

2992. Also, petition of E. Mary Agnor and other citizens, of Owego, N. Y., urging the passage of a Civil War pension bill for an increase in pension for the veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2993. Also, petition of M. H. Taylor, of Elmira, N. Y., and other citizens of that vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2994. Also, petition of J. E. Belknap and others, of Tioga County, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2995. By Mr. SWING: Petition of citizens of Riverside, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2996. Also, petition of citizens of Imperial County, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2997. By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition requesting favorable action on the National Tribune's Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2998. By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: Petition of 65 residents of Saginaw, Mich., in support of legislation increasing the rate of pension of Civil War veterans and widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2999. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Blairsville Chamber of Commerce, advocating legislation to reduce Federal income tax to the amount of \$400,000,000, as recommended by the business organizations of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3000. Also, resolution of the Joint Association of Postal Employees, favoring passage of House bill 25 and Senate bill 1727, known as Dale-Lehlbach bill; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3001. Also, petition of American Manufacturers' Export Association, indorsing House bill 9195, Cuban parcel post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3002. Also, petition of American Dental Association, indorsing House bill 5766; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3003. Also, petition of Shoe Polish Manufacturers' Association of America, indorsing Senate bill 1418 and House bill 11; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3004. Also, petition of Gettysburg Aerie, No. 1562, Fraternal Order of Eagles, advocating legislation to make adequate appropriation to maintain the Gettysburg National Military Park in a creditable condition; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3005. Also, petition of Waynesboro Chamber of Commerce, advocating legislation placing postal rates on a permanent, more equitable, and sound basis; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3006. By Mr. WATSON: Resolutions passed by the James E. Hyatt Council, No. 127, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, favoring House bill 5473, "To provide for the registration of aliens, and other purposes"; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3007. Also, resolution passed at meeting of Joint Association of Postal Employees, favoring passage of House bill 25, known as the Dale-Lehlbach bill; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3008. Also, resolution passed by Washington Camp, No. 523, Patriotic Order Sons of America, Trooper, Pa., favoring restricted immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3009. By Mr. YON: Petition signed by C. J. Rider, Bay County, Fla., and 19 other citizens, protesting against the passage of the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3010. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Frank M. Dillon, requesting an amendment to the retirement act so as to increase the maximum annuity; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

SENATE

THURSDAY, February 2, 1928

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 1, 1928)

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6491) to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and

monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the order adopted by the Senate on January 24, 1901, the Chair designates the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] to read Washington's Farewell Address to the Senate on the 22d instant.

PERRY'S VICTORY MEMORIAL COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 47)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1929, for Perry's Victory Memorial Commission, amounting to \$14,374, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement of the business of the company for the year ended December 31, 1927, together with a list of stockholders, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations of the company for the year ended December 31, 1927, together with a list of stockholders, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations of the company for the year ended December 31, 1927, together with a list of stockholders, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON INTERURBAN RAILROAD CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the Washington Interurban Railroad Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations of the company for the year ended December 31, 1927, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. SHORTRIDGE presented memorials of sundry citizens of the State of California, remonstrating against the passage of the bill (H. R. 6465) to amend the immigration act of 1924 by making the quota provisions thereof applicable to Mexico, Cuba, Canada, and the countries of continental America and adjacent islands, and favoring amendment of the existing immigration law in such manner as to prevent a shortage of farm laborers, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BLAINE presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Wisconsin, praying for certain changes in postal rates, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. FESS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Stark and Columbiana Counties, Ohio, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DENEEN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Chicago and Mount Vernon, in the State of Illinois, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. ASHURST, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6466) granting a part of the Federal building site at Phoenix, Ariz., to the city of Phoenix for street purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 203) thereon.

Mr. DALE, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bill and joint resolution, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2554) granting the consent of Congress to the cities of Atchison and Leavenworth, Kans., the city of St. Joseph, Mo., and the counties of Buchanan and Platte, Mo., their successors or assigns, to construct a bridge across the Missouri River, or to acquire existing bridges (Rept. No. 204); and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 104) granting consent of Congress to an agreement or compact entered into between the State of New York and the State of Vermont for the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission, and to construct,

maintain, and operate a highway bridge across Lake Champlain (Rept. No. 205).

Mr. DALE also, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1498) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Chesapeake Bay, and to fix the location of said bridge (Rept. No. 206);

A bill (S. 2188) granting the consent of Congress to Frank M. Burruss, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Miami, Saline County, Mo. (Rept. No. 207);

A bill (S. 2476) granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River on the Lafayette-Celina road, in Clay County, Tenn. (Rept. No. 208);

A bill (S. 2478) granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Decatur-Kingston road, in Roane County, Tenn. (Rept. No. 209);

A bill (H. R. 2479) granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Jasper-Chattanooga road, in Marion County, Tenn. (Rept. No. 210);

A bill (S. 2480) granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Knoxville-Maryville road, in Knox County, Tenn. (Rept. No. 211);

A bill (S. 2496) granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River on the Dover-Clarksville road, in Stewart County, Tenn. (Rept. No. 212);

A bill (S. 2666) granting the consent of Congress to the Madison Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Madison, Jefferson County, Ind. (Rept. No. 213); and

A bill (H. R. 6099) granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Lake Champlain between Crown Point, N. Y., and Chimney Point, Vt. (Rept. No. 214).

Mr. DALE also, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 797) granting the consent of Congress to the J. K. Mahone Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Wellsburg, W. Va. (Rept. No. 215);

A bill (S. 798) granting the consent of Congress to the R. V. Reger Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near New Cumberland, Hancock County, W. Va. (Rept. No. 216);

A bill (S. 1879) granting the consent of Congress to the Interstate Bridge Co., of Lansing, Iowa, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at Lansing, Iowa (Rept. No. 217);

A bill (S. 2189) granting the consent of Congress to F. C. Barnhill, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Arrow Rock, Saline County, Mo. (Rept. No. 218);

A bill (S. 2257) granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Coosa River near Wetumpka, Elmore County, Ala. (Rept. No. 219);

A bill (S. 2343) extending the time for completing the construction of the bridge across the Mississippi River in Ramsey and Hennepin Counties, Minn. (Rept. No. 220);

A bill (S. 2477) granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee for the construction of a bridge across the Clinch River on the Sneedville-Rogersville road in Hancock County, Tenn. (Rept. No. 221);

A bill (S. 2483) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River connecting the county of Carroll, Ill., and the county of Jackson, Iowa, at or near the city of Savanna, Ill. (Rept. No. 222); and

A bill (S. 2490) granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Paris-Dover road in Henry and Stewart Counties, Tenn. (Rept. No. 223).

Mr. WILLIS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions, to which was referred the bill (S. 2787) providing for the appointment of governors of the non-Christian Provinces in the Philippine Islands by the governor general without the consent of the Philippine Senate, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 224) thereon.

Mr. WATSON, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 83) authorizing an investigation of public-utility corporations, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 225) thereon.

REPORT OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I ask leave to submit a report from the Committee on Printing, and request its immediate consideration. It concerns the annual report of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am very sorry, but I must object to this matter and ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the receipt of the report?

Mr. COPELAND. Not at all. I have no objection to the receipt of the report, but I want no action taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received.

Mr. BINGHAM, from the Committee on Printing, reported a resolution (S. Res. 130), as follows:

Resolved, That the Thirtieth Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1927, be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. COPELAND subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning I objected to the consideration of a resolution reported by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM]. I wish to withdraw the objection and hope that the resolution will be acted on.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, as the Senator from New York is so kind, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Resolution 130, reported by the Committee on Printing, providing for the printing of the Thirtieth Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, may be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SCHALL:

A bill (S. 2979) amending an act entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BLAINE:

A bill (S. 2980) providing for pensions for Indians in old age; and

A bill (S. 2981) providing aid for Indians who are blind or blind and deaf; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 2982) authorizing the Secretary of Labor to provide for the construction, equipment, maintenance, repair, and operation of Government dormitories for women employees of the United States in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 2983) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. H. Fisher (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 2984) for the relief of Ella S. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 2985) for the relief of Otto F. Schroder; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Pennsylvania:

A bill (S. 2986) for the relief of Francis J. McDonald; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SACKETT (for Mr. GOFF):

A bill (S. 2987) granting an increase of pension to Lourana Patterson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PINE:

A bill (S. 2988) for the relief of Charles J. Hunt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 2989) for the relief of John B. Moss; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2990) to provide for the paving of the Government road extending from Lee & Gordon's mill to La Fayette, Ga., known as the La Fayette extension and constituting an approach road to Chattanooga and Chickamauga National Military Park; and

A bill (S. 2991) to provide for the paving of the Government road extending from Chattanooga and Chickamauga National Military Park in the State of Georgia to the town of Ringgold, Ga., constituting an approach road to the Chattanooga and Chickamauga National Military Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

A bill (S. 2992) authorizing an appropriation for improving road in the Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENEEN:

A bill (S. 2993) granting a pension to Hilda L. Patch; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALE:

A bill (S. 2994) granting a pension to Angelina H. Fortier Regan (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 2995) for the relief of Alfred L. Diebolt, sr., and Alfred L. Diebolt, jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 89) designating May 1 as child health day; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6491) to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

COMPILATION OF SENATE ELECTION CASES

Mr. SHORTRIDGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 131), which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections hereby is authorized and directed to have compiled and printed as a document a revised edition of the document entitled "Compilation of Senate Election Cases," bringing the same down to the close of the Sixty-ninth Congress.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On January 31, 1928:

S. 1801. An act in reference to writs of error.

On February 1, 1928:

S. 1798. An act concerning actions on account of death or personal injury within places under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States.

NICARAGUA AND OUR GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I present an article from the Century Magazine for February, 1928, entitled "Nicaragua and the policy our Government has pursued," by Moorfield Storey, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

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

NICARAGUA AND THE POLICY OUR GOVERNMENT HAS PURSUED

By Moorfield Storey

From every point of view our own interests—moral, political, and economic—are vitally affected by our relations with Nicaragua and our other weak neighbors. To the south of us are 20 Republics with an area more than twice that of the United States, an area which is one of the great food-supply regions of the world, and must soon become a vast market for manufactured goods, with a population of nearly 100,000,000 people, proud, sensitive, and patriotic. As the leading power in this great hemisphere, we are bound to set before them the highest standard of respect for law and consideration for their rights. "It is excellent to have a giant's strength," but it is barbarous to abuse it. We are under every obligation to respect the sovereignty of these Republics and to build up that confidence and foster that friendship which inevitably spring from right conduct upon the part of a strong nation. We owe these peoples the same respect and the same consideration that we pay to the greatest and most powerful nations.

The policy which has been pursued during the last year by our Government violates at once the Constitution of the United States and fixed principles of international law.

The Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress shall have power, among other things, "to declare war, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy." This power is vested in Congress and not in the President, because the people of the United States supply the soldiers who do the fighting. It is their husbands, their sons, their brothers who are called upon to risk their lives in

battle, and they have never given any man the power to involve them in war without the consent of their Representatives assembled in Congress. If, therefore, the President feels that there is an occasion for using military force in a foreign country, he is bound first to get the authority of Congress, and must not carry on war himself or create a situation where war is the only alternative.

It is no excuse that the President believes that certain things are beneficial. He has no right to exercise any power not given to him, or to decide the question of war or peace, which is expressly committed to Congress. He is not entitled to decide for this country whether acts of war are beneficial or not. It is for Congress to decide the policy of the country. The President's powers are executive, not legislative.

The fact that the Constitution makes the President Commander in Chief of the Army gives him no power to say when and how the Army shall be used, as that is a question for Congress. After Congress has decided that an army be called into the field the President may command it, but he can not determine whether it shall go into the field, for that power is in Congress.

At a time when our minister to England, Mr. Houghton, contends that war should not be declared except by vote of the people themselves, we certainly ought not to tolerate a course of dealing which takes from Congress the power to determine whether war is necessary, and permits it to be usurped by the President.

The rules of international law which regulate the relations between this country and its weaker neighbors have been settled by our own statesmen. When Mr. Elihu Root was Secretary of State he visited South America to attend the Pan American Congress at Rio de Janeiro and to assure those countries as to the policy and purpose of the United States he said: "We consider that the independence and equal rights of the smallest and weakest member of the family of nations deserve as much respect as those of the great empires. We pretend to no right, privilege, or power that we do not freely concede to each one of the American Republics."

When the Pan American Congress was held in Washington in January, 1906, Mr. Lansing, afterward Secretary of State; Mr. Root, who was the former Secretary of State, and Dr. James Brown Scott, one of our leading authorities on international law, framed for the American Institute of International Law the "Declaration of Rights of Nations." This declaration was adopted unanimously by the Pan American Congress and has the following passages:

"Every nation has the right to territory within defined boundaries, and to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over this territory and all persons, whether native or foreign, found therein.

"Every nation entitled to a right by the law of nations is entitled to have that right respected and protected by all other nations, for right and duty are correlative, and the right of one is the duty of all to observe."

It is not necessary to go further in order to determine the rules of international law. These are the rules formulated by a congress to which we and our smaller neighbors were parties in order to regulate our respective rights. From this proposition there is no escape.

The President, without consulting Congress, although it was in session at the time, sent into the territory of Nicaragua, a country with which we were at peace, a large force of marines, a considerable squadron of warships under the command of an American admiral, and a number of airplanes for use in scattering bombs. And as a result of this in one battle there were killed somewhat more than 300 Nicaraguans and a few of our marines.

What are the facts which caused this action? The President did not take the public into his confidence but was content with the statement that it was necessary to protect American lives and property, without going into particulars and telling his countrymen what interests were affected, whether any had been injured, and to what dangers they were exposed. On the contrary, he took the ground that the press and people of the United States were bound to support his action without questioning his rights or his wisdom. The statement of facts which follows has been gathered from other sources, and if there is any inaccuracy the President can not complain, since he does not tell us what the facts are.

In 1850 the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was signed by the United States and Great Britain, providing for a neutral canal across Nicaragua, which country was not consulted. America's interest, therefore, in Nicaragua dates back almost three-quarters of a century, but as time went on the joint interest with Great Britain in the canal was no longer favored. The United States adopted a policy of obtaining an interest of its own. Zelaya opposed the efforts of the United States to extend its control over Nicaragua by obtaining new concessions, and as a result in 1909 a revolution was started by the Conservatives in Nicaragua against President Zelaya, who belonged to the Liberal Party. That insurrection was on the point of being crushed when the United States intervened on the ground that two Americans, Groce and Cannon, had been murdered by Zelaya; and as a result Zelaya was expelled and a man of very high cultivation and intellect, Dr. José Madriz, succeeded him. But the United States, not satisfied with this, forced out Madriz and established the Conservatives in power. The Govern-

ment at that time controlled the whole country with the exception of the port of Bluefields, which was occupied by the revolutionists.

In 1912 Gen. Luis Mena began a revolution, and although himself a Conservative, was backed by the Liberals. The uprising became so general that the overthrow of the Government which the American Government was backing seemed imminent; whereupon between 1,500 and 2,000 United States marines were dispatched to Nicaragua on the pretext of protecting American life and property. They fulfilled this duty by fighting side by side with the Government troops, to whom they supplied the necessary arms and ammunition. Thus the Liberals were killed off by thousands with slight loss to us.

When the control of Nicaragua had been secured in this way, the American flag was hoisted on the Nicaragua "White House," and presidential elections were called. As our diplomatic representative agreed to Conservative candidates only, the Liberal Party, composed of about 75 per cent of the people, refused to vote. Nevertheless, we held these elections to be valid, and the elected Government is still being maintained in power by the presence of the American marines quartered in the "White House" at Managua, the Capital of Nicaragua. There is no question whatever that our troops kept the administration in power, and this is confirmed by Lieut. Col. Charles G. Long, one of our commanding officers, on November 18, 1912, who said in his report: "The Liberals constitute three-fourths of the country. The present Government is not in power by the will of the people."

This revolution against the Government which opposed the designs of the United States was financed to the extent of \$600,000 by Adolfo Diaz, now the so-called Conservative President, at that time a local official of La Luz & Los Angeles Mining Co., an American corporation, who was receiving a salary of \$1,000 a year. A provisional government was established and at its head was a general by the name of Estrada who favored the policies of the United States. He was bitterly opposed by the people of Nicaragua, but was sustained in office solely by our support for the purpose of floating a loan and the control of customs to secure that loan.

In May, 1911, Estrada resigned in favor of Vice President Adolfo Diaz in regard to which the American minister wired the State Department, "A war vessel is necessary for the moral effect." In the meanwhile through the good offices of the Department of State a small loan of \$1,500,000, afterward increased to \$2,500,000, was placed with New York bankers. The proceeds were used to establish a national bank in Nicaragua and to pay off some of the most pressing claims; and by this device, with the consent of our Government, a strong financial interest in Nicaragua was secured by Americans which could be used as an excuse for interference. The policy of refusing to recognize Nicaraguan governments that were not controlled by American interests and actively supporting the governments backed by American interests became well established.

The present difficulty began in 1923 with the death of President Chamorro who was succeeded by Vice President Martinez. Martinez had his own personal ambitions which were not backed by his associates, and as a result Carlos Solorzano, a Conservative, was selected as the nominee for President and Juan Bautista Sacasa, a Liberal, for Vice President. Meanwhile the regular Conservative Party met in convention and nominated Emiliano Chamorro, and the Liberal Party named Dr. Luis Corea.

The new coalition government composed of Solorzano and Sacasa entered office on January 1, 1925, and was duly recognized by the United States. Later Solorzano retired and Sacasa was driven out. On November 14, 1926, there having been various governments which the United States declined to recognize, Adolfo Diaz was inaugurated as President. President Diaz upon his inauguration addressed a note to the United States Government requesting its guidance, cooperation, and aid in restoring peace and order. He declared that he could easily control the situation if it were not for the hostile attitude of the Government of Mexico, which also imperiled the interests of Americans and foreigners in Nicaragua and threatened what he described as the "continental equilibrium." And at the conclusion of his note he said: "I desire to manifest to you at the same time that whatever may be the means chosen by the Department of State, they will meet with the approval of my absolute confidence in the high spirit of justice of the Government of the United States."

Three days later the United States recognized the Diaz government. The following day it was announced by the State Department at Washington that Diaz had asked for American assistance to protect American and foreign lives and property, and on December 18 he stated that he expected this assistance when he took office, and depended on it to retain it. The United States was privy to the movement which put Diaz in power, and his cry for help was expected. After this events moved steadily and rapidly. Having planted a strong military and naval force in Nicaragua which could overcome any resistance that Nicaraguans could offer, the President sent down Henry L. Stimson, not an officer of the United States confirmed by the Senate, but the personal representative of the President, who wrote the following letter to Gen. José Moncada, commander in chief of the forces opposed to Diaz:

"DEAR GENERAL MONCADA: Confirming our conversation of this morning, I have the honor to inform you that I am authorized to say that the President of the United States intends to accept the request of the Nicaraguan Government to supervise the elections in 1928; that retention of President Diaz during the remainder of his term is regarded as necessary for the proper and successful conduct of such elections, and that the forces of the United States are authorized to accept the custody of the arms of those who are willing to lay them down, including the Government's, and to disarm forcibly those who will not do so.

"Very respectfully,

"HENRY L. STIMSON."

The Associated Press dispatch from Washington, under date of May 6, made this report:

"A truce until to-morrow to enable General Moncada, Liberal commander in chief, to try to persuade his followers to surrender their arms to American marines was disclosed in the State Department announcement made public to-night.

* The eight conditions enumerated by Mr. Stimson as governing the suppression of civil war, made no reference to any threat on his part that American marines would disarm any Liberal troops which failed to turn in their weapons. In a message dated yesterday, however, Mr. Stimson expressed the hope there would be disarmament except for possible small groups of 'irreconcilables and bandits.'

"The program, as Mr. Stimson now views it, may be outlined as follows: 1. Complete disarmament on both sides. 2. An immediate general peace to permit the planting for the new crop in June. 3. A general amnesty to all persons in rebellion or exile. 4. The return of all occupied or confiscated property to its owners. 5. Participation in the Diaz cabinet by representative Liberals. 6. Organization of a Nicaraguan constabulary of a nonpartisan basis, commanded by American officers. 7. American supervision of the 1928 election. 8. The continuance temporarily in the country of a sufficient force of American marines to guarantee order pending the organization of the constabulary."

It is interesting to quote this statement from Mr. Stimson:

"My investigation has shown that this evil of government domination of elections lies, and has always lain, at the root of the Nicaraguan problem. Owing to the fact that a government once in power habitually perpetuates itself or its party in such power by controlling the election, revolutions had become inevitable and chronic, for by revolution alone can a party once in control of the government be dispossessed. All persons of every party with whom I have talked, admit the existence of this evil and its inevitable results; and all of them have expressed an earnest desire for the supervision of election by the United States in an attempt to get rid of the evil forever."

On what theory our troops are to be used may be gathered from the following:

"The organization of a nonpartisan constabulary, under the instruction and command of American officers, is further suggested by President Diaz, who, in this connection, asks for the continuance in Nicaragua of a sufficient portion of our present naval force to insure order pending the organization of the constabulary.

"References in dispatches from Nicaragua to the use of American troops to disarm Liberals may be in relation to this aspect of the peace terms, since they would impose on the American forces the duty of policing Nicaragua and suppressing any group that remained in arms until such time as the new constabulary should be ready to assume its duties. The status of the American marines in such circumstances, however, would be that of a police force temporarily lent to the Nicaraguan Government and acting by warrant of Nicaragua law in maintaining order in that country."

American soldiers can not become Nicaraguan policemen by warrant of Nicaraguan law. The only law which governs them is the law of their own country.

In a word, under pretense of protecting American property we take charge of Nicaragua, keep Diaz, whom we have been upholding, in power, and are to see that the new government elected next year will be chosen under the bayonets of our marines lent as policemen to a foreign government.

Mr. Stimson, in his letter says, "I am authorized to say that the President of the United States intends to accept the request of the Nicaraguan Government to supervise the elections of 1928."

The Congress of the United States was in session when this interference in Nicaragua was begun; it will be in session before the election in 1928, but Congress is not to be consulted. The President of the United States, exercising sole authority, using the military power and the money of this country, and acting through his personal representative, has taken control of an independent country and proposes to hold it.

There is not in the letter or the spirit of the Constitution anything which authorizes this action, there is no principle of international law which justifies this invasion and subjection of an independent people. It is a pure tyrannical usurpation of power, and it must be recognized as such. Behind it may be, and it would seem must be, American interests which ask the President's support. The people pay, the

interests profit, and the President receives their support. It is time that usurpations such as these were characterized as they deserve, and that Congress asserted the rights of the American people and protected the rights of friendly nations from such abuse.

The President in his speech defending his course says that "while it is a well-established international law that we have no right to interfere in the purely domestic affairs of other nations in their dealings with their own citizens, it is equally well established that our Government has certain rights over and certain duties toward our own citizens and their property wherever they may be located. The persons and property of its citizens are a part of the domain of the Nation even when abroad." What an absurd contention is this! Were it true we should only have to get a citizen or body of citizens to buy land in some other country and thereby add it to our domain. For such simple method of annexation there is no precedent. Contrast this statement with the rule laid down by our eminent statesmen which has already been quoted, that "every nation has the right to territory within defined boundaries, and to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over this territory, and all persons, whether native or foreign, found therein."

It is worth while to observe that the President counts on the request of the Government of Nicaragua. Does this mean that Diaz is in power to-day as our representative and as our agent?

Now that our force is in control of Nicaragua, our Army and Navy in its territory, its President in power only by our support, the morning paper, as I write, informs us that "President Coolidge sends messages of congratulation to five Central American Republics on the event of the anniversary of their independence. The messages were addressed to Presidents Ricardo Jimenez, Costa Rica; Miguel Paz Baraona, Honduras; Pio Romero Bosque, Salvador; Lazaro Chacon, Guatemala; and Adolfo Diaz, of Nicaragua." Can self-deception go further?

It is perhaps interesting to add that a scathing denunciation of the policies of the United States toward the countries of Latin America by Horace G. Knowles, former American minister to Rumania, Serbia, Bulgaria, Nicaragua, Dominican Republic, and Bolivia, enlivened Prof. William R. Shepherd's recent round-table session on "self-determination in Latin America."

"Our national policy," he charged, "has always been to take all we can from them and to give as little as possible to them. We have a long arm for taking and a short arm for giving. Instead of sending them teachers, instructors, and helpers, we have sent concession hunters, conscienceless and usurious bankers, avaricious capitalists, bribers, commercial tricksters, murderers, soldiers to shoot them, degenerates, and carriers of loathsome infectious diseases." Mr. Knowles said he was ready to prove these assertions.

Professor Borchard, a lawyer of eminence, who is very familiar with the Caribbean policy and who has been the Assistant Solicitor of the State Department, states the case accurately, as follows: "We must frankly recognize that the rights of small States and of government by consent of the governed, of which we have recently heard so much, have never been a consideration or factor in our Caribbean policy, nor has the social regeneration of a backward people, who constitute the bulk of the population, yet had any tangible manifestations."

The readiness with which the most civilized governments adopt the claims of their citizens against other nations, and the extent to which these claims shrink when put to the test may be illustrated by the statement made by the Hon. Wayne MacVeagh some years ago. He dealt with the claims presented to arbitration commissions for allowance between the year 1868 and 1892, and with the claims presented to commissions by Great Britain, the United States, France, Spain, Mexico, and Chile, countries which he stated were fairly represented by the civilized nations. The figures are very striking. To the commission constituted July 4, 1868, to settle the claims presented by the United States against Mexico, and Mexico against the United States, the United States presented claims for \$470,126,613.40, and the total amount awarded was \$4,125,622.20, a little less than nine-tenths of 1 per cent. Mexico presented claims for \$86,661,891.15—the cents in each case showing the extraordinary accuracy with which the figures were made up—and the amount allowed was \$150,498.41, about sixteen hundredths of 1 per cent.

By the commission appointed on the 8th of May, 1871, certain claims growing out of the Civil War were considered. Great Britain presented claims against the United States amounting to \$96,000,000, and the amount awarded was \$1,929,819, about 2 per cent. Claims presented by the United States against Great Britain amounted to \$1,000,000, on which not one cent was allowed.

Before another commission Spain presented claims amounting to \$30,313,581.32, and the amount awarded was \$1,293,450.55, about 4 per cent. To a joint commission to settle claims between France and the United States, France presented claims amounting to \$17,368,151.27 and received an allowance of \$625,566.35, the percentage of allowance being about 3.6 per cent. The United States presented claims against France amounting to \$2,747,544.99, and the amount allowed was \$13,659.14, an allowance of about one-half of 1 per cent. Taking all the commissions together, the total amount presented was over \$719,000,000, and the total allowance was less than \$8,500,000.

Had it not been for arbitration, it is probable that these great countries would have gone to war to collect the preposterous claims of their citizens, and well did Mr. MacVeagh say, "You sow military force against a weak and defenseless state and you reap injustice." With these figures before us, does it not become us to move slowly and be sure of our ground in international controversy? The fable of the wolf and the lamb is not without its application to such cases.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WARREN. I ask that the pending appropriation bill be now proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 9481) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the bill under consideration carries appropriations for the executive offices and some of the independent executive bureaus, boards, and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929. When the bill came from the House it carried appropriations amounting to \$539,593,111. This exceeded the appropriations for the same executive offices, bureaus, boards, and commissions for the fiscal year 1928 by \$5,684,697.

This is only one of a considerable number of general appropriation bills that are to become law before this session of Congress adjourns. And in addition there will be a multitude of laws enacted which will carry in the aggregate hundreds of millions of dollars additional. It is too early in the session to predict with any degree of certainty what the sum total of the appropriations for the next fiscal year will be, but the indications are that the direct and indirect appropriations will aggregate between four and five billion dollars. It is certain that the appropriations for the next fiscal year will exceed by a very large sum the expenditures of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928. These mounting figures indicate that if the Republicans are continued in power the costs of government will be increasingly greater as the years go by.

There is nothing to justify the claims of the party in power that it has given to the people an efficient and economic administration. There has been a persistent effort upon the part of Republican leaders and the Republican press to convince the people that the Republican administration has practiced economies and given to the country a high standard of efficiency. That success has attended these efforts is apparent. Much of the popularity of President Coolidge has resulted from the belief widely entertained that his administration has inaugurated reforms and effected economies in all branches of the Government.

Mr. President, in my opinion, there is no foundation whatever upon which to rest this claim of economy or efficiency; political propaganda has misled the people. Many of them have ascribed to the administration virtues which it does not possess and achievements which vanish like fleeting shadows when the light of investigation is thrown upon them.

During the last Democratic administration our country participated in the greatest war of all time. It mobilized more than four and one-half millions of men and transported more than 2,000,000 to European shores; it accomplished a task the most gigantic ever undertaken by any country or people. To accomplish this stupendous work billions of dollars were required. President Wilson and those charged with legislative responsibilities determined that a large part of the expenses required to carry on the war should be met from current revenues, even though heavy taxes were imposed upon the people.

A revenue system was devised and taxes laid which brought billions of dollars into the Treasury of the United States, but, large as the income of the Government was, it was insufficient to meet the military expenses. Accordingly bonds were issued to the extent of more than \$25,000,000,000. When hostilities ceased the administration applied itself with energy to the demobilization of the armies and the restoration of the affairs of the country to a peace-time basis.

The reactions following the war and misrepresentations made enabled the Republicans to gain control of the Government and Mr. Harding became President of the United States. In the campaign preceding his election the air was charged with misrepresentations by Republican orators and Republican newspapers. The claim was made that the Wilson administration had been inefficient and extravagant, and the Republicans solemnly assured the country that they would, if intrusted with power, inaugurate an efficient administrative system, abolish bureaus and executive agencies, commissions, and instrumentalities, consolidate Federal agencies, and decrease the personnel to peace-time limits. These promises were accepted

by the people as though they were genuine and fooled millions of voters into supporting the Republican Party. But when that party came into power it ignored these pre-election promises and solemn declarations; it abolished no bureaus or commissions or agencies, but, upon the contrary, increased the number. There have been no consolidations or reorganizations of departments and executive agencies, and no administrative reforms have been effected. The number of Federal employees exceeds by tens of thousands the personnel of the Federal Government in 1916.

The administrative expenses of the Government are greater now than under the Democratic administration, except during the limited period when the United States was participating in the World War. Economy does not characterize the present administration or executive departments. Every executive department, bureau, commission, and agency is reaching out for more power and is increasing its expenses and multiplying its personnel. The cry of economy has served its purpose. It has deceived the people and has aided the Republicans in winning elections. The people have been made to believe that the Coolidge administration has expended less per annum than was expended when the Democrats were in power from 1913 to the period when the United States entered the war.

When it has been shown that during the past five or six years Congress, extravagant as it has been, appropriated less than recommended by the President, the people have taken no cognizance of that fact and have set up an idol to worship, performing their devotions before an impalpable and invisible symbol which they think represents the executive power or form of the Government.

Mr. President, the appropriations for the coming fiscal year will be greater than for the present year, and it is safe to predict that if the Republican Party remains in power, the Federal Government will become more highly centralized, more powerful, more overbearing; and as its power increases and its authority is asserted, its demands for more departments, bureaus, commissions, executive agencies, and boards will increase and its expenditures will annually be enlarged.

It is the duty of executive departments to execute the laws enacted by the legislative branch of the Government, but under the present practice some executive departments and some in the army of officials and employees in executive departments expend a portion of their energy and time in devising new plans and schemes to increase the power of the Federal Government and to frame measures restrictive of the States and aggrandizing the National Government. A persistent effort is made by executive agencies to rob the States of their sovereignty and to submerge them under the rising tide of a destructive federalism.

If time permitted I could point out the triumphant and ruthless march of the Federal Government trampling down individual rights and State authority. In every part of the land voices are lifted in behalf of the Federal Government; the people are conjured to transfer from themselves and from the sovereign States the authority and power which they possess. It is certain that the Government established by the fathers is being materially modified. The centralizing tendencies were never so manifest and never so powerful as at present. The States are being assaulted; their sovereign powers are being taken from them.

The unitary theory of government is gaining ground; the lines bounding States are being obliterated and more and more they are being reduced to shadowy forms; their life, vitality, and vigor being destroyed by the increasingly powerful Federal Government. William Penn declared that—

Governments, like clocks, go from motion men give them; and as governments are made and moved by men, so by them they are ruined, too. Therefore governments rather depend upon men, than men upon governments.

And the people seduced by the gifts and gratuities and bounties of the Federal Government or intimidated by its formidable power surrender their individual rights and the prerogatives and sovereignty of their States and look with indifference upon the ever-increasing force exercised by the National Government. Students of history and those familiar with the philosophy of government will have no difficulty in determining the future of this Republic if it continues its abortive processes. The States as centers of democratic strength and power, as fountains pouring forth pure waters of democracy, will lose their identity, their vitality, their energizing spirit. They will be swallowed up in the all-embracing federalism, and as their authority is destroyed the initiative and vigor of individuals will be weakened.

Mr. President, in view of the persistent claims of Republicans that economy has characterized their administration since Mr. Harding's election, I desire to invite attention to a few figures

which will, in my opinion, negative the claims which they put forth. To show the enormous increase in the expenditures of the National Government I invite attention to figures which ought to arrest the attention of those who are interested in our Government.

In 1873 the entire expenses of the Federal Government were \$330,000,000. In 1890 they were \$395,000,000. In 1900 the National Budget carried \$698,000,000. In 1910 the national expenditures were \$1,044,000,000. In 1916, after the Democrats had been in power for a number of years, the total expenses of the National Government were \$1,114,490,706. In 1917 even after the United States had entered the World War the appropriations were \$1,628,000,000. During 1918 and 1919 the appropriations were, of course, necessarily very great. In 1920 they were \$6,454,000,000. In 1921 the Federal appropriations amounted to more than \$4,704,000,000. In each of the years 1922, 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927 the Federal expenses exceeded \$4,000,000,000.

It is too early to determine what the expenditures of the Government will be for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928. Not all of the appropriation bills providing for the ordinary expenses for the Government have been prepared; and it is certain that other measures will be passed before the adjournment which will call for stupendous sums. Bills are now before committees of the House and Senate calling for \$125,000,000 for the Boulder Dam project. I am advised that a bill will soon be reported to the Senate dealing with the so-called Columbia River project. It is not approved by the executive department of the Government and the data available show how impracticable is the scheme. This project will involve an expenditure of between three hundred and five hundred million dollars.

The St. Lawrence River project has powerful support and will require a billion dollars from the Federal Treasury. The demands for so-called flood control will undoubtedly be responded to by Congress, with the result that hundreds of millions of dollars will be required. Numerous other measures are pending before committees of the House and Senate which, in the aggregate, call for appropriations amounting to billions of dollars.

Many of the pending bills are supported by active organizations and forceful agitators and propagandists. Even States, and political subdivisions therein, are importuning Congress to enact laws which will infringe upon the rights of the States and absolve them from obligations which, under our dual form of government, belong to the States or to their political subdivisions alone. It is depressing to those who believe in our form of government, in the sovereignty of the States, and the independence of the individual, to witness the growth of paternalism and the increasingly powerful current which is sweeping the States into the maelstrom of a dangerous, if not despotic, federalism.

We hear much of mass production, of giantism and bigness in business, of huge consolidations and mergers of corporations, of trusts and monopolies, and their control of business. The people are dazzled with the almost astronomical figures employed in measuring the wealth of individuals and corporations. There seems to be a disposition to accept as a proper formula for economic, as well as political, guidance the statement that modern conditions require giantism and bigness in every line and field of business endeavor; that the day of small business has passed; and that individualism and the fine spirit of democracy must yield to the centripetal forces which standardize and consolidate.

The revolt against monopolies and trusts, resulting in the Sherman antitrust law and Clayton Act, seems to have subsided, or at least its voice seems inarticulate and paralyzed. Gigantic mergers in various lines of business are of almost daily occurrence. They are defended upon economic grounds, and the contention is made that competition is unwise and anachronistic. Accordingly billions of capital are employed in huge mergers and consolidations. The man or corporation with limited means is absorbed or destroyed by the advancing hosts of big business, which leave behind them the mangled remains of thousands of individuals who have been crushed beneath this modern juggernaut. Powerful movements, whether political, economic, or religious, have their repercussions in substantially all activities of the people.

If capital is massed, and huge consolidations and trusts control the economic and industrial activities of a nation, a materialistic atmosphere will be created. The thoughts and lives of the people will be largely shaped by the economic and business policies superimposed by dominating capitalistic forces. Little by little the resentment and fears of the people will be allayed unless the oppression become so great that a revolution will be precipitated. Consolidation of wealth in the hands of a few and the development of the mechanical system which seeks

the greatest possible production though individualism is destroyed, will, if continued, destroy democracy, individual initiative and independence, produce a condition of mental and moral inertia upon the part of the people that will lead to the destruction of political freedom.

The consolidation of wealth leads to the centralization of political and governmental authority. If the wealth of the country is controlled by the few, the political power of the many will be weakened and the central government will expand its authority until the citadels of democracy are destroyed. There is a growing disposition upon the part of the people of our country to shirk the duties and responsibilities imposed by a democratic government and to transfer from the people and the States the responsibilities and the power which belong to them. The States are being devitalized and local political units exhibit a depressing form of atrophy.

Students of history do not fail to discover analogies, if not parallels, in the life of this Republic and powerful nations of the past whose melancholy fate historians portray. The aggressions of the executive departments in our Government and the expanding power of our National Government no longer provoke serious opposition and resentment upon the part of the people. Indeed, too often they covet Federal interference and seek to uncrown themselves and despoil their sovereign States of prerogatives and power, which they bear as captives of old did their involuntary gifts to lay at the feet of their conqueror. The highest form of liberty can only be enjoyed where there is the highest form of democracy. Liberty is not always lost through political machinations. More frequently it is stolen from the people through the machinations of wealth.

When we have learned to reverence liberty as well as wealth we shall have a renaissance of democracy with all its beauty and glory.

Mr. Andre Siegfried has recently written a book entitled "America Comes of Age," which presents some views concerning our country and its institutions worthy of consideration. He refers to the use of machinery or "standardization, and to intensive division and organization of labor, resulting in a supercollectivism" which he declares is a "grave risk for the individual." He declares that the "integrity of the individual is seriously threatened not only as a producer but as a consumer as well."

He refers to the fact that American workmen may have a house, a bath, and a car, and he fears that these are obtained "at a tragic price—no less than the transformation of millions of workmen into automatons." He calls attention to some forms of American industry which result in the standardization of the workman himself, so that artisanship has no place in the New World, and that its disappearance there has dissipated "certain conceptions of mankind which Europeans consider the very basis of civilization." He declares that "to express his own personality through his creative efforts is the ambition of every Frenchman, but it is incompatible with mass production." He further states that—

once it is admitted that their conception of society is materialistic in spite of the idealism of its leaders, it is only logical that the doctrine of efficiency should become the central idea of the country. Today in America no sacrifice is too great to be endured for this sacred principle. There is no possible escape. Big profits overshadow liberty in all its forms, and the exercise of intelligence is encouraged only if it fits in with this common aim. Anyone who turns aside to dabble in research or dilettantism is regarded as almost mentally perverted. Hence a growing tendency to reduce all virtues to the primordial ideal of conformity. * * * An important transformation of society results from this concentration of energy on the one supreme object of mass production.

The individual, having become a means rather than an end, accepts his rôle of cog in the immense machine without giving a passing thought to the effect on his personality. Religion, also enrolled in the movement, exalts production as an ideal akin to the mysticism of life and of human progress. The ideal of "service" sanctifies this collaboration and its superb material rewards. Caught between the atrophied individual and the overdisciplined community, the family finds its field of action greatly restricted; for in the eyes of the apostles of efficiency the family is regarded as a barrier impeding the current.

Mr. Siegfried refers to the tendency of American society to "adopt an aspect of practical collectiveness which is subtly undermining the liberty of individuals and restricting his outlook to such an extent that without so much as regretting or realizing it he himself assents to his own abnegation."

The views of this acute critic may be extreme and perhaps inaccurate. Undoubtedly they will be resented by many Americans. I submit, however, that our industrial and economic situation is influencing—if not determining—our political views and shaping our political institutions. The sources controlling

trade, commerce, business, industrial, and economic conditions direct and drive the thoughts of the people into materialistic channels. More and more our lives are influenced by capitalistic views and these in turn modify—if they do not change—our political views and those noble ideals and principles of democracy that exist only when the true spirit of democracy prevails in political, social, and industrial activities.

These observations are somewhat foreign to what I was discussing and yet they are not irrelevant, or wholly disassociated from the subject of Federal expenditures, and the growing disposition of the people to shirk individual responsibility and place upon governmental agencies, State and national, solemn responsibilities and duties which, if shirked by individuals will bring inevitable evils, the consequences of which will be most serious. The abdication of personal and individual responsibility is a dangerous step in the direction of bureaucracy and paternalism. There is developing in the United States an oppressive State and municipal bureaucracy; and Federal bureaucracy and paternalism are marching forward with ruthless and destructive consequences.

The remarkable increase in the burdens of taxation and in governmental expenditures are manifestations of both bureaucracy and paternalism. They are evidences of the assumption by either States or National Government of duties belonging to individuals or local communities. An examination of the endless list of departments, bureaus, commissions, divisions, and organizations, both in States and in the Federal Government, furnish conclusive evidence of the powerful bureaucratic forces which govern the people by statute or by administrative measures and regulations, the number of which is so great as to be unknown to the people. No longer, it has been said, is this a Government of law, but a Government by bureaucrats who promulgate rules and regulations penal in character and oppressive in their operation.

I referred to the great increase in Federal expenditures. Permit me to further direct attention to this subject. The National Industrial Conference Board has done important service in publishing a number of volumes dealing with the cost of government in the United States. I have before me the volume issued in 1926, as well as the one issued in 1927. These volumes are worthy of study and should receive the attention of Senators and Congressmen, as well as the attention of members of the various State legislatures. The figures presented show the enormous increase in the cost of government, the stupendous amounts expended annually by cities, counties, and States, as well as the Federal Government.

In the introduction to the 1927 volume reference is made to the rapid expansion of public expenditures, and the question is suggested as to the possibility of securing a more active public interest in and control over physical forces. It is stated on page 9 of this volume that the total gross expenditures of the United States and the States and their local subdivisions for the year 1890 were \$855,000,000 (of this amount the Federal Government expenditures were \$291,000,000). In 1913 the expenditures were \$2,919,000,000; in 1923, \$10,265,000,000; in 1924, \$10,983,000,000; in 1925, \$11,124,000,000.

The expenditures for 1926 and 1927 are greater than those for 1925. The public expenditures during the fiscal year ended in 1925 were 8.4 per cent higher than for the fiscal year ended in 1923, and 281.1 per cent above the expenditures of 1913. The per capita tax in 1890 for Federal, State, and local purposes was \$13.65. In 1925 it was \$96.41. The tax for each person gainfully employed in 1890 was \$36.67, whereas in 1925 it was \$259.24. On the basis of the number of persons gainfully employed, there was an increase in the taxes between 1913 and 1925 of more than 246 per cent. It may be remarked that the military functions of our Government absorbed more than 30 per cent of the funds derived from ordinary receipts between 1920 and 1923. Substantially the same proportion was devoted to military expenditures in 1924, 1925, 1926, and 1927.

It is not improper to remark that the heavy taxes imposed upon the people have been inadequate to meet national, State, and municipal expenses. The result has been that the bonded indebtedness of both Federal and State Governments and their political subdivisions has been greatly increased. In 1913 the combined State and local bonded indebtedness amounted to \$3,196,000,000. In 1925 this had been increased to \$9,865,000,000. In 1923 the States and their political subdivisions issued bonds to the amount of \$1,043,118,000, and in 1926 to \$1,365,057,000.

The total interest-bearing debt of the United States before we entered the war was \$1,023,000,000. The present outstanding indebtedness of the Government is approximately \$18,000,000,000.

This enormous sum bears interest as do the bonds issued by the States and their political subdivisions. The total annual interest charges which the Federal Government and the States and their political subdivisions are required to meet, exceed

\$2,000,000,000. The outstanding indebtedness approximating \$30,000,000,000, together with the interest payments that must be met, constitute a heavy burden which the taxpayers of the United States are required to meet. But the increasing costs of Government, the extravagance, and inefficiency characterizing both National and State administration, should awaken the most serious thoughts in the minds of the people and cause apprehension as to the future of our Republic.

But, Mr. President, the knowledge of this huge indebtedness does not restrain either the Federal Government or the States and the municipalities or curb their expenditures. The expenses of the Federal Government for the fiscal year 1929 will, as I have stated, exceed those for the present fiscal year. In my opinion, the appropriations for the next fiscal year by the National and State Governments and their political subdivisions, will exceed \$12,000,000,000. This sum will amount to approximately 16 per cent of the gross earnings of all the people of the United States.

A burden so great will constitute an obstacle to prosperity and will arrest the economic and industrial development of our country. Substantially all taxes ultimately rest upon the great masses of the people. The bowed back of labor, like Atlas of old, bears the burdens of the Government. It is the farmer, the laboring man, the real producer who finally pay the taxes and meet the expenses of the Government.

Mr. President, I protest against the extravagant appropriations which have been made by the present Congress, and the program outlined by the majority party which will call for billions of dollars to be provided for before we adjourn in June. It is a time for economy and for the enforcement of drastic provisions calling for the reduction of the expenses of the General Government. Instead of increasing the bureaus and executive agencies and the number of employees, Congress should abolish many bureaus and Federal commissions and agencies and consolidate others and reduce the personnel by at least 150,000.

Greater efficiency is required in the administration of the affairs of the Government. Many Federal agencies could be dispensed with to the advantage of the Government. Instead of decreasing Federal expenses we are increasing them.

The Republican Party loudly declared in the campaign of 1920 that it would soon return to normalcy; that it would reduce the number of employees to the extent of hundreds of thousands and reach the pre-war level, that it would bring about reforms in administrative procedure that would greatly reduce taxes and make for more efficient administration. These declarations were for political purposes, as I have stated. They were not uttered in sincerity; it was not believed that they would be fulfilled. We are now confronted with demands from the party in power for appropriations for the next fiscal year which will be more than four times as great as the entire expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

If the Republicans continue in power, there will be no relief from tax burdens. The Republican leaders, when Congress met in December, stated that the first important measure to be enacted into law would be one reducing taxes. Indeed, before Congress met, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House was engaged in the preparation of what was called a revenue bill which would reduce taxes. It passed the House containing many obnoxious features, but the Republican majority in the Senate promptly pigeonholed the bill. Whether it will be permitted to emerge from the musty recesses of the Finance Committee I shall not attempt to say. Certain it is that in no event will there be any substantial reduction in the revenues which are to be collected from the people for the next fiscal year.

Mr. President, I should have stated in connection with the figures submitted showing the expenditures made by States and their political subdivisions that under our dual form of government they have the greatest responsibilities. The States are sovereign and they deal with those matters which fall within the category of internal and domestic affairs. The scope of the National Government is limited, and its expenses should be materially less than those of the States and the municipalities therein. But as I have heretofore said, the Federal Government is reaching out and taking over prerogatives and duties belonging to the States and to the local subdivisions therein.

Upon a number of occasions I have challenged the attention of the Senate to the usurpations of the Federal Government, to the improper, unwarranted, and, indeed, in many instances, unconstitutional measures enacted by it, pursuant to which individual and State rights have been interfered with if not destroyed. I have also expressed the hope that there would be an awakening upon the part of the people to the dangers that will inevitably result if the General Government shall con-

tinue its invasions of the rights of the States and its interference with the liberties and authority of individuals therein. I have urged that the people organize to protect themselves from Federal aggressions and to compel retrenchment, reform, and economy in both Federal and State Governments.

The American people will soon perceive the fact, if they have not learned it yet, that the power to tax is the power to destroy; they will learn sooner or later that to compound the States into one mass, controlled by Federal authority, will destroy their sovereignty and change the form of this Republic.

I regret that the Democratic Party, which has always been the champion of individual liberty, of the maintenance of local self-government, of the preservation of the States in all of their vigor and authority, has been and now is too complacent in the face of this new federalism which is a menace to liberty. If the Democratic Party has a mission, it is to preserve individual liberty and those personal rights for which patriots have ever contended and which tyrants have ever resisted. But there are Democrats who seem to forget the principles of Jefferson; the political philosophy which he expounded; the immortal principles of which he is the ablest exponent. The Democrats in my opinion, should oppose with the utmost vehemence these centralizing movements, the bureaucratic and paternalistic policies which are sapping the vitality of the States and effecting the courage and independence and initiative of the citizens of the sovereign States.

I repeat that the greatest question before the American people to-day relates to the preservation of the States and the protection of individual rights. I have examined many of the bills which have been offered in both branches of Congress during this and preceding sessions for the past 10 years. It is my belief from such examination that a majority of the measures of importance which have been offered have had for their object the extension of the authority of the National Government, and their enactment has had the result of weakening the power and authority of the States. Many of these measures have sought to curtail the liberties and freedom of the people and to project the Federal Government into the internal and domestic affairs of both the States and the families and individuals therein.

We need to-day some mighty leader who will arouse the people to the dangers from Federal usurpations, and who will lead them to the uplands where the shining light of liberty and justice and equality will illumine their pathway and guide their footsteps.

Mr. President, there is no danger to this Republic from any foreign power. Whatever dangers there are come from within. President Masaryk, of the Czechoslovak Republic, one of the great statesmen of Europe and a profound historian, states that "there is democracy and democracy"; and declares that genuine democracy should be economic and social, as well as political—

to proclaim and practice the equality of all citizens; to recognize that all are free and hold inwardly and outwardly the human principle of fraternity is as much a moral as political innovation.

Mr. President, if this Republic should ever fall it will not be because of enemies from without, but because of the lack of fidelity upon the part of the people to the principles of democracy and to the ideals of the founders of this Nation. It is essential that a proper equilibrium be maintained between the States (local self-government) and the National Government. If the States are absorbed by the Federal Government, that equilibrium is destroyed. Many nations which developed democratic institutions and a fair degree of personal liberty, have been destroyed because the centralizing forces, both political and financial, become too powerful. When wealth controls the policies of a government, it obtains political power, weakens local political units, and creates a highly centralized government. And governments of this character tend toward further centralization, if not absolutism. They become imperialistic, and one of the never-failing concomitants of imperialism is militarism. There may be economic imperialism, the subjugation, or at least the control through economic forces, of other governments and alien peoples. But economic imperialism inevitably develops more ugly forms of imperialism and they are supported by military governments.

Students of the historical development of this Republic will not fail to observe the powerful currents that result in atrophying the States and transferring to the General Government authority and prerogatives which belong to the former. In some countries there are movements toward decentralization of political power and the development of democracy with increased personal and individual liberty. I am opposed to the enormous appropriations which the Federal Government is making, because no inconsiderable portion of the same is devoted

to increasing the authority of the General Government at the expense of the States.

Moreover many appropriations are mere subsidies to the States and create a feeling of dependence upon the part of the people upon the bounties and favors of the Federal Government. In this manner the process of Federal absorption will be more rapid until sooner or later we will have a top-heavy paternalistic, if not an oppressive, Federal Government beneath which the ruins of States and local self-government will be found.

I have indicated one of the symptoms of approaching imperialism is found in demands for enormous military expenditures. For months the country has been resounding with the cries and demands of orators for hundreds of millions of dollars to be expended during the coming year for so-called military preparedness. The Executive department has submitted a Budget which calls for approximately \$800,000,000 for the ordinary expenses alone of the Army and Navy for the next fiscal year. This huge sum is nearly as much as was expended in 1916 to meet all expenses of the Federal Government. And yet when we are at peace with the world, except as we are carrying on war in Nicaragua, and governing Haiti by our bayonets and military forces.

We are asked by the President to appropriate nearly a billion dollars for the ordinary expenses of the Army and the Navy. And in addition to this request, Congress is asked to provide for the construction of 71 war vessels, the cost of which will exceed \$1,000,000,000. Additional sums will also be requested by the Executive department to replace war vessels and to elevate guns upon a number of our capital ships. If these demands are acceded to by Congress, there will be appropriated for military purposes approximately \$1,000,000,000 for the next year, and authorized appropriations of more than \$1,000,000,000. No nation in the history of the world in peace times expended for military purposes as much as the United States will expend during the next fiscal year. In my opinion, we are not justified in adopting a military policy requiring appropriations of such stupendous amounts. We are claiming to be a peace-loving Nation and are constantly avowing our devotion to peace and our hatred of all forms of militarism and imperialism. We need not be surprised if there are persons in other countries who are not disposed to give full faith and credit to our peaceful declarations. Some of them manifest great incredulity and do not hesitate to aver that our professions of peace and international good will do not entirely harmonize with our military activities.

There is no reason for this military outburst in the United States, nor for appropriations direct and authorized for military purposes totaling more than two billions of dollars. Who would dare to state that this Republic is menaced by any nation in the Western Hemisphere? Canada and the United States are bound together by enduring ties of friendship. Latin American states desire the friendship of this Republic and are willing to walk hand in hand with this Republic along the paths of peace and toward the goal of world fellowship.

The English-speaking people throughout the world feel a kinship with the people of this Nation. There are ties of consanguinity as well as of affinity. There can be no conflict between us and Great Britain. The Orient presents no menace to our peace; no danger to our security. It is true there are chauvinists and agitators within our borders, who, from time to time, seek to arouse animosities between the United States and Japan, but they will not succeed. The people of Japan are entering upon a democratic era and realize that they must have peace and opportunity for economic development. They are averse to war and would welcome the establishment of cordial and enduring relations between their country and all countries of the world. The United States is in a position to lead all nations along the highway of international fellowship. The people of the world will be glad to have the United States hold aloft the banner of peace and they will willingly follow in our footsteps.

Mr. President, we must put true and noble human qualities into politics and administration of state. That is one of the problems of democracy. Of course, we are national, "but the more national we are," as was stated by President Masaryk, "the more human we shall be, and the more human, the more national." "Humanity requires positive love of one's own people and fatherland and repudiates hatred of other peoples." Palachy, the great Czech patriot, in speaking to his countrymen, declared that the counsel he "bequeathed them" was that—

whenever we have triumphed it has been more by the might of the spirit than by physical power, and whenever we were vanquished it was through the lack of spiritual vigor more than lack of courage and bold-

ness * * *. Not until we conquer and rule under the power of the spirit in the struggle Providence has laid upon us from time immemorial, can we be sure of a lasting peace.

Mr. President, in my opinion it is an incipient spirit of militarism and imperialism that keeps us in the Philippine Islands and in Haiti. The Filipinos desire independence and we deny it to them. It is their country, not ours. The longer we remain in those far-off islands the more difficult will it be for us to withdraw. American economic interests will demand that the United States retain the Philippine Archipelago, and their demands, I fear, will be heeded. Imperialism, no matter in what form it appears, finds a multitude of pretexts and plausible reasons for its conduct. The Filipinos, imperialism says, are a backward race and need the strong hand of this Republic to guide them.

In my opinion the verdict of history will condemn the United States for its military operations in Nicaragua. War is being waged in Nicaragua to-day. There was no sufficient reason for landing American marines and carrying military operations against any of the political factions or groups of that country. But our mission there is a "peaceful" one; we are there in the interest of "justice" and to establish "democracy." We are in Nicaragua with guns and bayonets to show our love and affection for the people and to discharge "obligations" owing to that country!

I believe that our policy in Santo Domingo and Haiti was wrong. We were not justified in seizing either of those countries and superimposing upon them American military rule. In so doing we aroused resentments in all Latin-American countries and at the same time excited the fears of many of the people therein.

Many of the people believed that this Republic was embarking upon an imperialistic policy, and that it intended to extend its political power over weak and unoffending States. Some South American jurists and statesmen of eminence condemned the interpretation placed by some Americans upon the Monroe doctrine and saw in such interpretation a constant peril to the independence and security of their own countries. I have mentioned Haiti. For six or seven years I have sought to have the United States withdraw its armed forces from Haitian soil and permit the people of that country to set up a government of their own choice. I have offered amendments to a number of naval appropriation bills which called for the withdrawal of our marines and warships from Haitian soil and Haitian waters; but upon each occasion my efforts have been in vain.

Mr. President, our invasion of the Philippine Islands has cost our country hundreds of millions of dollars. Our military operations in Santo Domingo and in Haiti imposed burdens upon the American taxpayers amounting to tens of millions of dollars. What the cost of carrying on war in Nicaragua will be it is difficult to forecast. These incursions into foreign countries have not been helpful to world democracy or to the maintenance of the true spirit of democracy in our own land. There are military repercussions to-day in the United States, and they have stimulated demands from various parts of the Republic for these enormous appropriations for military purposes to which I have called the Senate's attention. Before we adjourn further demands will come having to do with so-called "preparedness."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. While the Senator is narrating the things that are going to come before us to be appropriated for, will he not take up the question of appropriations to carry on the war down in Nicaragua?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it was not my purpose in taking the floor to speak about Nicaragua or Haiti or our military operations in other countries. I intended, rather, to briefly comment upon the enormous appropriations being made to meet current expenses of the Government and the failure of the party in power to inaugurate reforms and proper economies in the administration of governmental affairs. However, I will say to the Senator that I am opposed to appropriating money to send our marines and warships to Nicaragua or to wage war against the people of that country. In my opinion the Executive was not warranted in sending the armed forces of the United States to Nicaragua, nor do I believe there is any constitutional warrant for the course of our Government in its present military operations in that country. I have prepared a resolution, which I shall offer to-morrow, asking the opinion of the Committee on the Judiciary as to the authority of the President of the United States to carry on war, as is being done in Nicaragua, without the consent of Congress.

Mr. NORRIS. Has the Senator any doubt about that question?

Mr. KING. No.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator suppose that it would take the Judiciary Committee to advise the Senate that under our Constitution the President has no right to carry on war without a declaration from Congress?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, legislative bodies sometimes are indifferent to executive policies which they are not authorized to carry out and which may be, indeed, unconstitutional. As I view the proposition there should be unanimity of opinion in this body that the military and naval operations in which our Government is engaging in Nicaragua constitute war, and that no declaration of war having been made by Congress, such operations are without constitutional warrant. I had hoped that a resolution of the character indicated might challenge the attention of the executive department and the country, as well as the Senate, to the conduct of our Government in Nicaragua. I had hoped that a resolution asking for the opinion of the Judiciary Committee would result in a review of our country's military operations and a declaration that the fundamental law of our land was violated in such proceedings. An expression by the Judiciary Committee and by the Senate, I believed, would lead many of our citizens to an examination of our Constitution and the powers of the Executive, and would also arouse in them apprehensions as to a national course which, if not imperialistic per se, would constitute a precedent as well as a dangerous policy which should not be supported by the American people.

Mr. NORRIS. The string, it seems to me, which Congress still has in its possession is the control of appropriations; and I interrupted the Senator because he was talking about appropriations. The President perhaps could not carry on war in Nicaragua without appropriations being made or some money be provided by Congress.

Mr. KING. I suggest to the Senator that he offer amendments to the Army and Navy bills when they are under consideration, providing that no part of the appropriations carried therein shall be employed for the purpose of carrying on military operations in any country without the consent of Congress. However, I fear the Senator's support would be insufficient to secure the adoption of such amendments.

Mr. NORRIS. I suppose I would get the Senator's vote for that proposition.

Mr. KING. I can assure the Senator he will.

Mr. NORRIS. We would still be laboring under the difficulty that the President might refer to the Senator's speech here, in which he refers to our activities in Nicaragua as a peaceful mission, one to carry on peace, and therefore quote the Senator from Utah in support of the contention that what he was doing there with the Army and the Navy was not war.

Mr. KING. Let me say to the Senator that I have felt reluctant to engage in a discussion of our Caribbean Sea policy and our policy in Latin America while the Habana congress is in session.

Mr. NORRIS. That Congress may remain in session until we adjourn.

Mr. KING. Then I hope that some Senators before that time will—shall I say, take the lid off?—discuss that question.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Utah, in my judgment, is particularly qualified to talk on that subject, because what we are doing in Nicaragua is akin to what we have been doing in Haiti; and the Senator has some personal experience and some personal knowledge as to what we are doing down in Haiti, at least.

Mr. KING. Yes; I confess that I have.

Mr. NORRIS. And I am satisfied that the Senator, with his usual courage and eloquence, might have a great deal to do in bringing about a condition here by which we might perhaps curtail appropriations to carry on "peaceful" activities of that kind, which, as a matter of fact, it seems to me, everybody must know are nothing more or less than war.

Mr. KING. I stated a few moments ago that I had offered amendments to each naval bill for several years providing that no part of the appropriations should be employed in maintaining military forces in Haiti. I received, however, but scant support from the Members of this body.

Mr. NORRIS and Mr. SHORTRIDGE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah further yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KING. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska. Then I shall be very glad to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. NORRIS. I was going to suggest to the Senator, when we pass the bills that contain the appropriations providing for the use and the handling of the Navy, and particularly of the marines, if we do refuse to prevent the use of the marines

for the holding of "fair elections" down in Nicaragua, if it is going to be the policy of the Government that that branch of our military service is to be used for holding elections around at different places in the world, we ought to enlarge our policy here at home. If that is the object of maintaining the marines, we could very well, with a great deal of appropriateness, send them up to Philadelphia or out to Pittsburgh.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall not be led into a discussion of a question which is now before a committee of which I am a member; and I know the Senator will pardon me if I do not discuss the elections in Pennsylvania.

I yield now to the Senator from California.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, anticipating a very interesting address by the Senator from Utah later on touching our foreign policy, perhaps, in Nicaragua and other points named, I wish to make a kindly suggestion that, when the Senator comes to make an address, he take up and consider the case of an American citizen, a citizen of California, Mr. Charles Butters, a very loyal and more or less eminent citizen, who went to Nicaragua and there expended some \$900,000 in the development of a mining property. He employed this modern "hero," Sandino, and paid him ample, generous wages for some six months or more, when one morning the said "hero," with a pistol in his hand, demanded of Mr. Butters that he turn over his property to him. Under force, stress of circumstances, glad to escape with his life, Mr. Butters turned over the property, which was thereupon very promptly wrecked.

I hope that my friend from Utah will come to consider the rights of American citizens who go lawfully into a foreign country, observe the laws of that country, and then are robbed and despoiled of their property, and then tell us whether Uncle Sam, your country and mine, should sit cowardly, pale-faced, afraid to reach out and in any way assert the rights of those despoiled American citizens.

I merely suggest that particular case. I have a detailed statement of it which I shall, on a proper occasion, lay before the Senate, and then ask the question of American Senators whether this Nation shall shut its eyes and drop its hands and scurry away and suffer that American citizen to go without any redress. Is that American doctrine?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, while the Senator is answering that, may I not put a case to the Senator so that he may answer them both at once?

Mr. KING. All right.

Mr. NORRIS. When the Senator is making his address I want him also to consider the case of Mr. John Baur, who, in the lawful pursuit of a legitimate business, was driving his automobile along through the State of Illinois, and was held up by a rascal—I do not know whether it was Sandino or not—but some fellow, and at the point of a gun was compelled to surrender his property into the hands of this bandit. He did so under that kind of persuasion; and then I want the Senator to be faced with the question also in regard to Mr. Baur, whether we, as American citizens here in the Senate, are going to close our eyes to the destruction of property and the robbery of American citizens by bandits and do nothing about it. Why are we not going to send the Army and the Marines and the Navy to defend those American citizens?

Mr. KING. The Senator from Nebraska might have referred to the case in Illinois—and I hope I shall be pardoned for localizing—where a few years ago a number of persons who were peacefully seeking work were assaulted, some of them were bound and driven before their captors and butchered. We might call attention to the fact that in a western State, not many years ago, 60 or 70 Chinese were killed by white persons, some of whom at least, were citizens of the United States. China did not invade the United States because of this crime against her citizens.

Mr. NORRIS. May I give the Senator an illustration where we have used our marines to protect patriotic citizens and their property? The Senator will remember—and this could be given as a precedent for sending the marines anywhere—a year or two ago a man by the name of Harry Sinclair was interested in a Teapot Dome oil reservation, and some ruthless fellows who had nothing in support of their claim except that they had made a contribution to a campaign fund were illegally in possession. Our Government, in a very patriotic and dignified way, sent its marines out there to take possession of Teapot Dome and turn it over to the rightful owner, who had bought and paid for it in various ways.

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

Mr. KING. I yield; but I would like to conclude my remarks.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Let us not be in a hurry to put through a bill like this.

Mr. KING. I agree with the Senator; I should like to move to recommit it, and if I am in the Chamber when the bill is put on its passage, I shall move to recommit, with instructions to the committee to reduce the amount of the appropriation by at least \$50,000,000.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I was going to observe that the President of the United States, the present occupant of the Executive chair, promptly, before ever a voice was raised in the Senate, announced to the people of the United States that the rights of the United States to the property referred to by the Senator from Nebraska would be protected, and took every step, earnestly urging the appointment of competent attorneys to bring appropriate action to assert the rights of the United States, incidentally, and, of course, to recover the property referred to.

Some gentlemen who want to be President see, or think they see, a parallel between a crime committed in Illinois and an outrage committed in Nicaragua. The crime committed in Illinois presumably will be punished, either by State or other authority. For the crime committed in Nicaragua against an American citizen, where is his redress? Who is to give him aid and comfort unless it be his country? Some have seemed to come to the point of thinking that this country is not to protect its citizens when they travel abroad.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, Senators can not expect me to fully cover all questions they submit, especially when they are not connected with the matter under discussion. Briefly replying to the Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE], permit me to state that I should be glad when I discuss conditions in Haiti and our foreign policy, to consider at some length what obligations rest upon the Government of the United States to protect its nationals when they are in foreign countries. I might observe, however, that the invasion of Nicaragua by the United States was not for the purpose of protecting Mr. Butters, or, so far as I am advised, the property which the Senator states he owns. It is my recollection that the State Department, speaking for the President, announced some weeks ago that we were in Nicaragua to protect the Nicaraguan canal route, and because Mexico was furnishing ammunition and supplies to the liberal forces led by Sagasa. That there was any danger to the so-called Nicaraguan canal route from the domestic convulsions in Nicaragua, no serious person could believe. That Mexico was trying to establish communism in Nicaragua, and for that purpose was sending military supplies into Nicaragua, is a myth which no one now accepts. There was no reason, in my opinion, to justify the United States in interfering in the domestic affairs of Nicaragua or in taking part in factional controversies and giving military support to one faction as against another.

It may be true that some military forces or some guerrillas robbed Mr. Butters of his property, but conceding such to be true, it would not, in my opinion, justify armed intervention or the military activities which are being waged by the United States in that country. The fact is, as I understand, the rights of no American citizen were interfered with by either of the contending factions in Nicaragua prior to the time American troops were landed upon Nicaraguan soil. So far as I am advised, even then no American lost his life or property. The only case of which I have heard where an American was assaulted or his property taken is that of Mr. Butters, and I never heard of that until the Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] made the statement a few moments ago.

But conceding that Mr. Butters was outraged and wronged, the Government of the United States could have demanded reparations from the Nicaraguan Government. The Senator is aware of the fact that more than 600 Americans during the past 10 or 12 years have been killed in Mexico by Mexican troops or Mexican nationals. He also knows that property of the value of hundreds of millions of dollars owned by Americans has been confiscated or destroyed by the Mexican Government or by its nationals. The Republican administration has not sent troops into Mexico. It has not waged war upon Mexico to recover damages for the death of these Americans or reparations for the great property losses sustained by thousands of American citizens.

I do not approve the view that we must send marines and warships to every country where some American has been wronged. We know that in our own country the nationals of a number of countries have been assaulted and some have been killed and the property of many has been destroyed. No country, however, has suggested that military operations should be carried on against the United States because of the wrongs committed against aliens.

If American citizens go into foreign lands and engage in business or speculation, there are certain risks they must assume. This is particularly true if they enter countries which are not as far advanced in civilization as the United States.

It is known that in some countries there are large numbers of illiterates and law and order do not always prevail. It is also known that some Americans have not always been scrupulous and highly ethical in their business dealings with the people of the countries to which they have gone. The same may be said of the nationals of other countries who have engaged in business in the same countries where Americans were operating. It would be a rather dangerous doctrine to announce that the United States must send its battleships and marines wherever any adventuresome American goes. Of course, self-respecting nations will protect their nationals in their lawful pursuits, whether upon land or upon sea; but there are different ways of protection, and the mere fact that one has been despoiled of his property does not, prima facie, require his government to land troops and make war upon the country where the larceny was committed.

If Mr. Butters has sustained injuries, it is the duty of the United States to make proper representations to the Nicaraguan Government and require compensation in his behalf. I have not heard that our marines in Nicaragua were there to collect damages for any wrong done the distinguished citizen of California referred to by the Senator. But even if the wrong done to an American citizen is such as to justify a punitive expedition against the offending country, Congress must speak before war is declared and military forces landed upon foreign shores.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BINGHAM in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nevada?
Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. ODDIE. One brief statement in connection with what the Senator from California said in regard to Charles Butters. He also is an old friend of mine. For over 25 years that man has been struggling against heavy odds in developing his mining property in Nicaragua. He stands as one of the foremost mining engineers of the world. His many valuable inventions in the cyanide process and the filtration process for the recovery of precious metals from ores are known to every mining man. His name is among the foremost in the mining profession, and I know that the mining men of all the Western States are back of Mr. Butters and with him heartily in obtaining the protection he needs.

Mr. KING. Delicate diplomatic questions frequently arise growing out of the alleged mistreatment of the nationals of one country by another country or its nationals. Many Americans have invoked the offices of our State Department to obtain reparations for wrongs done them by other countries or by the nationals of such countries. Our State Department now is negotiating with Mexico for the purpose of obtaining compensation for Americans who have been injured in Mexico. Commissions have been appointed to hear the evidence and pass upon the claims submitted. It is the duty of our Government, as well as every government, to use its good offices to secure indemnification for any wrong done to its citizens. American citizens have been greatly wronged in Mexico, and our Government has been derelict, in my opinion, in protecting the rights of its nationals. It has been too indifferent to the flagrant wrongs inflicted upon American citizens. But I do not support the proposition that the President alone can send our armies into Mexico and our warships into Mexican harbors for the purpose of carrying on war against Mexico. I protest against the proposition, or the view, or the theory, that the President of the United States may, without the consent of Congress, wage war against any country or engage in military operations against the same.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I just came into the Chamber. I wanted to ask the Senator what the facts were with reference to the right of this Government to send marines down there for the purpose of stamping out banditry in Nicaragua?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, so many claims are made in justification of sending our marines and war vessels to Nicaragua that it is difficult to determine upon what ground the administration rests its position. We are told now that we are operating in Nicaragua and killing persons who resist our military forces in order to get ready for an election which is to be held in Nicaragua by Nicaraguans. Apologists of the administration speak of the Nicaraguans who oppose the invasion of their country as "bandits." When Nicaraguans are killed by our marines there appears to be in some quarters a spirit of elation, and the country is promptly advised that a certain number of "bandits" were killed in resisting American troops. George Washington and the Revolutionary patriots were called "bandits" by Lord North and George the Third. They were proscribed and when captured were to be transported to England and hung.

When the United States sent large military forces and landed them upon Haitian soil many of the Haitians believed that their country was to be taken from them. They sought to repel the invasion, and more than 2,500 were killed by our occupying military forces. They were denounced as "rebels," "bandits," and "guerrillas." The same offensive epithets were applied to Aginaldo and the Filipinos, who had extinguished Spanish authority in the Philippine Archipelago and established a government in harmony with the wishes of the Filipinos. When the United States sought to take possession of the islands these men, who a short time ago were patriots and who resisted American intervention, were denounced as "rebels" and "bandits," and many of them were killed.

Mr. President, perhaps if I or some other American were a Haitian or a Nicaraguan we would have been killed.

Mr. President, the people of Nicaragua and Haiti and the Philippine Islands and Mexico and all other countries have their views, their traditions, and their ideals. Their States may be small, the peoples may be weak, and many of them may be illiterate and below the ethical and political standards of the most civilized nations of the world. However they are entitled to their own lands and to work out their own salvation. They are entitled to their national aspirations and to the kind of government they desire. This Republic has not been made the arbiter of the world. It may not, because of its superior advantages and its great achievements, arrogate to itself the right to control other nations or to take the lives of other peoples.

This Nation may become the great moral and spiritual leader of the world, but it can not occupy this exalted position by force, by imperialism, economic or otherwise; but it may wear the crown of leadership by pursuing a just and righteous course, by patience, by confidence in humanity, by following the example of the Master who taught that he who would be greatest among men must be the least among them.

I am pleading for a policy of justice and peace, not a craven or a bullying policy. A powerful man is not humiliated by the delinquency of some weak and foolish person. Our Nation is so great and powerful that it need not wear the gaudy trappings of military power and swagger through the world seeking pretexts for quarrels and contests. There is something in the world more important than physical force, there is a moral and spiritual force; and there are ethical concepts and standards, adherence to which makes men and nations irresistible. Physical barriers yield to the moral and spiritual forces.

I am opposed to a militaristic policy. Two years ago I supported the President when he did not follow the demands of excited militarists and insist upon immediate construction of a certain number of war vessels. The President was right then. I regret that the present position of the administration is such upon its naval program that I can not give it my support.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I was going to say to the Senator that they did not send the marines to chase down the bandits or the Chinese nationals who destroyed property at Nanking, either, did they?

Mr. KING. No; we landed some of our forces, however, in Turkey, as did the Allies, when Smyrna was burning and Christians were being massacred, more than 200,000 of them being butchered by the Turks. The Standard Oil properties were protected, but we could not protect the lives of men, women, and children who were carried away into slavery by the Turks, or the lives of thousands of Armenians who were butchered by the Turks.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. DILL. Does not the Senator think the time has come when the Senate ought to act on some of these resolutions regarding Nicaragua?

Mr. KING. I certainly do. I said, however, a few moments ago, that I had refrained from discussing the Nicaragua situation and the questions relating to our Latin-American policy during the conference at Habana. I hope that good will result from this Pan American gathering. The President, in my opinion, in attending the conference, desired to promote more cordial relations between this Republic and Latin America. I am glad to support him in these efforts. I desire to uphold the hands of the President in his conduct of foreign matters. I believe I would go further in upholding the Chief Executive, who is not of my political party, when dealing with foreign affairs, than I would a President of my political faith. We may be partisan when considering domestic and internal affairs, but so far as possible there should be an absence of partisanship in considering what we denominate foreign affairs.

I should feel freer to criticize the conduct of a Democratic President in dealing with foreign questions than I would a Republican President.

It is a delicate matter to conduct the foreign relations of a country of the magnitude and power of the United States, particularly in view of the chaotic condition in the Orient and the somewhat unsettled conditions existing in various parts of the world growing out of the Great War. I have believed, therefore, that it was my duty, so far as I could in honor, to support the Chief Executive of my country in his administration or handling of foreign affairs. Of course, I do not mean where a policy is pursued by the executive department that I regard as dangerous and unjust and unconstitutional, that I should support those responsible for the adoption and execution of such a policy. There are questions, however, that do arise which are not fundamental and which do not involve the honor or safety of the country; questions which permit of honest differences of opinion and which no matter how decided would not seriously affect our country. There will a time come, however, if we persist in foreign policies which are inconsistent with the ideals of the Republic and dangerous to our peace and harmful to our influence in the world, when silence will no longer be possible nor honorable.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. The Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] suggested that business men who go to foreign countries and lawfully spend their money in a business way should be protected. I was wondering if the Senator from Utah does not think that if that were the case, a Senator of the United States who goes to one of those foreign countries for a little careful, quiet, lawful investigation, should not also receive some protection.

Mr. KING. I do not want to inject my own experience into this discussion. The Senator refers to the fact that several months ago I was denied the opportunity of entering Haiti because of my criticism of the policy of the United States in taking possession by military force of that country, and subjecting it from that time until the present, to American rule, supported by American bayonets. For a number of years I have urged that the American forces of occupation be withdrawn and that the Haitian people be permitted to establish a government of her own choice. I have criticized the course of the United States in waging war upon the Haitians, overthrowing their Government, abrogating their constitution and forcing upon them an alien rule. I have insisted that American marines be withdrawn from Haiti and that Haitians be permitted to enjoy their old constitution and elect their own officials and govern themselves free from the military rule of the United States.

Mr. President, the course of the United States in dealing with Haiti has aroused bitter feelings against this Republic among the people of the Central and South American countries and the Caribbean islands. The Haitians for more than a hundred years maintained their own government and discharged all international obligations. Without sufficient reason, the United States sent war vessels into Haitian waters and landed military forces upon Haitian soil. This occurred in 1915. Our troops are still in Haiti, and the Haitian people are governed not by themselves but by agencies set up by the United States and supported by the power and bayonets of this Republic.

Mr. President, the interruptions which have occurred have led me into discussions not pertinent to the theme to which I intended to briefly address myself. I shall not pursue further the questions presented by Senators. Upon some other occasion there will undoubtedly be full and free discussion concerning the foreign policy of the administration, not only in South and Central America but in other parts of the world.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment to the pending bill; but before doing that I want to say there is at least one thing that has been said by the able Senator from Utah in which I fully concur, and that is that the present moment is a highly inopportune time for discussion of our foreign policy. I noted, however, that the Senator, having said that, went ahead and discussed it. I content myself simply by saying that at the proper time there will be discussion of the Central American situation, but I do not believe the present is opportune for such discussion.

There is one other thing I want to say in this connection. The Senator from Utah criticized very strongly the idea of the United States being the policeman of the world and yet, as I recall, the Senator was one of those who was most active in undertaking to make the United States the policeman of the

world by dragging it into the League of Nations. We are told now by one of the chief defenders of the League of Nations that that organization is the very thing that prevents France from entering into the arrangement which was proposed by this country for the elimination of war, it being said in effect that Articles X and XVI of the covenant of the league specifically require the use of force. So that at last it develops that the advocates of the league now admit what some of us were contending eight years ago, that it is not an instrument of peace, but an instrument of war and force and so intended.

But I had risen to introduce an amendment to the pending bill, which I now send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 26, after line 17, insert the following:

Perry's Victory Memorial Commission: For electric lighting of the Memorial Plaza and grounds, \$7,374; for a utility building on the Memorial grounds for use as a public comfort station and storage warehouse, \$7,000; in all, \$14,374.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, the reason for the amendment is best stated in one paragraph of a letter from the Director of the Budget. It comes to us by transmission from the Executive and with a recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget. One paragraph of that statement is as follows:

The commission—

That is, Perry's Victory Memorial Commission—

reports that the park of 14 acres surrounding the memorial remains in darkness at night, the lighted portions of Put in Bay being removed from it.

Many of us are rather familiar with the geography of that section and will recall that the memorial is erected on a rather narrow neck of land connecting two larger portions of the island.

Mr. OVERMAN. What memorial is it?

Mr. WILLIS. Perry's Victory Memorial at Put in Bay.

It is believed that the park should be lighted at night to afford an adequate setting for the monument, to prevent acts of vandalism, and to permit increased revenues from night operation of the memorial. The need for a utility building, combining the purposes of a comfort station for the public and a storage warehouse for equipment and supplies, has been made urgent by the parking of the grounds.

That states the facts, and we have here the recommendation of the Budget Commissioner and the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I understand that this amendment is provided for by legislation and also that it is approved by the Budget. Does the Senator from Ohio think it is important and necessary?

Mr. WILLIS. I am quite familiar with that section of our country. I think there is no question about it that it is very necessary.

Mr. WARREN. I believe there can be no objection made to the amendment and, so far as I may do so, I accept it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, was it estimated for?

Mr. WARREN. Oh, yes, by the Budget; but it came to us after we had completed the consideration of the bill in the committee. It is entirely regular.

Mr. BLAINE addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time,

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRAZIER in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. DILL. The Senator is discussing a subject which I think is of great interest to the country, and I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Caraway	George	Johnson
Barkley	Copeland	Gerry	Jones
Bayard	Couzens	Gillett	Kendrick
Bingham	Curtis	Gooding	Keyes
Black	Cutting	Gould	King
Blaine	Deneen	Greene	La Follette
Blease	Dill	Hale	McKellar
Borah	Edge	Harris	McLean
Bratton	Edwards	Harrison	McMaster
Brookhart	Ferris	Hawes	McNary
Broussard	Fess	Hayden	Mayfield
Bruce	Fletcher	Heflin	Metcalf
Capper	Frazier	Howell	Moses

Neely	Ransdell	Smith	Tyson
Norbeck	Reed, Pa.	Smoot	Wagner
Norris	Robinson, Ark.	Steak	Walsh, Mass.
Nye	Robinson, Ind.	Stelwer	Walsh, Mont.
Oddie	Sackett	Stephens	Warren
Overman	Schall	Swanson	Waterman
Phipps	Sheppard	Thomas	Watson
Pine	Shipstead	Trammell	Wheeler
Pittman	Shortridge	Tydings	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Will not the Senator from Wisconsin permit us to vote on the pending amendment? I understand that there is no objection to it. The chairman of the committee has agreed to it, and if we could have the amendment disposed of, I should be very glad.

Mr. BLAINE. If there is to be no debate, I yield for that purpose.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. Let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, after line 17, insert:

Perry's Victory Memorial Commission: For electric lighting of the memorial plaza and grounds, \$7,344; for a utility building on the memorial grounds for use as a public comfort station and storage warehouse, \$7,000; in all, \$14,374.

The amendment was agreed to.

[Mr. BLAINE resumed his speech, and after having spoken in all over an hour and half he yielded the floor for the day. Mr. BLAINE's speech will be published entire in the RECORD of February 3.]

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, may we now have a final vote upon the bill?

Mr. KING. What is the pending item before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The CHIEF CLERK. Substitute for the word "three" on line 24, page 35, the word "two," and add at the end of line 25 the following proviso: "Provided, That no attorney shall be paid more than \$10,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

No officer or employee of the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation shall be paid a salary or compensation at a rate per annum in excess of \$10,000 except the following: One at not to exceed \$18,000, two at not to exceed \$15,000 each, and one at not to exceed \$12,000: Provided, That no attorney shall be paid more than \$10,000 per year.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there are other amendments to be offered, and because of the closeness of the hour when we are to go into executive session it seems to me that it would be wise to have the bill go over for to-day.

Mr. JONES. Then the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama will be considered as pending.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, we have made such progress to-day that I am sorry we can not go ahead and complete the consideration of the bill.

At this time I ask that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. COPELAND. I object.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 3 o'clock having arrived, the Senate, under the order heretofore made, will now proceed to the consideration of executive business. The Sergeant at Arms will clear the galleries and close the doors.

The Senate thereupon proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 2 hours and 55 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

CONFIRMATION OF MEMBERS OF FEDERAL FARM LOAN BOARD

In executive session this day, following the confirmation of George R. Cooksey, Floyd R. Harrison, and Eugene Meyer, to be members of the Federal Farm Loan Board, on motion of Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and by unanimous consent, the injunction of secrecy was removed from the vote of confirmation.

The vote on confirmation resulted—yeas 60, nays 13, as follows:

YEAS—60			
Ashurst	Fess	McLean	Shortridge
Barkley	George	McNary	Simmons
Bingham	Gillett	Mayfield	Smith
Black	Gooding	Metcalf	Smoot
Blease	Gould	Moses	Steak
Bruce	Greene	Norbeck	Steiwer
Capper	Hale	Oddie	Swanson
Caraway	Harris	Overman	Thomas
Copeland	Harrison	Phipps	Tydings
Couzens	Hayden	Reed, Pa.	Tyson
Curtis	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	Wagner
Cutting	Jones	Sackett	Warren
Deneen	Kendrick	Schall	Waterman
Edge	Keyes	Sheppard	Watson
Edwards	King	Shipstead	Willis
NAYS—13			
Blaine	Fletcher	La Follette	Wheeler
Brookhart	Frazier	McMaster	
Dill	Heflin	Nye	
Ferris	Howell	Trammell	
NOT VOTING—21			
Bayard	Gerry	Norris	Stephens
Borah	Glass	Pine	Walsh, Mass.
Bratton	Goff	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Broussard	Hawes	Ransdell	
Dale	McKellar	Reed, Mo.	
du Pont	Neely	Robinson, Ind.	

So George R. Cooksey, Floyd R. Harrison, and Eugene Meyer were confirmed as members of the Federal Farm Loan Board.

The following pairs were announced:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] (for) with the Senator of Oklahoma [Mr. PINE] (against).

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] (for) with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] (against).

The doors having been reopened.

SHIPMENT OF LIVE POULTRY

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 42, to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, the act of February 2, 1903, and the act of March 3, 1905, as amended.

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

Mr. COPELAND. House Joint Resolution 112, which has passed the House, contains the amendments which have been recommended by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I ask that that joint resolution be substituted for Senate Joint Resolution 42.

Mr. CURTIS. Are they identical?

Mr. COPELAND. They are identical.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 112) to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, the act of February 2, 1903, and the act of March 3, 1905, as amended, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act entitled "An act for the establishment of a Bureau of Animal Industry, to prevent the exportation of diseased cattle, and to provide means for the suppression and extirpation of pleuro-pneumonia and other contagious diseases among domestic animals," approved May 29, 1884, as amended, the act entitled "An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to more effectually suppress and prevent the spread of contagious and infectious diseases of livestock and for other purposes," approved February 2, 1903, and the act entitled "An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain quarantine districts, to permit and regulate the movement of cattle and other livestock therefrom, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1905, as amended, are hereby further amended to include within their provisions live poultry, and wherever in the said act the term "livestock" is used it shall be followed by the words "and/or live poultry"; and all the penalties, terms, and provisions in said acts, as amended, are hereby made applicable to live poultry.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senate Joint Resolution 42 will be indefinitely postponed.

INVESTIGATION OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DENEEN. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate Resolution 79, submitted by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], and reported by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER], from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments, to report it favorably as proposed to be amended, and I ask for its present consideration.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I trust that there will be no objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported with amendments, on page 3, line 4, after the word "persons," to insert the word "books," and at the end of the resolution to add a new paragraph reading:

The expenses of said investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate and shall not exceed \$30,000.

So as to make the resolution read:

Senate Resolution 79

Whereas there are 225,000 Indians presently under the control of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, who are, in contemplation of law, citizens of the United States but who are in fact treated as wards of the Government and are prevented from the enjoyment of the free and independent use of property and of liberty of contract with respect thereto; and

Whereas the Bureau of Indian Affairs handles, leases, and sells Indian property of great value, and disposes of funds which amount to many millions of dollars annually without responsibility to civil courts and without effective responsibility to Congress; and

Whereas it is claimed that the control by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the persons and property of Indians is preventing them from accommodating themselves to the conditions and requirements of modern life and from exercising that liberty with respect to their own affairs without which they can not develop into self-reliant, free, and independent citizens and have the rights which belong generally to citizens of the United States; and

Whereas numerous complaints have been made by responsible persons and organizations charging improper and improvident administration of Indian property by the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

Whereas it is claimed that preventable diseases are widespread among the Indian population, that the death rate among them is not only unreasonably high but is increasing, and that the Indians in many localities are becoming pauperized; and

Whereas the acts of Congress passed in the last hundred years having as their objective the civilization of the Indian tribes seem to have failed to accomplish the results anticipated; and

Whereas it is expedient that said acts of Congress and the Indian policy incorporated in said acts be examined and the administration and operation of the same as affecting the condition of the Indian population be surveyed and appraised: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate is authorized and directed to make a general survey of the condition of the Indians and of the operation and effect of the laws which Congress has passed for the civilization and protection of the Indian tribes; to investigate the relation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the persons and property of Indians and the effect of the acts, regulations, and administration of said bureau upon the health, improvement, and welfare of the Indians; and to report its findings in the premises, together with recommendations for the correction of abuses that may be found to exist, and for such changes in the law as will promote the security, economic competence, and progress of the Indians.

Said committee is authorized to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, to employ such clerical assistance as is necessary, to sit during any recess of the Senate, and at such places as it may deem advisable. Any subcommittee, duly authorized thereto, shall have the powers conferred upon the committee by this resolution.

The expenses of said investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate and shall not exceed \$30,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

SURVIVORS OF THE MEXICAN WAR

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, this day, February 2, 1928, is the eightieth anniversary of the signing of the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, which brought the Mexican War to a close. There are now five survivors of that war in the United States, according to the statement of the Commissioner of Pensions, as follows:

William F. Buckner, Paris, Mo.; Uriah Gasaway, Reelsville, Ind.; Owen Thomas Edgar, 5000 Fourteenth Street, Washington, D. C.; Richard A. Howard, Sterling City, Tex.; Samuel Leffer, St. Paul, Ind.

I felt that the Senate would be interested in this information.

ENLARGEMENT OF CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 2301) to create a commission to be known as the commission for the enlarging of the Capitol Grounds, and

for other purposes. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. What is the measure?

Mr. FESS. It merely provides for the creation of the Plaza commission. There is no expense attached to it at all.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the chairman of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the minority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol are hereby created a commission to be known as the commission for the enlarging of the Capitol Grounds. The commission shall have charge of the area between the Capitol and the Union Terminal Station, now owned by the Government, and such other parcels of land as may be added thereto, and is authorized to consider plans and estimates for the creation of a park area to enlarge the Capitol Grounds, both the plans showing the original scheme for the development of this area, and the alternative scheme for the development of this and added areas, and to recommend to the Congress such original and alternative plans or schemes with estimates of costs therefor, together with recommendations for the purchase of such other areas as may be considered necessary to give to the plans for the enlargement of the Capitol Grounds a suitable landscape treatment for the Capitol Building in relation to the landscape treatment with the proposed arrangement of the Mall area.

Mr. FESS. To-day the committee agreed unanimously to report the bill. It provides for the appointment of a commission to consist of the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the chairman of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the minority leaders of the House and Senate, and the Architect of the Capitol. They are to make up the commission.

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

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

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

RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. In accordance with the order heretofore made, I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 6 o'clock p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, February 3, 1928, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 2 (legislative day of February 1), 1928

MEMBER OF UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Homer A. A. Smith, of Maryland, to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for the unexpired term of six years from March 15, 1923, vice Charles H. Verrill, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 2 (legislative day of February 1), 1928

MEMBERS FEDERAL FARM LOAN BOARD

George R. Cooksey.
Floyd R. Harrison.
Eugene Meyer.

MEMBER FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Roy A. Young.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Andrew J. Russell to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Arkansas.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Seth W. Richardson to be United States attorney, district of North Dakota.
George Sellett to be district attorney, United States court for China.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

To be captain

Jonathan S. Dowell, jr.

To be lieutenant commanders

Edward B. Rogers.
George R. Fairlamb, jr.
Walter C. Calhoun.

To be lieutenants

Walter S. K. Trapnell.
Michael H. Kernodle.
Francis D. A. Ford.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Wilkie H. Brereton.
James B. Hogle.
Samuel G. Kelly.

To be passed assistant surgeon

George W. Cooper.

To be chief boatswains

William S. Burns.
Harold S. Bogan.

To be chief electrician

Joshua V. B. Meeker.

To be chief radio electrician

Anthony B. Pronier.

MARINE CORPS

To be major

Egbert T. Lloyd.

To be captains

Merritt A. Edson.
John A. Tebbs.

To be first lieutenants

James S. Monahan.
John A. Bemis.
Howard N. Kenyon.
William N. McKelvy, jr.
Andre V. Cherbonnier.
William W. Davies.
Bayard L. Bell.
Vernon E. Megee.
Augustus W. Cockrell.
James M. Smith.
William H. Doyle.
Ernest E. Linsert.
Orin H. Wheeler.
Joseph DaC. Humphrey.
Everett H. Clark.
Lewis A. Hohn.
William O. Brice.
Francis M. Wulbern.
Edwin A. Pollock.
Randolph McC. Pate.
Cornellus J. Eldridge.
Lucian C. Whitaker.
John R. Streett.
Franklin C. Hall.
Beverly S. Roberts.
Dudley W. Davis.
John C. Donehoo, jr.
Raymond P. Coffman.
Ralph B. DeWitt.

John B. Weaver.
James M. McHugh.
Rupert R. Deese.
Harry E. Dunkelberger.
James P. Riseley.
Clayton C. Jerome.
Emery E. Larson.
Robert L. Skidmore.
George J. O'Shea.
Charles C. Brown.
Frederick W. Biehl.
Eugene H. Price.
Lyman G. Miller.
Ralph E. Forsyth.
William M. Mitchell.
James A. Stuart.
Pierson E. Conradt.
Howard R. Huff.
William W. Orr.
Gregon A. Williams.
Clifton L. Marshall.
Evans F. Carlson.
John W. Lakso.
Harold C. Roberts.
Monroe S. Swanson.
Franklin W. R. Brown.
Will H. Lee.
William E. Lee.

To be second lieutenants

Clinton E. Fox.
Harold R. Lee.
Karl K. Louther.
Walker A. Reaves.

Louis C. Plain.
Robert L. Peterson.
Paul Drake.
George E. Williams.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

William V. Dodd, Carbon Hill.
Thelma Slone, Cedar Bluff.
Violet A. Brooks, Chickasaw.
John W. Brasfield, Dora.
Anna H. Kinney, Elberta.
Luke Bates, Rogersville.

CALIFORNIA

Ambrose E. Daneri, Merced.
William J. Boyd, Sausalito.

COLORADO

Alvin L. Bourquin, Stonington.

ILLINOIS

John H. Brill, Hampshire.
Joseph V. Campeggio, Ladd.
Roy C. Hallowell, La Harpe.

IOWA

John C. Dow, College Springs.
John F. Homer, Dewitt.
James O. Vail, Garden Grove.
Edwin S. Watts, Harvey.
Arthur F. Ogren, Kingsley.
Arthur E. Granger, Marion.
Charles W. Shelly, Ollie.
Willis W. Overholser, Sibley.
Chester M. Burnside, Waucoma.

KENTUCKY

Bettie K. Wyatt, Valley Station.

MASSACHUSETTS

Carl H. Carlson, Franklin.
Wilfred J. Tancrell, North Uxbridge.

MONTANA

Gladys M. Eiselein, Boulder.
Leslie L. Like, Drummond.
Ruth Allen, Poplar.
Glenwood H. Corrington, Ryegate.
Rose C. Spangler, Superior.

NEW JERSEY

Anna Heus, Demarest.
Frank H. Burgher, Hamburg.
Walter D. Finch, Mahwah.
William B. Lance, Stanhope.
Clifford G. Hanks, West Englewood.

NEW YORK

Alonzo L. Waters, Medina.

NORTH CAROLINA

Herbert C. Whisnant, Granite Falls.
James A. Wyche, Hallsboro.
Theodore E. McCrary, Lexington.
Charlie H. Murray, Middlesex.
William F. Ballard, Mount Holly.
Arthur B. Dickey, Murphy.
Charles E. Zedaker, Red Springs.
Cyril L. Walker, Roper.
W. Heman Hall, Rosehill.
John H. Elliott, Stony Point.
Alexander B. Berry, Swanquarter.
Neill K. Currie, Tabor.
Lat W. Purser, Vanceboro.
Jeremiah C. Meekins, jr., Washington.

OKLAHOMA

Ted R. Trolinger, Bluejacket.
Elace B. Lairmore, Dewar.
James O. Dowdy, Haskell.
Calvin C. Wilson, Henryetta.
Harry B. Kelly, Hockerville.
James T. White, Howe.
Ralph P. Witt, Maud.
Mary E. L. Allen, Ramona.
Alvin S. Gibson, Roosevelt.
Daniel G. Wood, Sasakwa.

PENNSYLVANIA

John R. Baltz, Ardmore.
Daniel K. Miller, Birdsboro.
George H. Houck, Cairnbrook.
William M. Heaps, Darby.
Millard F. Hauser, Delaware Water Gap.
William R. Smith, Harmony.
William H. Law, Koppel.
George J. Thumm, Lansdale.
John L. Coldren, Manheim.
Mabel G. Wetzel, Middleburg.
William S. Durham, Mont Clare.
Erasmus E. Bentel, Rochester.
Robert E. Frech, Stowe.
William E. Bowers, Waynesboro.
Amos E. Chick, Wehrum.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Arthur P. Horton, Heath Springs.
William J. Hughes, Loris.
George C. Cox, Myrtle Beach.
Murphy T. Sumerel, Ware Shoals.
John W. Geraty, Yonges Island.

VIRGINIA

Paul B. Jenks, Wilder.

WEST VIRGINIA

Ernest T. Morrison, Sutton.

WISCONSIN

Thomas A. Lowerre, Delafield.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, February 2, 1928

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Jehovah Father, these words are with us: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." Thy truth is immortal! It is everlastingly at morning's dawn. Every upright endeavor of every upright heart is to know the truth. Holy Spirit, be with us. Tell us that there are portals more golden than eye or ear. Enable us to see in Thee that which the flesh or blood can not reveal. Speak to our souls and show us the power of Thy sacrifice and the empire of Thy love. Let Thy spiritual accent fall on their altars and beget a longing in us to be one with Thee. May we enjoy this world and after a while enjoy the world eternal. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 1154. An act to authorize the use by the county of Yuma, Ariz., of certain public lands for a municipal aviation field, and for other purposes;

S. 2594. An act transferring a portion of the lighthouse reservation, Ship Island, Miss., to the jurisdiction and control of the War Department; and

S. 2752. An act to amend section 80 of the Judicial Code to create a new judicial district in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table, and, under the rule, referred to the appropriate committees, as follows:

S. 1154. An act to authorize the use by the county of Yuma, Ariz., of certain public lands for a municipal aviation field, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2594. An act transferring a portion of the lighthouse reservation, Ship Island, Miss., to the jurisdiction and control of the War Department; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2752. An act to amend section 80 of the Judicial Code to create a new judicial district in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PERMISSION TO POST OFFICE COMMITTEE TO SIT DURING THE SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I am authorized by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to ask unanimous consent that that committee may sit during the sessions of the House, when necessary.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, by direction of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, asks unanimous consent that that committee be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman mean through the entire Congress?

Mr. GRIEST. Throughout this session of the Congress.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Could not the gentleman make that 30 days? The gentleman can get a renewal of this if he wishes. I have not had any opportunity to confer with my fellow Members about this.

Mr. GRIEST. The reason for asking for this is because we have a large number of bills that are engaging our attention at this time and we expect to take up next week a general revision of the postal rates, which will require hearings for several weeks. I do not know how long.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection at all to the committee having that permission for 30 days, and I shall not object to a renewal of it at the end of the 30 days.