F. Horner, prominent among the leaders of Kansas City and the West, recently, on his trip abroad, had an opportunity to make a close personal study of the causes underlying the European attitude toward the United States.

In his telegram Mr. Horner summarizes with clearness what apparently is almost the universal opinion of the entire country.

People generally—

States Mr. Horner—

are very much perplexed regarding the Nicaraguan and Mexican situation, and are generally unacquainted with the facts. My own thought is that we blundered in a too-hasty recognition of Diaz and attempted to make a right out of two wrongs. I do not believe it is creditable to a government any more than to an individual to insist on proceeding with a policy that was begun in error.

#### SIGNIFICANCE OF THESE OPINIONS

There is significance in the invited and valued opinions of these nine notable Americans, whose points of view are cordially welcomed by the House Members of the Congress.

If it is logical to assume that the points of view expressed by these nine eminent and conservative citizens are indicative of the trend of majority opinion throughout the Nation, then it would seem that from these sample expressions of what the masses of Americans evidently are thinking the Department of State might make helpful deductions, much to the comfort and advantage of the country.

#### TROUBLE WITH OIL

I believe it has not been denied that Mexican oil, in which certain gentlemen of this country are deeply interested financially, has from the beginning been one of the most troublesome factors responsible for turmoil in Mexico.

It is well to remember that the late Mr. Doheny has been up to his neck in Mexican oil.

It was because of alleged oil prospecting, within objectionable proximity to the Government's natural resources, that Fall and Doheny were invited to explain to a jury of their so-called peers.

The intellectual boy jury was impressed by the bombastic boast of Doheny's stage patriotism, in the face of a phony Japanese war bogie, of which nobody had ever heard.

The jury was moved to the verge of tears by the heart-rending reminiscences of the Damon-Pythias relationship that ex-

isted between the two veteran oil and gold diggers in the good old days when their prospecting was not so annoyingly close to the National Capital.

#### INNOCENCE

Deeply touched by the spirit of auld lang syne and the melodramatic forensics of a clever actor-lawyer, the youthful jury set the innocent patriots free—free to roam at large in the oil fields of Mexico, where at this moment Doheny's millions are engaged.

Recalling our own Government's disturbing difficulty with oil, as politics is done in oil by artists of the Doheny and Fall type, it would be a real service toward alleviating the suspicions of millions of average citizens if Secretary Kellogg were to broadcast what he might be able to find out concerning oil's attempt to mix with Mexican politics, as he has in such brazen fashion broadcast ludicrous and spooky tales of phantom Bolshevism.

#### MORE TO BE PITIED THAN BLAMED, PERHAPS

It is not surprising that so many thinking Americans look upon Secretary Kellogg's excitable efforts at diplomacy as a tragedy as well as a comedy of errors.

Although it be admitted that Secretary Kellogg's undiplomatic attempts at diplomacy are at times as grotesque as they are disappointing to the country and at other times as dangerous to the peace between the United States and Mexico as they are grotesque, yet, after all is said and done, are not the politician job fixers of his party, who elevated this amiable and nervous little man to a job apparently unsuited to his temperament, as much to blame as the unfortunate victim of their good intentions?

It was four years ago that the people of Minnesota decided that, from the standpoint of their standards of estimating men fit for public office involving great responsibility, Mr. Kellogg was no longer qualified to represent them in the United States Senate.

#### THE LAME-DUCK POLITICIAN

The moment his own people retired him to private life Mr. Kellogg was persuaded to avail himself of the traditional prerogative of lame-duck politicians, and was imposed upon to the extent of being induced to accept an appointive job with the Government in spite of the disapproving verdict of the voters of his home State.

There is no custom more unjust to the defenseless taxpayer public than the reprehensible practice of defying the will of the voters by going over their heads and appointing to high office a politician whom the voters, for good reasons of their own, have just removed from office.

#### A MISFIT

A politician, voted out of office by the people of his own State, one who holds his present office by grace of "lame-duck" appointment, whose imagination is so easily stamped and whose disposition is so temperamental as to get himself referred to affectionately by his former colleagues in the Senate as "Nervous Nellie," is scarcely the most desirable type of statesman to carry the torch of diplomacy among the open powder cans filled with high-explosive issues such as are involved in our negotiations with Nicaragua and Mexico, and now with China.

Uncle Sam has just finished wiping the blood off his hands and treating his wounds resulting from participation in that delirium of international political insanity known as the late World War.

The people who do the paying and the people who do the dying when Uncle Sam gets into trouble with other countries are justified in their opposition to the announced policy of anyone in officially responsible position, who, in dealing with neighbor nations, broadcasts misleading propaganda or who bullies, browbeats, or blusters.

#### AMERICA'S GREATEST POLITICAL NEED IS STATESMANSHIP

With an ambitious and aggressive Mussolini shaking his fists and shouting at mankind that he wants "more breathing space" for his people, and with the critical and moody attitude of other nations toward the United States to-day it is terrifying to contemplate what might happen in a real crisis, if any other than a well-poised, trained diplomat and a truly great statesman should, in such a crisis, by chance, be the spokesman for this Nation.

With the possibility of an awakened China challenging the world, it is not pleasant to contemplate a Secretary of State of Mr. Kellogg's temperament as being the one to make decisions for the United States.

Only through just, wise, magnanimous, and dignified statesmanship can this Nation win back from the other nations of the world the prestige we have already lost.

## SYNTHETIC BOLSHEVISM

Peace and national prestige are too precious to be placed at the mercy of disturbing policies inspired and directed by lame-duck statesmanship that shows symptoms of paralysis agitans when the ambassadors for oil exhibit their frazzled and over-worked pet ghost camouflaged as "Bolshevism" with which, through propaganda, they would attempt to terrify and benumb the bewildered minds of the American people.

Let those already perturbed by propaganda console themselves with the reminder that from actual facts so far available to the public the only Bolshevism of immediate danger to this country is the synthetic Bolshevism produced in the propaganda laboratories of a few predatory "junkers" who evidently hope to divert public attention by frightening the people for purposes that ought to be obvious to anyone of normal intelligence.

## ARBITRATE OR ABDICATE

Uncle Sam in the rôle of big brother to Nicaragua, Mexico, and the smaller nations of the world is in harmony with our Nation's divine destiny, but Uncle Sam in the rôle of big bully is a tragic monstrosity whose blundering dollar diplomacy is certain to put this Nation in the hypocritical position of practicing the warlike maneuvers of intimidation after years of pretending to the world to believe in arbitration.

Arbitrate or abdicare would seem to be an appropriate slogan for expressing the message which the masses of Americans desire the Secretary of State to heed in his negotiations with Nicaragua and Mexico.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I intended to discuss at some length this afternoon the "national origins" provision of the 1924 immigration act, but as time is now so limited I will have to be content with pointing out a few interesting features, with a view of making an extension in the RECORD, and thus place further interesting facts before you.

But before proceeding along that line I would like to say this to the gentleman from New York and others: The Committee on Immigration is making a very serious effort to find some simple plan of extending a modicum of relief to a large number of wives and children of declarants who would like to come to the United States and join their husbands and fathers who have taken out first papers for naturalization. The committee, however, is pressed with a number of other problems, and it seems impossible to carry any one to fruition because of the immediate coming up of some other problem which interferes with it.

For instance, this morning, while we were discussing a proposal to transfer preference for farmers quota in countries where the quota is less than 6,000, and using that preference for wives and children, we were met with statements that the quotas should not be so tied that they can not be distributed among other relations—mothers, sisters, and so forth.

I have decided, and in this I represent a number of members of the committee, to introduce, through the basket, a resolution which would authorize the appointment of a commission comprised of Members of the Senate and House Committees on Immigration, who would be authorized to sit prior to the Seventieth Congress, to investigate conditions and to frame suggestions for legislation. The proposal is as follows:

Joint resolution to create a commission to study the immigration and naturalization laws

*Resolved, etc., That—*

(a) A commission is hereby created, to be known as the "Joint commission on immigration and naturalization" and to be composed of such members of the Committee on Immigration of the Senate and of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives, whose terms of office include or who have been re-elected to the Seventieth Congress, as may be designated by the chairman of the respective committees.

(b) Such commission is authorized—

(1) To select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members;

(2) By subcommittee or otherwise to hold such hearings and to sit at such times and places within the United States and to make such investigation and examination of the immigration and naturalization laws of the United States, their operation, administration, and effect as it deems necessary;

(3) To have such printing and binding done, to employ such clerical and other assistance, and to incur such expenses as it deems advisable (but the cost of stenographic service in reporting hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words); and

(4) To report to the Congress not later than the close of the first session of the Seventieth Congress with recommendations for any legislation deemed necessary.

(c) The expenses of the commission shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by its chairman or vice chairman.

As Members of the House, all of you will realize that problems of immigration and naturalization have become so magnified and involved as to make it impossible for any one committee of the House to finish even in one long session, to say nothing about a short session, the legislation necessary to bring into harmony both the immigration and the naturalization laws. It is highly desirable to find some method of giving the right to naturalization to a considerable number of people who are in the United States, and who through no fault of theirs are unable to get complete naturalization because they were not given by the Federal Government the very proof that they must have to comply with in order to become a citizen of the United States. If there were a dozen Members who would care to stay here after adjournment and work four or five weeks, I think they could complete the work of codification and rewriting, with orderly proposals for additional legislation. Our committee sitting down on occasional mornings and working only until noon can not get further than the preliminary processes, because the problems are not only contentious but elusive.

If you will read the law, you will find that the national origins provision goes into effect if a proclamation is issued by the President on or before April 1. No person, so far as I know, has any intimation as to what the President's thought at this time is in regard to that matter. The necessary statistics are sent to him after being compiled under the direction of three Secretaries of the Cabinet. That has been done in a preliminary way, and I have taken the floor, among other things, for the purpose of saying that it has been ascertained that if the six experts who prepared the first or preliminary figures for national origins should re-solve every possible error against that population which made up the bulk of the United States in 1790, the quotas would be reduced for Great Britain from a suggested 73,000 under national origins to 63,000; increased for the Irish Free State from 13,862 to just under 20,000; and increased for Germany from a possible national origins figure of 23,426 to a possible 27,000. Those are the three countries that figure the largest in the national origins provisions, and if I had the time I would like to explain to you just how they arrive at those figures. For fear I forget it, I think it proper to state that an error made in the old days, based on the first or 1790 census, and other historical documents, amounts to almost nothing in the additions that make the grand total of all the peoples that have lived in the United States of America from that time until this, when that grand total is finally reduced to a maximum of 150,000. The error amounts to so little that it takes 600 persons to have lived here in 1790 to make a difference of one in the quota as of the census of 1920. Six hundred persons of any given nationality would have had to be here to make a change of one.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Just how does the gentleman account for those figures of 73,000 in Great Britain and only 23,000 in England?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That refers to the British Isles, except the Irish Free State—not England; England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, and such of Ireland as is not in the Irish Free State.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Would that mean 73,000 of 150,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; but reduced finally, I believe, to 63,000. When this country fought the war against the mother country it was an English-speaking country, made up of English colonists and immigrants. We had been colonists for a long time before that war in 1775. In 1750 Benjamin Franklin made an estimate that the population of all of the colonies was 1,000,000, and he estimated that that 1,000,000 people had come very largely from 80,000 basic colonists. Population doubled in those days every 25 years. Every child was a distinct asset. The home was the center of things, and that is the way population grows when it is not restricted in any way, so that when we came to take the first census in 1790 we were 3,000,000 people, not counting those who had been brought here as slaves. Most of the 3,000,000 were of English ancestry.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. SHREVE. I regret very much that I can not, because all of the time is pledged.

Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute more to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the Members who are present think it is wise for a commission to sit between Congresses in an effort to compile and suggest legislation and to make a codification of the present laws which we have practically done at the present time, they can assist in the movement that would bring that about, and I believe that one of the finest works that we could do for the whole population of the United States would be to secure from these experts the data from which they arrive at these figures. Everyone is interested. It can not hurt anyone. They have no power to print the material at all, and if we had the authority to sit for a few weeks this summer and bring that together in committee hearings and print them, I believe it would be of tremendous interest and value to those who make the laws and generally to the people of the country, and that if it were known that this would be done the "national origins" proclamation could be held pending further study and development.

Mr. SHREVE. I would like to ask the ranking member of the subcommittee to consume some of his time.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KVALE].

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to read into the record a resolution by the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation. In the St. Paul Dispatch of Thursday, January 20, a good Republican paper, I read the scare headlines across the top of the page, "Farm Bureau calls Jardine policies 'scandal.'" Under the heading, "Jardine's policy a national scandal," the report states:

We regret that Dr. William M. Jardine, Secretary of Agriculture, has seen fit to oppose and obstruct all farm legislation demanded by farmers for surplus control, and that his idea of the solution of this problem is to force more credit on any industry which needs the ability to repay its present obligations instead of additional means of getting into debt.

We are bitterly disappointed that he has taken the viewpoint of the industrial East instead of the viewpoint of the agricultural West and South in dealing with the agricultural situation in the United States.

#### CALLED DOUBLE INDIGNITY

Under his administration, the United States Department of Agriculture has ceased to be a coordinate branch of our Federal Government. It is dominated by and is subordinated to the Department of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture is head of his department in name only.

The historic policy of our Government has been to foster agriculture, the basic industry of all, even in prosperous periods, and the Jardine policy is a double indignity because of the calamitous economic condition now surrounding agriculture which calls for constructive leadership.

This is a national scandal of the first order calling for a searching investigation as contemplated in the Wheeler resolution now pending in the United States Senate.

#### PEASANTRY STUDY ASSAILED

Mr. Jardine's unfitness for Secretary of Agriculture is further demonstrated by his action in sending a Federal employee to Europe to "study peasantry" in order to apply in this country the methods used there; by his reference, before a New York audience, to farmers as a "pack of wolves"; by his numerous broken promises to support the farm legislation of a kind determined by farmers, and by his support of the notorious Fess-Tincher bill, which was a flimsy political excuse offered for the solution of an important problem.

Mr. Chairman, these are not the vaporings of a "radical," nor even the words of any one individual in a state of excitement. This is the calm, deliberate, well-considered statement of a body of conservative men, a very large majority of whose membership I take it to be Republican. I am very glad that the Farm Bureau has awakened to an understanding of the attitude of the Republican administration in regard to agriculture. Three or four years ago those of us who made similar statements and indictments of the attitude of the Republican administration to agriculture were called "Bolsheviks," "radicals," "calamity howlers," and sundry other choice epithets. And I have not the slightest doubt, Mr. Chairman, that a great many of those who passed this unanimous resolution were among those who joined in the chorus of derision, because it was part of the policy of the whole Republican press of the State of Minnesota so to designate those of us who voiced the same sentiments that these men now do by this resolution. I am glad the eyes of the Farm Bureau membership have been opened to the true condition of affairs.

I have this suggestion to make. Why not go to the root of the matter? Why skim along the surface only? Who is back

of Mr. Jardine? Who appointed Mr. Jardine? Who keeps him in office? Why, the gentleman in the White House, Mr. Coolidge, your President and mine. He appointed him. And he appointed him knowing well what his agricultural policies were and are. And he keeps him in office, not in spite of these views and opinions held by Mr. Jardine, but because of those views. And why these strictures on Mr. Jardine? Why jump on him, or why immolate Mr. Hoover? Why build a straw man and proceed to knock him down when you can engage in mortal combat with real flesh and blood? Why not go to the heart of the matter? Mr. Jardine is only an appointive officer of the Government, only the tool, only the medium through which the President of the United States speaks, or, rather, the ones who are back of the President. Why not go a little deeper? What good would it do to remove Secretary Jardine, as this resolution calls for, as long as the man in the White House holds the views he does on farm relief legislation? He would undoubtedly appoint someone else of the same complexion, or still worse. Why say about Mr. Jardine that he "has the views of the industrial East"? Why not substitute the man back of him, and let it read thus: "We are bitterly disappointed, that Mr. Coolidge has always had and always will have the viewpoint of the industrial East instead of the viewpoint of the agricultural West and South in dealing with the agricultural situation in the United States?" It is well known why the McNary-Haugen bill did not pass. It was because Mr. Coolidge and those back of him were opposed to it. And if it does not pass at this session of Congress it is not because of Jardine, Tincher, and Fess, but because of Mr. Coolidge's opposition to the McNary-Haugen bill. I have nothing but the kindest of feelings for President Coolidge; but I can not help but deeply regret that he has shown so little understanding of the problems confronting the Northwest.

Members of the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, let us be frank and honest about it and place the blame where it belongs—lay it at the door of the President of the United States, Mr. Calvin Coolidge. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an encyclical letter from the Pope, a letter from the bishops of the United States, and also a letter by the bishops of Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I would not take this time in saying anything further about the conditions in Mexico were it not for the fact that a Member of the other Chamber saw fit to mention me by name on Friday last and to say that I introduced a resolution—which I did—asking for a severance of diplomatic relations with Mexico. The exception I take is that the gentleman sought to use it as a foundation for a previous rather loose utterance of his in which he stated that the Catholics of the United States wanted us to go to war with Mexico on account of conditions there; and he went further in speaking about two distinguished residents of my city, former Judge Morgan J. O'Brien, who presided in the appellate division of our supreme court, and Alfred J. Talley, former judge of the court of general sessions, the leading and principal criminal court in our jurisdiction.

Both men talked only to the resolution, arguing that the United States ought to exercise its moral influence to put a stop to the Bolshevik practices below the Rio Grande, practices which have virtually crushed all religion, education, and liberty out of the struggling people of Mexico. These hearings were open; some of the testimony has been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; the rest is a part of the committee's proceedings. Both Judge Talley and Judge O'Brien, as well as myself and other witnesses, appealed for favorable action upon the resolution. We asked, and do ask, that the United States definitely and deliberately place Mexico under the ban of all civilized nations by a severance of relations.

In my opinion such a step might reveal to misguided Mexico the error of her ways. It might cause her to abandon a régime which has led to the crisis in which we find ourselves now. But not a word, not a sentiment, not a thought of war can be found in anything said before that committee. The members of that committee, both Republicans and Democrats, will bear witness to that statement.

Yet this Senator cited the testimony of Judge Talley and Judge O'Brien as proof of his charge that the Knights of

Columbus and the Roman Catholic lalty desire war with Mexico. He stood in his place in the Senate and waved in the air such an inflammatory document as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which contains part of Judge Talley's remarks. He ranted and raved and beat his breast, shaking the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the faces of all who dared to question him, until a distinguished Member of his own party, the able and high-minded Senator from Missouri, weary at last of this gentleman's hallucinations and dreamings, gave him a badly needed bath in the clear and crystal waters of religious, political, and social toleration.

Yet this gentleman from Alabama daily lights the fires of bigotry and fans the flame of passion under the pretense that he would keep us out of war. Beating his breast with one hand and sawing the air with the other, he seems to regard himself as the Patrick Henry of the rear row in the Senate; he essays to lecture his colleagues and all who disagree with him; he reads impudent and indecent doggerel attacking journalists who venture to condemn the spirit of unfairness and prejudice and bigotry which animate him; he seeks to spread abroad in this fair land the same atmosphere of intolerance and bitterness and class and religious and sectional warfare which through all the years of history have cost thousands of lives on many a battle field and, even in the enlightened twentieth century, stalk among us in this very House of Congress. There are not many who agree with him; I believe they can be counted on the fingers of one hand. He is a type of his own, fortunately; but such reckless, abandoned, and absurd charges as he has made unfortunately find lodgment and echo in many breasts throughout the land.

A great and distinguished member of his own party has repudiated, for the Senate, the sentiments this gentleman espouses and spouts.

I believe I may presume to speak for the lower body in saying that this attempt to create strife within our own borders finds no sympathy or support in this Chamber. It would be a sorry day for these United States of America, a Nation which justly boasts of its Washingtons, its Jeffersons, its Lincolns, its Roosevelts, and its Wilsons, and of its broad acres as furnishing a refuge to those who are oppressed and heavy laden, when such sentiments as this gentleman has expressed are permitted to pass as representative of the intelligence and tolerance and ideals of the House of Congress. We may serve and worship God in many ways—in church, chapel, temple, hall, or synagogue—but our allegiance to the cross, to the Bible, to the Talmud, or to nothing more than a decent code of ethics, does not thereby mean that our oath of allegiance to the flag, to the Constitution, and to all that America means to us has any reservations based upon our religious training or beliefs.

Does not this gentleman realize that Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, of whatever race and religion, have fought together for peace quite as frequently as they have struggled together in military conflict? Does he seriously believe that any body of men and women desire war, marring and bruising the bodies of their children and husbands and brothers? Does he think it a fine thing, merely for the sake of winning votes at home, to assail the honor and intelligence of a group of citizens who comprise so many millions of our citizens? Does he believe that by such efforts he is fulfilling his oath of office?

Nobody has asked him for proof of his silly charges, because he has none, and everybody knows it. He produces resolutions which he misconstrues and misreads, fragmentary editorials by irresponsible writers, and my resolution, which he has not read, apparently, or reading, he does not understand it. If any man in this House had made the same rash and reckless statements which have come from his mouth, and had then been able to present no more proof than he has, I am sure that in fairness he would be quick to apologize to the House and to the body of men he had so wantonly assailed.

For the Knights of Columbus I do not need to speak. They constitute as fine a group of men as ever served God and country. The deepest and truest instincts of the human heart unite them in a spirit of service which proved itself during the World War, as it does daily in time of peace. To consider myself their spokesman in replying to the childish statements resounding in the other Chamber would be presumptuous on my part and tend to dignify the Alabama Senator's assertions beyond their deserts.

It is time for him to abandon his vaporings, repent, and apologize. If he will keep his seat the country will keep out of war.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much pleased this afternoon to see the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] rising in this House and saying concerning a certain gentleman from Alabama that in speaking he spoke for himself, and not for the delegation from that State.

In further support of my statement that the Catholics do not want war with Mexico, I append to my remarks the encyclical letter of Pope Pius XI, an extract from the pastoral letter of the Catholic Episcopate of the United States, and a pastoral letter of the bishops of Mexico:

[From the Special Supplement The N. C. W. C. News Sheet]

ENCYCLICAL LETTER "INQUIS AFFLICTISQUE" OF POPE PIUS XI ON THE PERSECUTION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN MEXICO

(Translated by Rev. Dr. James H. Ryan, of the Catholic University of America, for the N. C. W. C. News Service. Copyright, 1926)

(By N. C. W. C. News Service)

"In vain will you found missions and build schools if you are not able to wield the offensive and defensive weapons of a loyal Catholic press." (Pope Pius X.)

The work of the Catholic papers has been most praiseworthy. They have been an effective auxiliary to the pulpit in spreading the faith." (Pope Benedict XV.)

ROME, December 3.—Following is the encyclical letter "Inquis afflictisque" of His Holiness Pope Pius XI on the persecution of the Catholic Church in Mexico:

"In speaking to the sacred college of cardinals at the consistory of last December, we pointed out that there existed no hope or possibility of relief from the sad and unjust conditions under which the Catholic religion exists to-day in Mexico except it be by a 'special act of Divine mercy.' You, venerable brothers, did not delay to make your own and approve our convictions and our wishes in this regard, made known to you on so many occasions, for by every means within your power you urged all the faithful committed to your pastoral care to implore by instant prayers the Divine Founder of the church that He bring some relief from the heavy burden of these great evils.

"We designedly use the words 'the heavy burden of these great evils' for certain of our children, deserters from the army of Jesus Christ and enemies of the common Father of all, have ordered and are continuing up to the present hour a cruel persecution against their own brethren, our most beloved children of Mexico. And if in the first centuries of our era and at other periods in history Christians were treated in a more barbarous fashion than now, certainly in no place or at no time has it happened before that a small group of men has so outraged the rights of God and of the church as they are now doing in Mexico, and this without the slightest regard for the past glories of their country, with no feelings of pity for their fellow citizens. They have also done away with the liberties of the majority and in such a clever way that they have been able to clothe their lawless actions with the semblance of legality.

EXPRESSES GRATITUDE FOR PRAYERS

"Naturally, we do not wish that either you or the faithful should fail to receive from us a solemn testimonial of our gratitude for the prayers which, according to our intention, were poured forth in private and at public functions. It is most important, too, that these prayers which have been so powerful an aid to us should be continued, and even increased, with renewed fervor. It is assuredly not in the power of man to control the course of events or of history, nor can he direct them as he may desire to the welfare of society by changing either the minds or hearts of his fellow men. Such action, however, is well within the power of God, for He without doubt can put an end, if He so desires, to persecutions of this kind. Nor must you conclude, venerable brothers, that all your prayers have been in vain simply because the Mexican Government, impelled by its fanatical hatred of religion, continues to enforce more harshly and violently from day to day its unjust laws. The truth is that the clergy and the great majority of the faithful have been so strengthened in their long-suffering resistance to these laws by such an abundant shower of divine grace that they have been enabled thereby to give a glorious example of heroism. They have justly merited, too, that we, in a solemn document executed by our apostolic authority, should make known this fortitude to the whole Catholic world.

"Last month on the occasion of the beatification of many martyrs of the French Revolution, almost naturally the Catholics of Mexico came to our thoughts, for they, like these martyrs, have remained firm in their resolution to resist in all patience the unreasonable behests and commands of their persecutors rather than cut themselves off from the unity of the church or refuse obedience to the apostolic see. Marvelous indeed is the glory of the divine spouse of Christ who, through the course of the centuries, can depend, without fail, upon a brave and generous offspring ever ready to suffer prisons, stripes, and even death itself for the holy liberty of the church!

RECALLS FORMER MEXICAN PERSECUTIONS

"It is scarcely necessary, venerable brothers, to go back very far in order to narrate the sad calamities which have fallen upon the church of Mexico. It is sufficient to recall that the frequent revolutions of modern times have ended in the majority of cases in trials for the church and persecutions against religion. Both in 1914 and in



1915 men who seemed veritably inspired by the barbarism of former days, persecuted the clergy, both secular and regular, and the sisters. They rose up against holy places and every object used in divine worship and so ferocious were they that no injury, no ignominy, no violence was too great to satisfy their persecuting mania.

"Referring now to certain notorious facts concerning which we have already raised our voice in solemn protest and which even the daily press recorded at great length, there is no need to take up much space in telling you of certain deplorable events which occurred even in the very recent past with reference to our apostolic delegates to Mexico. Without the slightest regard for justice, for solemn promises given, or for humanity itself, one of these apostolic delegates was driven out of the country; another, who, because of illness had left the Republic for a short time, was forbidden to return, and the third was treated in a most unfriendly manner and forced to leave. Surely, there is no one who can not understand that such acts as these, committed against illustrious personages who were both ready and willing to bring about peace, must be construed as a great affront to their dignity as archbishops, to the high office which they filled, and particularly to our authority which they represented.

"Unquestionably the events just cited are grave and deplorable. But the examples of despotic power which we shall now pass in review, venerable brothers, are beyond all compare, contrary to the rights of the church and most injurious as well to the Catholics of Mexico.

#### RECOUNTS PROSCRIPTION OF CLERGY

"In the first place, let us examine the law of 1917, known as the political constitution of the United States of Mexico. For our present purposes it is sufficient to point out that after declaring the separation of church and state the constitution refuses to recognize in the church, as if she were an individual devoid of any civil status, all her existing rights and interdicts to her the acquisition of any rights whatsoever in the future. The civil authority is given the right to interfere in matters of divine worship and in the external discipline of the church. Priests are put on the level of professional men and of laborers, but with this important difference, that they must be not only Mexicans by birth and can not exceed a certain number specified by law, but are at the same time deprived of all civil and political rights. They are thus put in the same class as criminals and the insane. Moreover, it is commanded that priests not only must inform the civil authorities but also a commission of 10 citizens whenever they take possession of a church or whenever they are transferred to another mission. The vows of religious, religious orders, and religious congregations are outlawed in Mexico. Public divine worship is forbidden unless it take place within the confines of a church and is carried on under the watchful eye of the Government. All church buildings have been declared the property of the state. Episcopal residences, diocesan offices, seminaries, religious houses, hospitals, and all charitable institutions have been taken away from the church and handed over to the state. As a matter of fact, the church can no longer own any property of any kind. Everything that it possessed at the period when this law was passed has now become the property of the state. Every citizen, moreover, has the right to denounce before the law anyone who he thinks is holding in his own name property for the church. All that is required in order to make such action legal is a mere presumption of guilt. Priests are not allowed by law to inherit property of any kind except it be from persons closely related to them by blood. With reference to marriage, the power of the church is not recognized. Every marriage between Catholics is considered valid merely if contracted validly according to the prescriptions of the civil code.

#### RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IS PROHIBITED

"Education has been declared free, but with these important restrictions: Both priests and religious are forbidden to open or to conduct elementary schools. It is not permitted to teach children their religion even in a private school. Diplomas or degrees conferred by private schools under control of the church possess no legal value and are not recognized by the state. Certainly, venerable brothers, those men who originated, approved, and gave their sanction to such a law either are totally ignorant of what rights pertain 'jure divino' to the church as a perfect society, established as the ordinary means of salvation for mankind by Jesus Christ, our Redeemer and King, to which He gave the full liberty of fulfilling her mission on earth (such ignorance seems incredible to-day, after 20 centuries of Christianity, and especially in a Catholic nation and among men who have been baptized, unless in their pride and foolishness they believe themselves able to undermine and destroy the 'house of the Lord, which has been solidly constructed and strongly built on the living rock') or they have been motivated by an insane hatred to attempt anything within their power in order to harm the church. How was it possible for the archbishops and bishops of Mexico to remain silent in the face of such odious laws?

"Immediately after their publication the hierarchy of Mexico protested in kind but firm terms against these laws, protests which our immediate predecessor ratified, which were approved as well by the whole hierarchies of other countries, as well as by a great majority of individual bishops from all over the world, and which finally were confirmed even

by us in a letter of consolation of the date of the 2d of February, 1926, which we addressed to the bishops of Mexico. The bishops hoped that those in charge of the Government, after the first outburst of hatred, would have appreciated the damage and danger which would accrue to the vast majority of the people from the enforcement of those articles of the constitution restrictive of the liberty of the church, and that, therefore, out of a desire to preserve peace, they would not insist on enforcing these articles to the letter, or would enforce them only up to a certain point, thus leaving open the possibility of a *modus vivendi* at least for the time being.

#### CHURCH DEPRIVED OF LIBERTY

"But in spite of the extreme patience exhibited in these circumstances by both the clergy and laity, an attitude which was the result of the bishops' exhorting them to moderation in all things, every hope of a return to peace and tranquillity was dissipated, and this as a direct result of the law promulgated by the President of the Republic on the 2d of July, 1926, by virtue of which practically no liberty at all was left to the church. As a matter of fact, the church was barely allowed to exist. The exercise of the sacred ministry was hedged about by the severest penalties as if it were a crime worthy of capital punishment. It is difficult, venerable brothers, to express in language how such a perversion of civil authority grieves us. For whosoever reveres, as all must, God the Creator and our beloved Redeemer, whosoever will obey the laws of holy mother church, such a man, we repeat, such a man is looked on as a malefactor, as guilty of a crime; such a man is considered fit only to be deprived of all his civil rights; such a man can be thrown into prison along with other criminals. With what justice can we apply to the authors of these enormities the words which Jesus Christ spoke to the leaders of the Jews: 'This is your hour, and the power of darkness.' (Luke xxii, 53.)

"The most recent law which has been promulgated as merely an interpretation of the constitution is as a matter of fact much worse than the original law itself and makes the enforcement of the constitution much more severe, if not almost intolerable. The President of the Republic and the members of his ministry have insisted with such ferocity on the enforcement of these laws that they do not permit the governors of the different States of the confederation, the civil authorities, or the military commanders to mitigate in the least the rigors of the persecution of the Catholic Church. Insult, too, is added to persecution. Wicked men have tried to place the church in a bad light before the people; some, for example, uttering the most brazen lies in public assemblies. But when a Catholic tries to answer them, he is prevented from speaking by cat-calls and personal insults hurled at his head. Others use hostile newspapers in order to obscure the truth and to malign 'Catholic action.'

#### CATHOLICS FORBIDDEN TO PROTEST

"If, at the beginning of the persecution, Catholics were able to make a defense of their religion in the public press by means of articles which made clear the truth and answered the lies and errors of their enemies, it is now no longer permitted these citizens, who love their country just as much as any other citizens do, to raise their voices in protest. As a matter of fact, they are not even allowed to express their sorrow over the injuries done to the faith of their fathers and to the liberty of divine worship. We, however, moved profoundly as we are by the consciousness of the duties imposed upon us by our apostolic office, will cry out to heaven, venerable brothers, so that the whole Catholic world may hear from the lips of the common father of all the story of the insane tyranny of the enemies of the church, on the one hand, and on the other that of the heroic virtue and constancy of the bishops, priests, religious congregations, and laity of Mexico.

"All foreign priests and religions have been expelled from the country. Schools for the religious education of boys and girls have been closed, either because they are known publicly under a religious name or because they happen to possess a statue or some other religious object. Many seminaries likewise, schools, convents, and institutions connected with churches have been closed. In practically all the States of the Republic the number of priests who may exercise the sacred ministry has been limited and fixed at the barest minimum. Even these latter are not allowed to exercise their sacred office unless they have beforehand registered with the civil authorities and have obtained permission from them so to function. In certain sections of the country restrictions have been placed on the ministry of priests which, if they were not so sad, would be laughable in the extreme. For example, certain regulations demand that priests must be of an age fixed by law; that they must be civilly married, and they are not allowed to baptize any one except with flowing water. In one of the States of the confederation it has been decreed that only one bishop is permitted to live within the territory of said State, by reason of which law two other bishops were constrained to exile themselves from their dioceses. Moreover, because of circumstances imposed upon them by law, some bishops have had to leave their dioceses, others have been forced to appear before the courts, several were arrested, and practically all the others live from day to day in imminent danger of being arrested.

## GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES DRAGOONED

"Again, every Mexican citizen who is engaged in the education of children or of youth, or holds any public office whatsoever, has been ordered to make known publicly whether he accepts the policies of the President and approves of the war which is now being waged on the Catholic Church. The majority of these same individuals were forced, under threat of losing their positions, to take part, together with the army and laboring men, in a parade sponsored by the regional confederation of the workingmen of Mexico, a socialist organization. This parade took place in Mexico City and in other towns of the Republic on the same day. It was followed by impious speeches to the populace. The whole procedure was organized to obtain, by means of these public outcries and the applause of those who took part in it, and by heaping all kinds of abuse on the church, popular approval of the acts of the President.

"But the cruel exercise of arbitrary power on the part of the enemies of the church has not stopped at these acts. Both men and women who defended the rights of the church and the cause of religion, either in speeches or by distributing leaflets and pamphlets, were hurried before the courts and sent to prison. Again, whole colleges of canons were rushed off to jail, the aged being carried there in their beds. Priests and laymen have been cruelly put to death in the very streets or in the public squares which front the churches. May God grant that the responsible authors of so many grave crimes return soon to their better selves and throw themselves in sorrow and with true contrition on the divine mercy; we are convinced that this is the noble revenge on their murderers which our children who have been so unjustly put to death are now asking from God.

"We think it well at this point, venerable brothers, to review for you in a few words how the bishops, priests, and faithful of Mexico have organized resistance and 'set up a wall for the House of Israel, to stand in battle.' (Ezech. xlii, 5.)

## MEXICAN BISHOPS SOUGHT PEACE

"There can not be the slightest doubt of the fact that the Mexican hierarchy have unitedly used every means within their power to defend the liberty and good name of the church. In the first place, they indited a joint pastoral letter to their people in which they proved beyond cavil that the clergy had always acted toward the rulers of the Republic motivated by a love for peace, with prudence, and in all patience; that they had even suffered, in a spirit of almost too much tolerance, laws which were unjust; that they had admonished the faithful, outlining the divine constitution of the church, that they, too, must always persevere in their religion, in such a way that they shall 'obey God rather than men' (Acts v, 29) on every occasion when anyone tries to impose on them laws which are no less contrary to the very idea of law and do not merit to be called laws, as they are inimical to the constitution and existence itself of the church.

"When the President of the Republic had promulgated his unjust and unjust decree of interpretation of the constitution, by means of another joint pastoral letter the bishops protested and pointed out that to accept such a law was nothing less than to desert the church and hand her over a slave to the civil authorities. Even if this had been done, it was apparent to all that such an act would neither satisfy her persecutors nor stop them in the pursuit of their nefarious intentions. The bishops in such circumstances preferred to put an end to every public religious function. Therefore they ordered the complete suspension of every act of public worship which can not take place without the presence of the clergy, in all the churches of their dioceses, beginning the last day of July, on which day the law in question went into effect. Moreover, since the civil authorities had ordered that all the churches must be turned over to the care of laymen, chosen by the mayors of the different municipalities, and could not be held in any manner whatsoever by those who were named or designated for such an office by the bishops or priests, which act transferred the possession of the churches from the ecclesiastical authority to that of the state, the bishops practically everywhere interdicted the faithful from accepting a place on such a committee bestowed on them by the Government and even from entering a church which was no longer under the control of the church. In some dioceses, due to the differences of time and place, other arrangements were made.

## HIERARCHY CALMED PEOPLE'S FEELING

"In spite of all this, do not think, venerable brothers, that the Mexican hierarchy lost any opportunity or occasion by means of which they might do their part in calming the popular feelings and bringing about concord despite the fact that they distrusted, or it would be better perhaps to say, despaired of, a happy outcome to all these troubles. It is sufficient to recall in this context that the bishops of Mexico City, who act in the capacity of procurators for their colleagues, wrote a very courteous and respectful letter to the President of the Republic in the interests of the bishop of Huejutla, who had been arrested in a most outrageous manner and with a great display of armed force, and had been ordered taken to the city called Pachuca. The President replied to this letter by means of a hateful angry screeed, a fact now become notorious. Again, when it happened that certain personages, lovers of

peace, had spontaneously intervened so as to bring about a conversation between the President and the archbishop of Morelia and the Bishop of Tabasco, the parties in question talked together for a long time and on many subjects, but with no results. Again, the bishops debated whether they should ask the House of Representatives for the abrogation of those laws which were against the rights of the church or if they should continue, as before, their so-called passive resistance to these laws. As a matter of fact, there existed many good reasons which seemed to them to render useless the presentation of such a petition to Congress. However, they did present the petition, which was written by Catholics quite capable of doing so because of their knowledge of law, every word of which was, moreover, weighed by the bishops themselves with the utmost care. To this petition of the hierarchy there was added, due to the zealous efforts of the members of the Federation for the Defense of Religious Liberty, about which organization we shall have something to say later on in this letter, a great number of signatures of citizens, both men and women.

## PETITION REJECTED BY CONGRESS

"The bishops had not been wrong in their anticipations of what would take place. Congress rejected the proposed petition almost unanimously, only one voting in favor of it, and the reason they alleged for this act was that the bishops had been deprived of juridical personality, since they had already appealed in this matter to the Pope and therefore they had proved themselves unwilling to acknowledge the laws of Mexico. Such being the facts, what possibly remained for the bishops to do if not to decide that, until these unjust laws had been repealed, neither they nor the faithful would change in the slightest the policy which they had adopted? The civil authorities of Mexico, abusing both their power and the really remarkable patience of the people, are now in a position to menace the clergy and the Mexican people with even more severe punishments than those already inflicted. But how are we to overcome and conquer men of this type who are committed to the use of every type of infamy unless we are willing, as they insist, to conclude an agreement with them which can not but injure the sacred cause of the liberty of the church?

"The clergy have imitated the truly wonderful example of constancy given them by the bishops and have themselves in turn given no less brilliant an example of fortitude through all the tedious changes of the great conflict. This example of extraordinary virtue on their part has been a great comfort to us. We have made it known as well to the whole Catholic world and we praise them because 'they are worthy.' (Apoc. iii, 4.) And in this special context, when we recall that every imaginable artifice was employed, that all the power and vexatious tactics of our adversaries had but one purpose, to alienate both the clergy and people from their allegiance to the hierarchy and to this apostolic see, and that despite all this only one or two priests, from among the 4,000, betrayed in a shameful manner their holy office, it certainly seems to us that there is nothing which we can not hope for from the Mexican clergy.

## PRIESTS' STEADFASTNESS PRAISED

"As a matter of fact, we behold these priests standing shoulder to shoulder, obedient and respectful to the commands of their prelates despite the fact that to obey means in the majority of cases serious dangers for themselves, for they must live from their holy office, and since they are poor and do not themselves possess anything by which they can support the church, they are obliged to live bravely in poverty and in misery; they must say mass in private; they must do all within their power to provide for the spiritual needs of their flocks, to keep alive and increase the flame of piety in those round about them; moreover, by their example, counsels, and exhortations, they must lift the thoughts of their fellow citizens to the highest ideals and strengthen their wills so that they, too, will persevere in their passive resistance. Is it any wonder, then, that the wrath and blind hatred of our enemies are directed principally and before all else against the priesthood? The clergy, on their side, have not hesitated to go to prison when ordered so to do, and even to face death itself with serenity and courage. We have heard recently of something which surpasses anything as yet perpetrated under the guise of those wicked laws, and which, as a matter of fact, sounds the very depths of wickedness, for we have learned that certain priests have been suddenly set upon while celebrating mass in their own homes or in the homes of friends, that the blessed Eucharist was outraged in the basest manner, and the priests themselves carried off to prison.

"Nor can we praise enough the courageous faithful of Mexico who have understood only too well how important it is for them that a Catholic nation in matters so serious and holy as the worship of God, the liberty of the church, and the eternal salvation of souls should not depend upon the arbitrary will and audacious acts of a few men, but should be governed under the mercy of God only by laws which are just, which are conformable to natural, divine, and ecclesiastical law.

## COMMENDS CATHOLIC ORGANIZATIONS

"A word of very special praise is due those Catholic organizations which, during all these trying times, have stood like soldiers side by side with the clergy. The members of these organizations, to the limit

of their power, not only have made provisions to maintain and to assist their clergy financially; they also watch over and take care of the churches, teach catechism to the children, and, like sentinels, stand guard to warn the clergy that their ministrations are needed, so that no one may be deprived of the help of the priest. What we have just written is true of all these organizations. We wish, however, to say a word in particular about the principal organizations, so that each of them may know that it is highly approved and even praised by the vicar of Jesus Christ.

"First of all we mention the Knights of Columbus, an organization which is found in all the States of the Republic, and, fortunately, is made up of active and industrious members, who, because of their practical lives and open profession of the faith, as well as by their zeal in assisting the church, have brought great honor upon themselves. This organization promotes two types of activities which are needed now more than ever. In the first place, the national sodality of fathers of families, the program of which is to give a Catholic education to their own children, to protect the rights of Christian parents with regard to education, and in cases where children attend the public schools, to provide for them a sound and complete training in their religion. Secondly, the Federation for the Defense of Religious Liberty, which was recently organized when it became clear as the noonday sun that the church was menaced by a veritable ocean of troubles. This federation soon spread to all parts of the Republic. Its members attempted, working in harmony and with assiduity, to organize and instruct Catholics so that they would be able to present a united, invincible front to the enemy.

#### WORK OF WOMEN AND YOUTH

"No less deserving of the church and the fatherland as the Knights of Columbus have been and still are we mention two other organizations, each of which has, following its own program, a special relation to what is known as Catholic social action. One is the Catholic Society of Mexican Youth, and the other the Society of Mexican Ladies. These two sodalities, over and above the work which is special to each of them, promote and do all they can to have others promote the activities of the above-mentioned Federation for the Defense of Religious Liberty. Without going into details, with pleasure we desire to call to your attention, venerable brothers, but a single fact; namely, that all the members of these organizations, both men and women, are so brave that, instead of fleeing danger, they go out in search of it, and even rejoice when it falls to their share to suffer persecution from the enemies of the church. What a beautiful spectacle this, that is thus given to the world, to angels, and to men! How worthy of eternal praise are such deeds! As a matter of fact, as we have pointed out above, many individuals, members either of the Knights of Columbus, or officers of the federation, of the Society of Mexican Ladies, or of the Society of Mexican Youth, have been taken to prison handcuffed, through the public streets, surrounded by groups of soldiers, locked up in foul jails, harshly treated, and punished with prison sentences or fines. Moreover, venerable brothers, and in narrating this to you we can scarcely keep back our tears, some of these young men and boys have gladly met death, the rosary in their hands and the name of Christ King on their lips. Young girls, too, who were imprisoned, were criminally outraged, and these acts were deliberately made public in order to intimidate other young women and to cause them the more easily to fail in their duty toward the church.

"No one, surely, venerable brothers, can hazard a prediction or foresee in imagination the hour when the good God will bring to an end such calamities. We do know this much: The day will come when the Church of Mexico will have respite from this veritable tempest of hatred, for the reason that, according to the words of God there is no wisdom, there is no prudence, there is no counsel against the Lord (Prov. xxi, 30), and 'the gates of hell shall not prevail' (Matt. xvi, 18) against the spotless bride of Christ.

#### TRIUMPH OF CHURCH PREDICTED

"The church which, from the day of Pentecost, has been destined here below to a never-ending life, which went forth into the world, endowed with the gifts and the inspirations of the Holy Spirit, what has been her mission during the last 20 centuries, and in every country of the world if not, after the example of her Divine Founder 'to go about doing good'? (Acts x, 38.) Certainly this work of the church should have gained for her the love of all men; unfortunately the very contrary has happened as her Divine Master Himself predicted (Matt. x, 17-25) would be the case. At one time the bark of Peter, favored by the winds, goes happily forward; at other times it appears to be swallowed up by the waves and on the point of being lost. Has not this ship always aboard the Divine Pilot who knows when to calm the angry waves and the winds? And who is it but Christ Himself, who alone is all-powerful, that brings it about that every persecution which is launched against the faithful should react to the lasting benefit of the church? As St. Hilary writes, 'It is a prerogative of the church that she is the vanquisher when she is persecuted, that she capture our infelleets when her doctrines are questioned,

that she conquers all at the very moment when she is abandoned by all.' (St. Hilary of Portiers 'De Trinitate,' Bk. VII, No. 4.)

"If those men who now in Mexico persecute their brothers and fellow citizens for no other reason than that these latter are guilty of keeping the laws of God, would only recall to memory and consider dispassionately the vicissitudes of their country as history reveals them to us, they must recognize and publicly confess that whatever there is of progress, of civilization, of the good and the beautiful, in their country is due solely to the Catholic Church. In fact, every man knows that after the introduction of Christianity to Mexico, the priests and religious especially, who are now being persecuted with such cruelty by an ungrateful Government, worked without rest and despite all the obstacles placed in their way, on the one hand, by the colonists who were moved by greed for gold and, on the other, by the natives who were still barbarians, to promote greatly in those vast regions both the splendor of the worship of God and the benefits of the Catholic religion, works and institutions of charity, schools and colleges for the education of the people and their instruction in letters, the sciences, both sacred and profane, in the arts, and the crafts.

#### URGES PRAYERS FOR ENEMIES

"One thing more remains for us to do, venerable brothers, namely, to pray and implore Our Lady of Guadalupe, heavenly patroness of the Mexican people, that she pardon all these injuries and especially those which have been committed against her, that she ask of God that peace and concord may return to her people. And if, in the hidden designs of God that day which we so greatly desire is far distant, may she in the meantime console her faithful children of Mexico and strengthen them in their resolve to maintain their liberty by the profession of their faith.

"In the meanwhile, as an augury of the grace of God and as proof of our fatherly love, we bestow from our heart on you, venerable brothers, and especially on those bishops who rule the Church of Mexico, on all your clergy and your people, the apostolic blessing.

"Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on the 18th day of November, 1926, the fifth year of our pontificate.

"PIUS XI."

[Extract from the pastoral letter of the Catholic Episcopate of the United States.]

#### THE CHURCH TURNS TO PRAYER NOT ARMS

Even Catholics have asked why the church in Mexico does not use its undoubted power to bring this persecution to a speedy end and take measures to prevent its recurrence, since it is admitted that the overwhelming majority of the Mexican people are of its fold. They forget that there are but two human means to that end: The ballot and the sword. The first is hopeless in Mexico, because there the ballot is not respected and governments are unaffected by it. Few citizens use it, because their votes are counted only when they favor the ruling powers or when these powers, for effect or deception, are willing to admit the existence of a small minority. An outstanding proof of this is found in the rejection, by a vote of every member save one, of the petition for relief addressed by the Mexican bishops to the Congress, though the petition was supported by the people.

Congress, Senate, and courts do the bidding of the President, and this condition has been the rule and not the exception since "liberty" came to Mexico by force of arms. It will continue to be the rule while that kind of "liberty" stays. Ballots are less powerful than bullets when they are the playthings of tyranny.

The second human remedy is equally hopeless, for Christian principles forbid the church founded by the Prince of Peace to take up the sword or rely upon such carnal weapons as the inflamed passions of men would select. If the church has learned many things in her life of 2,000 years, the principal lesson came from the patience of her Divine Founder. She is not fated to die, but she has learned how to suffer. With Him she will be crucified, but with Him also she will rise. The weapons of men are not for her. But if these human weapons the church will not use, she has one that well fits her hand, armored as it is in justice and in truth. She has prayer. Never in the history of the trials of the church in Mexico has that weapon been so firmly held as now, thanks to the paternal counsels of the sovereign pontiff. Because of these no longer does the quivering voice of the afflicted church of Mexico rise alone to the Comforter. From end to end of the earth the answer to the appeal of Pius goes upward to the throne of God. The hatred of men may spurn it. The malice of men may curse it. The unbelief of men may mock it. But its hope is in a promise and its power is in a faith.

THIS IS NO APPEAL FOR POLITICAL INTERVENTION OR ACTION OF ANY SORT

What, therefore, we have written is no call on the faithful here or elsewhere to purely human action. It is no interposition of our influence either as bishops or as citizens to reach those who possess political power anywhere on earth, and least of all in our own country, to the end that they should intervene with armed force in the internal affairs of Mexico for the protection of the church. Our duty is done when by telling the story, defending the truth, and emphasizing the principles we sound a warning to Christian civilization that its foundations are

again being attacked and undermined. For the rest God will bring His will to pass in His own good time and in His own good way. Mexico will be saved for her mission, whatever it may be. That this mission is now to give a great example of Christian patience and to demonstrate the force of faith undaunted we may well believe. For the future we may take confidence from the examples of other nations that went through the same fiery furnace of persecution and emerged triumphantly prepared for great things. The Mexican nation once proved its inherent worth by its rapid advancement in Christian civilization. For the days of De Gante and Zumarraga, Las Casas and Motolinia, as well as those of Junipero Serra, who carried the work of the missionaries into what is now our own land, Mexico has no need to offer apology.

#### MEXICO'S DEBT TO THE CHURCH

For the sad days of decline the church, forbidden by law to teach and robbed of the means to carry on her mission of enlightenment, has only to show her chains and say to her enemies: "You blame me for poverty, yet you took from me the endowments for my hospitals, my orphanages, my countless works of mercy. You blame me for ignorance, yet you closed my schools and stole my colleges, the first to light the torch of learning on this continent. You say that I have added nothing to science and art, but you destroyed the art I brought with me and developed, burned my books, and scattered the results of my labor for science to the four winds of heaven. You blame me for lawlessness, yet you destroyed my missions among a peaceful and thriving Indian population and gave to them in place of Christ's gospel the 30 pieces of silver with which you bribed them to murder their fellows. You took the cross out of their hands to replace it with a torch and a gun. Show me one good thing in Mexico I did not give you. Show me one genius for whom I was not responsible. Show me one step toward the light that I did not help you to make. Take out of your country all that I put in it and see what remains. You may thrust me out, exile my bishops, murder my priests, again steal by schools, and desecrate my sanctuaries, but you can not blot out history, you can not erase the mark I made on you—not in a century of centuries."

#### "FOR MY NAME'S SAKE"

If the gaining of the whole world does not recompense the individual for the loss of his soul, what, then, shall it profit a nation? There was a soul in Mexico, a spirit manifesting its presence by the impulse that sent her missionaries of civilization along a way unmarked, save for the print of their sandals, but now the great Royal Road of California—the Camino Real. It was a spirit that building on its faith and inspiration left monuments to tell Mexico's story in the old missions of Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and along the shores of the Pacific from San Diego to San Francisco. For us of the north these buildings, landmarks of the first Christian missions within our borders, beacons of the light of religion and civilization on our soil, fountains and fertile sources of a distinctive literature touched and tinted with colors and values all its own, are treasures honored as a rich legacy, noble and ennobling. The old records speak in the Spanish tongue to tell us that it was not really Spain but Mexico that sent the padres to the north. Their Castilian speech is passing; nor are there left many descendants of the brave souls who came with them to write the first chapter, the chapter of beauty, into the history of our California. But the memories are not dead, nor has the trail been lost that was marked by the discoverers who gave to the far western country the first martyrs as well as the first teachers in all our Nation. Through them we share in the glory of the initial gesture of Christian civilization on this continent.

We have not denied, nor shall we deny, our debt to Mexico for this. Already it has been acknowledged by voices which, if they do not all sing the old hymns, yet do all understand something of the message of the singers; if they do not all worship at the old altars, yet do all hold sacred the spots upon which the padres built them, and give to the new cities that grew around them the old names, to keep for the great West its traditions, its character, and its charm. If the mother should forget what the sons and daughters love, shall not these sons and daughters take shame instead of glory from her? For you of our own flock in this happy land, where the rights of conscience are recognized and upheld by the laws and respected by the people, we reach the appeal of our holy father, Pope Pius XI, and ask the charity of your prayers—a memento in the daily masses of the priests and a remembrance in the daily devotions of the faithful—for your afflicted brethren in Mexico, recalling to you words of our Lord to show that your practical sympathy thus expressed will be pleasing in His sight: "Blessed are they that suffer persecution for justice sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. v, 10.)

To the bishops, the clergy, and the faithful of Mexico we inscribe this defense of their history and their rights, not alone as a duty to the faith we hold in common, but as a testimony to their fortitude under trial and to the justice they preach in their dignified and legitimate demands. We bid them be of good cheer, for to Mexico in affliction may the significant words of the Master to the apostle of the gentiles be once more applied: "This man is to Me a vessel of election, to carry

My name before the gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel. For I will show him how great things he must suffer for My name's sake." (Acts ix, 15-16.)

Given this 12th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1926, Feast of Our Lady of Guadalupe.

#### PASTORAL OF THE BISHOPS OF MEXICO

We, the archbishops and bishops of Mexico, to our venerable clergy and to the beloved faithful: Greeting, peace, and the blessing of Our Lord, Jesus Christ.

VENERABLE BRETHREN AND BELOVED SONS: His Holiness, Pius XI, deeply moved by the religious persecution which, for some time, continues to be waged against the people of Mexico and which began even before the brutal measures recently adopted, declared in his apostolic letter of February 2, 1926, "So unjust are the decrees and laws which a Government, hostile to the church, is publishing among you and enforcing on the Catholic people of Mexico, that we need not say to you, who have borne the yoke so long, that these decrees, far from being founded in reason, far from being in the interest of the common good, as it is their obligation to be, are, in reality, quite otherwise, and, therefore, scarcely deserve the name of laws at all. With abundant justification, our lamented predecessor, Benedict XV, approved your action, when, in all justice and holiness, you protested against these laws, and we now make this approval our very own."

Since 1917, the date of the protest to which His Holiness refers, until a few months ago, our attitude was one of prudent silence, because the antireligious clauses were not then being enforced in such a manner as to render impossible the life of the church.

In reality the governments which succeeded each other during those years placed grave obstacles in the way of the church and subjected her to summary procedures which were excessive in their severity and frequently in violation of our rights under the constitution. They did not, however, render wholly impossible the preaching of the Gospel, the administration of the sacraments, or the exercise of public worship.

Toward that persecution, most severe it is true but in some sense only spasmodic and temporary, we were able to assume an attitude of waiting, to seek to adjust things as best we could, to endure vexation in patience, so long as there was no violation of the rights which the church, as such, has from God, her founder.

Now, the law, which the Chief Executive of the Federal Government promulgated on July 2 of the present year, violates these rights of the church, and, at the same time, the natural rights of man, which are the very foundation and lifeblood of civilization and of religious liberty; and is, in the opinion of eminent authorities, a flagrant violation of the constitutional laws of Mexico. In the face of such an outrage against the moral values we hold sacred, an attitude of inaction is no longer possible to us. Our forbearance in these circumstances would be criminal. We can not go before the judgment seat of God having for our only defense the lamentation of the prophet: "Woe to me that I was silent."

Who will deny that to make a crime of acts which are commanded by God himself, of acts which are encouraged under the laws of all civilized nations, of acts, which, for centuries, have been the very soul and the life of the Mexican people—who will not admit that to make of such acts crimes, punishable by penalties more severe than are imposed for crimes against morality, even against life, property, or the other rights of man, is a violation by the chief executive of the inalienable rights which man has received from God and belong to him by nature, and a denial of those principles which are most dear and most sacred to the people of Mexico?

Who will pretend that this decree has for its purpose the defense of these rights? Who can deny that the sole aim and purpose of this decree is to surround with a sort of sacred inviolability the Queretaro charter? The fact that this charter may be amended is established in the charter itself, and there is no room to doubt that the people of Mexico demand its immediate amendment for reasons that are convincing. Is it not clear beyond doubt that this decree, far from providing for the common welfare by guaranteeing religious liberty, commanded by the constitution, has for its only purpose the destruction of the Catholic religion of Mexico and can end only in involving the Government in a conflict which is unnecessary?

Therefore, imitating the example set for us by the holy father, before God we protest against this decree; we protest before the heroes who have defended justice and right throughout history; we protest before the civilized nations of the world. With the help of God and with your cooperation we will labor to secure the amendment of this decree and of the antireligious articles of the constitution, and we will not give up the task until our labor has been successful.

In our last pastoral we proved to you that this action is not rebellion, because the constitution itself provides for its own amendment and because our action is justified on principles of justice and patriotism, which are higher than any law and is a defense of rights which by the law itself are held sacred and inalienable.

Confronted by the impossibility of exercising our sacred ministry subject to the prescriptions of this decree, after having consulted our holy father, Pius XI, who has approved of this, our action, we command that, beginning with the 31st day of July of the present year and until further notice is given by us there be suspended in every church of the Republic every act of public worship which requires the intervention of a priest.

We hasten to reassure you, our beloved sons, no interdiction is imposed upon you, our only purpose is to employ this the only measure which remains to us to manifest our refusal to accept the antireligious clauses of the constitution and the laws which have been enacted for their enforcement.

The churches are to remain open so that the faithful may continue to enter them for prayer. Priests in charge of churches will withdraw from them to escape the penalties prescribed for them by this decree of the President and because, in conscience, they can not comply with the order that they seek from agents of the Government the authority for the exercise of their ministry.

We leave the churches to the care of the faithful, having no doubt that you will preserve, with pious solicitude, the sanctuaries which you inherited from your forefathers or which, at great sacrifice, you yourselves have built and consecrated to the worship of God.

The law now denies to the Catholic schools the right to teach religion as it is their obligation to do; we therefore make it binding in conscience upon parents to take such steps as may be necessary to prevent their children from attending schools where their religion and their morality are in danger of being undermined or where the textbooks used are a violation of the constitutional provision which command the Government to pursue a policy of nonintervention in matters of religion. Let the parents in the sanctity of the home do what is possible to fulfill their sacred duty, to give an education to the sons and daughters with whom God has blessed them.

Our souls are filled with sadness, our hearts are bleeding, because we have been compelled to take measures so severe. Unhesitatingly, however, we assume the full responsibility for our act. No other course is open to us. Do not lose faith in us, as we will never lose faith in you, our beloved sons. As one man united, let us place our faith in God. We commend ourselves with confidence and hope to our holy mother, the Virgin of Guadalupe. There will come times when the Divine Pilot will seem to have fallen asleep. He will not fail when necessity calls to console and comfort those who have had faith in Him.

Let not our trust in God tempt us into a life of inaction. Let us remember always that Ninevah was saved from destruction by prayer and penance. Be ceaseless in your prayers to Mary Immaculate and her Divine Son.

He will not be heedless to your fasting, your penance, and your deeds of charity. Be not unmindful of the priests whose means of livelihood have been taken from them. Give open evidence of the sorrow that is in your hearts by refusing to participate in frivolous amusements. By every means that is legal and peaceful exert your efforts to bring about the repeal of those laws by which you, and your children after you, are being denied that treasure to be prized above all else, your freedom to worship God, your religious life.

On August 1 the vicar of Christ, our holy father, Pius XI, will lift his voice to the throne of God and, with him, Catholics in every part of the world, in prayer for the Mexican church. Let us join our voice to that of his holiness, to that of our brothers throughout the world, devoting this day to prayer and penance.

In conclusion, let us find comfort in those words which Jesus addressed to His apostles foretelling His death and resurrection: "Behold we go up to Jerusalem," where the things foretold by the prophets shall be accomplished, "and they shall mock Him and spit upon Him and scourge Him and kill Him; and the third day He shall rise again."

The life of the church is the life of her Divine Founder. Thus, beloved sons, the church of Mexico to-day is delivered up to her enemies; she is mocked and buffeted and treated with contempt. It seems that she must die, but she will rise again with a new life and vigor and having a splendor even greater than any she has had among us. Let this be your unflinching hope.

And now we conclude and give to you all our pastoral blessing, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

On the feast of the apostle, St. James, July 25, 1926.

(Signed by 8 archbishops and 28 bishops.)

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LEHTBACH, 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. 16576) 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, 1928, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADDRESS OF HON. OGDEN L. MILLS, OF NEW YORK

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the speech of my colleague [Mr. MILLS] made last Saturday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech recently made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the permission given me to-day, I insert herewith in the RECORD the very able speech of my colleague from New York, the Hon. OGDEN L. MILLS, which he delivered at the National Republican Club, New York City, Saturday, January 22, 1927.

The speech is as follows:

#### TAX REDUCTION

That the Federal Government will close the fiscal year 1927 with a substantial surplus has occasioned much talk of immediate tax revision and a demand by some groups that if Congress does not revise all tax schedules downward, we at least make certain specified cuts during the present session.

From some quarters has come a particularly insistent demand that the rate of the corporation income tax be reduced, on the ground that that rate was increased in the revision of 1926. The advocates of this particular reduction very conveniently forget that while the law of 1926 did raise the corporate income-tax rate, it at the same time repealed the capital-stock tax, so that, if anything, corporation taxes as a whole are somewhat lower to-day than they were a year ago. There is no basis in fact, therefore, for the charge that the taxes on corporations were increased at a time when other taxes were being reduced. I do not want to be understood to be opposed to revision of our corporation taxes—quite the contrary. But I think that that revision should take place after adequate study and as part of a general program. Furthermore, as a practical matter, an amendment to any part of the revenue law would bring the entire law before the Ways and Means Committee and the Congress for amendment. Once the door was opened, the demands of the other groups of taxpayers for reduction of their taxes would be equally insistent. Day by day propaganda and pressure would grow, until, having started to amend the law in one particular, the Congress, before it knew it, would find itself engaged in a general revision.

There should be no general revision at the present session of Congress. It should not take place until the full effects of the last revision are known and we are in a position to estimate with some degree of accuracy the normal revenues that may be anticipated from the existing law. That law has been in effect less than seven months, and the figures as to its yield are based on estimates rather than actual receipts for a full fiscal year. The revenue act of 1924 was not enacted until the act of 1921 had been in effect for over two years, while the revenue act of 1926 was not enacted until the last revision had been in effect for a full 12 months. This is a sound practice, which should not be departed from. Tax rates are not adjusted simply to meet the needs of a single year, but to cover the expenses of Government under normal conditions over a number of years. Any other system would necessitate constant raising and lowering of rates, with a consequent disturbance that would be most unfortunate from a business standpoint. Certainty is one of the prerequisites of a sound tax system. It is almost as important for the business man to know accurately what his tax liability is to be as that that liability shall not be excessive.

The mere fact that there is a surplus this fiscal year does not necessarily imply that there will be a surplus next year, though the best estimate that the Treasury can make at this time indicates a surplus for 1928 of approximately \$200,000,000. This is not an excessive margin of safety on a \$4,000,000,000 business, considering the real possibility of a falling off of revenue, accompanied by an increase in expenditures. A number of sources of income are available this year which will not be available next. For instance, we will collect some hundred million dollars less in back taxes and the revenue from estates will fall off by approximately \$37,000,000. This year the Government realized \$60,495,000 from the sale of farm-loan bonds, a nonrecurring item, and the Treasury estimates the receipts from the sale of railroad securities at \$15,670,000 less next year than this. Estimates made last fall indicate a total falling off in revenue of approximately \$250,000,000, and this, of course, doesn't take into consideration fluctuations arising from a slowing up of business activity. During the depression from 1919 to 1921 corporate taxes declined by \$378,000,000, while from 1924 to 1925 they increased by \$119,000,000. Changes in business conditions are immediately reflected in tax returns, and the fluctuations are by no means insignificant. The Treasury has to allow a margin of safety against these fluctuations, and \$200,000,000 is not an excessive margin.

Turning, now, to the expenditure side of the ledger, there is reason to anticipate an increase rather than a decrease. Under normal conditions, governmental expenditures have a constant tendency to rise.

There was an increase in the expenditures of the Federal Government of 139 per cent, from 1890 to 1915, and, while the policy of economy that has been strictly adhered to during the last few years has resulted in a gratifying decrease in the cost of government, my observation leads me to believe that the administrative cost of government has probably reached bed rock. The policy has been popular, but how long will it remain so? Judging by what is taking place in our States and municipalities, there is a very real danger that public sentiment may tire of retrenchment and demand expansion. Already, a strong movement in favor of the expenditure of large sums on vast public works is well under way; and when it comes to spending, Congress is very apt to be responsive to public demands. All of these factors must be given due weight in framing our revenue policies. Certainly, no responsible group of men can afford to brush them aside simply because at any given time an ample surplus for a single year is in sight.

It is these considerations that led the Ways and Means Committee to decide against tax revision at the present session of Congress, and to apply the surplus for the present fiscal year to the reduction of the national debt. As President Coolidge said, "That also is eventually tax reduction," a reduction which enures to the benefit of all classes of taxpayers.

There is some popular misconception as to surplus funds, and the charge has been made that the surplus will be allowed to accumulate and to carry over into the next fiscal year, and so be available for a sweeping tax reduction in a presidential year. This is not the case. Surplus funds are applied quarterly to debt reduction. Government obligations mature in September, December, March, and June of each year. If receipts at that time are exceeding expenditures chargeable against ordinary receipts, less new securities are sold than the amount of those maturing. This automatically reduces the outstanding debt, the process taking place from quarter to quarter as a normal part of Treasury financing.

I have said that the application of surplus revenues to debt reduction means a benefit to all taxpayers. There is, in the first place, the benefit derived from decreased interest charges in the immediate future. Thus, interest on the public debt decreased from approximately \$881,000,000 in 1925 to \$785,000,000 this year, or a saving of almost a hundred million dollars annually, effected over a period of 24 months by means of debt reduction. This saving in interest charges can only be brought about by retirement from surplus or from foreign repayments. Retirement through the sinking fund does not effect an immediate reduction in interest charges, since the amount appropriated for the sinking fund is increased each year by the amount of interest that would have been paid on the securities retired had they not been retired.

But the benefit to the taxpayers is not confined to an immediate reduction in interest charges. The early retirement of the public debt means an enormous saving in the total amount of interest to be paid during the life of the debt. To illustrate: On twenty-five billions of debt, bearing  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent interest, retired over a period of 25 years, we will pay a total of sixteen billions in interest. If the redemption period were extended to 30 years, we would have to pay an additional three and a half billions, and if, as has been suggested by some, the period of redemption were extended to 62 years, instead of paying \$16,000,000,000 in interest charges, we would pay over \$46,000,000,000. Or, in other words, we would have to raise an additional thirty billions in taxes to meet the interest charges.

It may be urged that raising money from taxes and paying it out again in interest is simply transferring funds from one pocket into another, since it all comes from the public and is returned to them, and this would be true, of course, if all taxpayers were bondholders. But as there are many more taxpayers than there are bondholders, and as the latter class tends to become more and more restricted, it is obviously for the benefit of the taxpayers to get the bonds out of the way at as early a date as possible.

Moreover, as Undersecretary of the Treasury Winston pointed out in a recent speech, the purchasing power of the dollar has very materially increased of late, and over the next quarter of a century will tend to increase even more. Our war obligations were incurred when the purchasing power of the dollar was worth 51 cents. To-day it has risen to 66 cents, though the obligations repaid during the course of the last seven years have been paid with a 56-cent dollar. The retirement of those obligations at a time when the purchasing power of the dollar was 56 cents, instead of retiring them to-day, when the purchasing power of the dollar is 66 cents, means that the taxpayers have benefited to the extent of \$600,000,000, or, in other words, that the dollar which they paid in was worth that much less to them than the dollar they would have been required to pay to-day. The bondholders, of course, have no complaint, since they loaned a dollar with a 51-cent purchasing power to the Government and they received in return a dollar with a purchasing power of 56 cents. Assuming that the purchasing power of the dollar will tend to rise, it is obvious, then, that it is of benefit to the taxpayers to retire these obligations at an early rather than at a later date.

There are those, of course, who will say that they would rather have the direct and immediate benefit resulting from lower taxes than these less obvious and indirect ones which I have described, and complain that the debt has already been reduced at too rapid a rate. To those gentlemen I would point out that we raised two and a half billion dollars less in taxes in 1926 than we did in 1920, so that debt retirement has hardly been allowed to interfere with tax reduction, and that during the last five years surplus funds applied to debt reduction include \$950,000,000 of proceeds from the sale of capital assets, and during the last three years \$400,000,000 of back taxes, a nonrecurring item. Few people will contend, I think, that the proceeds of the sale of capital assets should not be applied to debt reduction, rather than expended for current needs, and the same, to a less degree, is true of back tax payments, which, since they do not recur, can hardly be relied on for current purposes.

But the fact that it is unwise to undertake a general revision of our revenue laws at this time does not by any manner of means imply that we are not confronted with tax problems demanding serious consideration and ultimate settlement. They should be settled when our knowledge of the revenue situation is sufficiently established to justify a general revision. In the meanwhile, they should be the object of careful analysis and thoughtful study.

Our present taxes on corporations are largely the result of the war, and in so far as they have been modified in more recent years, the changes were made without the complete information which it is so essential to have when dealing with economic factors whose influences are not only far-reaching, but extremely powerful. The truth is we have been proceeding somewhat in the dark. In 1921 we repealed the excess-profits tax because, while attractive in theory, it had been found to be completely unworkable in practice; and, to make good the loss of revenue we increased the income-tax rate from 10 to  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent without giving very serious thought to what effects might result from the rate increase. Again, this year we repealed the capital-stock tax and undertook again to raise the income-tax rate without adequate consideration of the results of the change, though it was very clear that it would benefit some classes of corporations and be detrimental to others.

There is very real need, then, of a thorough survey of the corporation-tax field with a view to ascertaining whether the burden is excessive, from the standpoint of the prosperity of our industries; whether it is distributed with some degree of equity; where it ultimately rests; whether it is wise to tax all corporations, irrespective of their character, on the same basis and at the same rate; the extent of the discrimination between incorporated and unincorporated businesses; and, finally, whether the high rate of the corporation-income tax doesn't constitute serious discrimination against the small stockholder of moderate means. None of these questions can be answered off hand, and yet all of them should be answered before we finally commit ourselves to a permanent system of corporate taxation.

That serious discriminations have existed, and still exist, we all know, even if we are not in a position to measure their extent. For instance, there isn't any doubt but that under the high war-time surtax rates certain partnerships paid much higher taxes than they would have had the business been incorporated. To-day the position is reversed, though I rather fancy that even to-day this will depend on the circumstances in each particular case. Again, when we first adopted the income-tax system, there was a definite and proper relationship between the normal tax rate on individuals and the corporation tax rate; but now that the normal rate on individuals runs as low as  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, and doesn't exceed 5 per cent, while the corporation tax rate is fixed at  $13\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, that relationship has completely disappeared, and the exemption of dividends paid to the individual from the normal tax is inadequate to protect the stockholders from what is, in effect, severe double taxation. This is particularly serious in the case of the man of small means, whose capital is invested in the stock of a corporation, and who, according to the ability-to-pay principle, upon which our progressive income-tax structure rests, should be taxed at the low rate. He is actually taxed, through the corporation, at  $13\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, a rate which isn't reached on the entire income in the case of the personal income tax until we touch the \$80,000 class.

It must be remembered that we are not dealing with small and unimportant sums, but with payments which, even for a country as rich as ours, are large, and which must have a distinct influence on our economic life. Last year the Federal Government, through the corporate income and capital stock taxes, received from corporations approximately a billion dollars in taxes, while in 1923, all corporations paid as much as \$2,572,000,000 in taxes to Federal, State, and local governments. This last figure amounted to 2.2 per cent of their gross receipts, 3.5 per cent of their net assets, 27.75 per cent of their net income before deduction of taxes, and 61.7 per cent of the amount paid the stockholders in the form of cash dividends. In other words, for every dollar paid to the stockholders, the Government received almost 62 cents.

The second problem, and perhaps the most important one, that should engage our attention is that of State and local taxes, and

what, if anything, can be done by the Federal Government to relieve the serious situation which exists by restricting a more equitable distribution of the sources of revenue. The real tax problem in the United States to-day will be found in the county seat, city halls, and State capitols, rather than in Washington. Federal taxes have now been reduced to a point where, either from the standpoint of rates or of total volume, they no longer constitute an excessive burden for a Nation as rich as ours. Raising \$2,500,000,000 in internal revenue taxes by the Federal Government is not a problem of any magnitude, but in 1924 our States and localities raised by taxation \$4,612,000,000. From 1919 to 1924, Federal taxes were reduced by \$1,974,000,000 a year, while State and local increased \$1,847,000,000 and unquestionably are continuing to increase at a rate of probably not less than 10 per cent a year.

The seriousness of the problem arises not only because of the colossal sums of money involved but more particularly from the fact that our State and local tax systems are inequitable and unscientific. Generally speaking, Federal taxes are fairly well divided between direct and indirect, and give recognition to the principle of ability to pay. State and local, however, fall, to a very large extent, on one form of property—over 90 per cent of the \$3,478,000,000 of local taxes rest on real property—and disregard, to a very great extent, the ability of different classes of taxpayers to contribute to the support of government. Thus, in New York, for the calendar year 1924, the total State and local tax bill was \$679,000,000. Of this amount \$518,000,000, or 76 per cent, was raised by the general property tax. In New York City, it has been estimated that anywhere from two to three months' rent isn't rent at all, but taxes, a condition which is particularly burdensome where the supply of cheap housing facilities is limited, and where a tenement house problem exists. In the rural districts, taxes constitute one of the principal contributing factors to the high cost of production and consequently low profits. In New York, property taxes are consuming from 30 to 50 per cent of net income from property in the prosperous agricultural sections of the State. What is true in New York is unquestionably true throughout the country. It constitutes the real tax problem in the United States.

It has recently been suggested in New York that we aggravate this situation by reducing our State income tax and making up the loss in revenue through the imposition of a gasoline tax. I can find no justification for such a proposal. With the present exemptions, the income tax is paid by a comparatively small number of people. The rate is already low. In many instances the tax represents the only contribution made by these individuals to the support of their State and local governments. To substitute for a low, direct tax on a limited and, on the whole, well-to-do class, a consumption tax on an article in general use, is a proposition that doesn't commend itself to my sense of equity or to sound tax principles.

But, it will be said, what can the Federal Government do to remedy such a situation? It is unquestionably true that there are many tax resources which the States and localities have not as yet made use of, that they have not developed truly modern systems of taxation, that conservatism has led them to cling to too great reliance on the general property tax, and that the latter has completely broken down, in so far as intangible wealth is concerned, which means that in those States which have not as yet adopted the income tax, or what is known as the classified property tax, real property bears the bulk of the burden. While it is true, therefore, that the States could do much to help themselves, first, by a drastic program of economy and, secondly, by a more thorough development of their available tax resources, in so far as the latter is concerned, they are limited by the attitude and position of the Federal Government. Thus it was very difficult for any State fully to develop an income system of taxation for the purpose of reaching intangible wealth as long as the Federal Government insisted on taxing incomes at the excessive rates that have prevailed up to this year. It is equally true that the States in imposing taxes on corporations must, from a sense of equity if nothing else, take note of the fact that the Federal Government is imposing a tax of 13½ per cent on their net income, and should the Federal Government find it possible in the future to moderate the rate, it would to that extent increase the freedom of action of State and local governments. Then there are estate and inheritance taxes, which by tradition and legal theory belong to the States. A Federal inheritance or estate tax has never been imposed in this country except during a war emergency, and there is not the least doubt in my mind that our present Federal estate tax should have been completely repealed a year ago, thus making this exceedingly valuable and fruitful source of revenue available to our State governments. There are other tax bases that could be discussed in considering a proper apportionment of resources between the Federal and State and local governments, but these will, I think, serve to illustrate the nature of the problem.

Finally, there is the much-discussed question of simplification of our tax laws, to which, I think, the select committee will unquestionably devote considerable attention, together with that other very desirable ideal, the prompt and certain administration of the law. Personally, I have grave doubts as to whether a truly simple tax

law can be written. Theoretically, it is easy enough to do so, but as a matter of practice it presents enormous difficulties. The sums involved are very large, the situations that arise are not only infinite in their variety but in their possible complexities, and while exact justice is impossible that degree of equity and fairness which we have a right to insist on in each individual case will be lacking if the law is written in general language, invoking rule-of-thumb methods and a rough system of justice which will hit fairly a majority of the cases but inflict intolerable injustice on a great number of exceptional cases. The complexities in our present tax system are due to our desire to protect the taxpayer and to our unwillingness to give any degree of discretion to our administrative officers. The first is, of course, entirely commendable; in so far as the second is concerned, I think we are in error. This distrust not only results in making the law complex but is responsible to a very large extent for those delays which have occasioned so much complaint and so much confusion. If a simple tax law is too much to hope for, a simplified administration is not. It will come, I think, by placing more authority and discretion in the administrative officers, by paying them adequate salaries and insuring them a long tenure of office, and finally by a program of decentralization which will permit the adjustment of many disputed cases at the home offices of the taxpayers rather than referring them all to a central bureau in Washington.

#### THE ELLIOTT BILL, H. R. 13450

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on H. R. 13450, widows' pensions. The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the Sixty-ninth Congress, it is fitting and proper to commemorate the valor and bravery of the soldiers of this Republic who served their country during the dark days of the sixties, when in their young manhood they defended and saved this Government, by relieving and increasing the pensions of their widows, who have been neglected by Congress until their numbers are few and their bodies are bent with age and infirmity, and they are reduced to poverty and want. The present law is not sufficient. The \$50 per month given to the widows of the Civil War veterans applies only to those who were wives of the veterans during that awful struggle. Congress has overlooked the fact that a great majority of that splendid army was unmarried young men, who married immediately after the close of that awful conflict. Some of their widows are now more than 80 years of age, and destitute and helpless, and yet the Government of which we boast only allows them the pittance of \$30 per month.

House bill No. 13450, known as the Elliott bill, now before the House, is fair and just. By its provisions the widows of the Civil War veterans, who married prior to 1905, are allowed \$50 per month. This bill was unanimously reported by the Invalid Pensions Committee, of which I am a member, after due consideration, with the belief that this House and the Senate would realize the justness of such a bill and would pass it as an emergency measure. I am proud of the fact that this Congress has been reasonably fair to our soldiers, their widows, and orphans of all the wars, and it is to be commended for it, yet it has not gone far enough with some pension legislation. It has failed to place the aged soldiers of different wars on an equality. I can see no good reason why a Spanish-American War veteran, who has reached the age of 75 years or more and is old and helpless and dependent should not receive the same pay as a Civil War veteran who is of the same age and the same physical condition. I have introduced a bill at this session of Congress seeking to place both classes of soldiers on an equality.

The World War veterans should receive more compensation, and each soldier should be allowed a pension who is now destitute and unable to earn a support and whose income is not sufficient to maintain him, whether his disability is of service origin or not, according to the degree of his disability, not the result of his own vicious habits. I introduced a bill, H. R. 15416, for their benefit, allowing such soldiers pensions along the lines suggested.

We are spending millions along other lines. Why not remember the destitute soldiers, their widows, and orphans?

I regard the passage of this bill as an emergency measure, because the widows benefited by the provisions of this bill are dying rapidly and will all soon pass away within the next few years, and if anything is to be done for them, in the name of the helpless and aged ones, in the name of the heroes of the sixties, who are resting over yonder, who have obeyed the last command of the Great General of the universe, in the name of humanity and justice, do it now. I beg you to pass this bill for the benefit of these destitute and helpless widows of the

Civil War, not so much as an act of charity but because it is right.

During my service in Congress, I have tried to do all I could for the soldiers of all the wars, their widows and orphans; I have been their friend. I only regret I could not do more. When I retire to private life, I will still be their friend, and will continue the fight for them, firmly believing that my Government will not neglect them—its heroes, who have so nobly defended it on the land and on the sea, at home and abroad, and that their widows and orphans will be provided for after the heroes of the Republic have been called to answer the roll in the Great Beyond, and that my Government will be loyal to them and see to it that they are not neglected or forgotten: Our deeds will be judged by a righteous Judge

At a place, we know not where,
A time, we know not when,
The Great God Divine in justice there
Will judge the deeds of men.

A vote for this bill could be no mistake. It is an act and deed on the side of justice and right, by which we will not fear to be judged.

I hope this bill will pass.

INCOME AND CORPORATION TAXES

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with personal-income and corporation taxes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in connection with personal-income and corporation taxes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the permission granted me of extending my remarks on income and corporation taxes is availed of herewith in presenting a Treasury circular containing the latest compilation on that interesting subject:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Internal Revenue Bureau.

Comparative statement of income tax (separated as to corporation and individual) collected during the calendar years 1925 and 1926

Table with columns for States, Corporation, Individual, Total for 1925 and 1926. Includes a summary section for income tax by calendar year and quarter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn. The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 26, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following list of committee hearings scheduled for Wednesday, January 26, 1927, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

(10 a. m.)

Relating to labor of certain watchmen and building guards (H. R. 13217).

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

(10 a. m., room 246)

Authorizing a survey of the Caloosahatchee River drainage area, in Florida, and a survey of Lake Okeechobee and certain territory bordering its shores in Florida (H. R. 16622).



COMMITTEE ON ELECTION OF PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, AND REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS

(10.30 a. m.)

To amend Federal corrupt practices act, 1925 (H. R. 15341).

COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

(10 a. m.)

To amend an act entitled "An act to provide relief in cases of contracts connected with the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1919, as amended (S. 3641).

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

(10.30 a. m.)

To provide for the erection of a National Guard armory in the District of Columbia as a memorial to those who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during times of war (H. R. 8122).

Authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury in carrying into effect the provisions of section 3 of the public building act to acquire a site for a post-office building in each of the cities of West Point, Ga., and Lannett, Ala., in lieu of the site heretofore acquired by the Government for the post-office building authorized to be located on the State line of these two cities, and cause to be erected, respectively, within the extended limit of cost fixed by Congress in said section (H. R. 12366).

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

(10 a. m.)

To hear Members of Congress on bills introduced by them which would provide loans to soldiers on their certificates.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

(10.30 a. m.)

To provide for the protection, development, and utilization of the public lands in Alaska by establishing an adequate system for grazing livestock thereon (S. 3963).

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To provide for the preservation, completion, maintenance, operation, and use of the United States Muscle Shoals project for war, navigation, and fertilizer manufacture, electric-power production, and other purposes, and, in connection therewith, the incorporation of the Farmers' Federated Fertilizer Corporation and the lease to it of the said project (H. R. 16396).

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

Legislative appropriation bill.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

902. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, for salaries of the judges of the supreme court and court of appeals, District of Columbia, amounting to \$26,500 (H. Doc. No. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

903. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Employees' Compensation Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, amounting to \$2,400 (H. Doc. No. 666); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1640. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a national arboretum, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1855). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McLEOD: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 15347. A bill to reorganize the office of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1858). 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. BOX: Committee on Claims. S. 1339. An act for the relief of Katherine Southerland; with amendment (Rept. No. 1856). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9163. A bill for the relief of Margaret T. Head; with amendment (Rept. No. 1857). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14602) granting an increase of pension to Kate A. Hickey, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 16647) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HOLADAY: A bill (H. R. 16648) to provide for a system of voluntary registration by certain aliens who desire to become citizens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAGRADY: A bill (H. R. 16649) to extend the time for construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River in Northumberland and Snyder Counties, State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 16650) to promote the efficiency of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 16651) authorizing an addition to the Cache National Forest, Idaho; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 16652) granting the consent of Congress to the Lawrenceburg (Ind.) Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, operate, and maintain a bridge across the Miami River between Lawrenceburg, Dearborn County, Ind., and a point in Hamilton County, Ohio, near Columbia Park, Hamilton County, Ohio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RATHBONE: A bill (H. R. 16653) to regulate the practice of medicine and midwifery in the District of Columbia, and to punish persons violating the provisions thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ARENTZ: A bill (H. R. 16654) to authorize the remodeling of the building occupied by the United States mint and assay office at Carson City, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 16655) to authorize the designation of persons to act for disbursing officers and others charged with the disbursement of public moneys of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RATHBONE: A bill (H. R. 16656) to establish a national war memorial museum and veterans' headquarters in the building known as Ford's Theater; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 16657) to enable the National Capital Park and Planning Commission to cooperate with the States of Maryland or Virginia in acquiring land for extension of the National Capital park and parkway system in these States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GARRETT of Texas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 339) authorizing the Secretary of War to award a Nicaraguan campaign badge to Capt. James P. Williams, in recognition of his services to the United States in the Nicaraguan campaign of 1912 and 1913; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 47) desiring to withdraw all obstacles in the way of the Republic of China's realization of her national aspirations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 48) creating a special joint committee to investigate what further employment is desirable for Federal prisoners in the United States penitentiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: Resolution (H. Res. 396) to survey the Federal parole system; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. KAHN: Resolution (H. Res. 397) to provide an attendant for the cloakroom of the women Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADKINS: A bill (H. R. 16658) to amend the military record of Robert Zink; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16659) granting a pension to Robert Zink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16660) granting an increase of pension to Hester Lynes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 16661) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Mark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 16662) granting a pension to Augusta Cornog; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COCHRAN: A bill (H. R. 16663) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Hoerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLEN: A bill (H. R. 16664) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Fowler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ESLICK: A bill (H. R. 16665) granting a pension to S. H. C. Springer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 16666) for the relief of Luke Merrick and Charles J. Anderson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLEAR: A bill (H. R. 16667) for the relief of Rudolph Nehring; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 16668) to extend the provisions of the retirement laws for the Lighthouse Service to include James L. Weems, a former employee of the Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALL of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 16669) granting annuities to those who underwent the experiments for yellow fever in Cuba and their widows; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 16670) granting a pension to Mary L. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16671) granting a pension to Nancy C. Whitesell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16672) granting an increase of pension to David Phillips, alias Charles Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H. R. 16673) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Fouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 16674) for the relief of Rolla Duncan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 16675) for the relief of Louis H. Harmon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORROW: A bill (H. R. 16676) granting an increase of pension to Estefana Deacy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 16677) granting an increase of pension to Milley Vaniter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16678) granting an increase of pension to Mary Hogan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 16679) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Pardue; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16680) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Ladd; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16681) granting a pension to Amanda Baker Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOLVERTON: A bill (H. R. 16682) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Dailey; 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:

5618. By Mr. ARENTZ: Petition of Parent-Teachers' Association of Pioche, Nev., urging the passage of a bill for the public protection of maternity and infancy, and providing a method of cooperation by the Government of the United States and the several States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5619. Also, petition of Mrs. Ann E. Bean, urging early passage of Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5620. By Mr. CELLER: Petition of citizens of New York City, urging the disposition of Muscle Shoals at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5621. By Mr. ESLICK: Petition of Mrs. Alice C. Evans, C. D. Evans, and others, requesting Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5622. By Mr. FREDERICKS: Petition of California Society, Sons of the Revolution, Exchange Club of Hollywood, and Los Angeles Unit, United Veterans of the Republic, asking for vote on bill for retirement of disabled emergency Army officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5623. By Mr. FRENCH: Petition protesting against the enactment of House bill 10311 by the citizens of Caldwell, Idaho, and vicinity; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5624. By Mr. GIFFORD: Petition of 167 residents of Plymouth and Kingston, Mass., favoring legislation for the control of radio broadcasting; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5625. By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of a number of voters of Everett, Wash., urging further relief for Civil War veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5626. Also, petition of a number of voters of King County, Wash., urging further relief for Civil War veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5627. By Mr. HALL of Indiana: Petition of Mrs. Hazel Huckery and 60 other citizens of Marion, Ind., requesting immediate steps to secure a vote on an increase in Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5628. By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Petition of certain citizens of Terre Haute, Ind., for increase of Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5629. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Henry B. Gilpin Co. and Gilbert Bros. & Co., Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5630. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of 24 ex-service men, patients at the United States Veterans' Hospital No. 55, Fort Bayard, N. Mex., asking for the repeal of paragraph 3 of subsection 7 of section 202 of the Reed-Johnson Act passed in June, 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5631. By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: Petition signed by C. C. McCasky and others, of Columbia, Mo., in behalf of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5632. By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of W. R. Donohoo and 117 others, of Pearl, Ill., favoring Civil War pension bill containing rates proposed by the National Tribune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5633. By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: Petition of Pearl E. Jones, Bert Toole, and others, of Spencer County, Ind., that the bill increasing the pension of Civil War widows be enacted into law at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5634. By Mr. STALKER: Petition signed by sundry citizens of Ithaca, N. Y., urging the passage of a Civil War pension bill for Civil War veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5635. By Mr. SWING: Petition of certain residents of Hemet, Calif., protesting against the passage of any bills relating to the observance of Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5636. By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: Petition of residents of Ionia, Mich., requesting pension legislation for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5637. By Mr. WOODYARD: Petitions of citizens of Barboursville, W. Va., favoring pension legislation relative to Civil War soldiers and widows of soldiers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### SENATE

WEDNESDAY, January 26, 1927

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 25, 1927)

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Fess	La Follette	Robinson, Ind.
Bayard	Fletcher	Lenroot	Sackett
Bingham	Frazier	McKellar	Schall
Blease	George	McLean	Sheppard
Borah	Glass	McMaster	Shipstead
Bratton	Goff	McNary	Shortridge
Broussard	Gooding	Mayfield	Smith
Cameron	Gould	Means	Smoot
Capper	Greene	Metcalf	Steck
Caraway	Hale	Neely	Stephens
Copeland	Harris	Norbeck	Stewart
Couzens	Harrison	Nye	Trammell
Curtis	Hawes	Oddie	Tyson
Dale	Heflin	Overman	Wadsworth
Deneen	Howell	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.
Dill	Johnson	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Edge	Jones, Wash.	Pine	Warren
Edwards	Kendrick	Reed, Mo.	Watson
Ernst	Keyes	Reed, Pa.	Wheeler
Ferris	King	Robinson, Ark.	Willis