

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. This seems to complete the pension bills on the calendar.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. McCUMBER. I withdraw the motion for a moment.

#### CENTENARY OF THE BIRTH OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Several days ago House joint resolution 247, relating to the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, and making the 12th day of February, 1909, a legal holiday, and for other purposes, was passed by the Senate. The joint resolution was amended in the Senate by inserting a provision in regard to a memorial road to Gettysburg. I am not officially advised, but I understand that amendment has not been and will not be agreed to by the House. If I am in order, I desire to move to recall the joint resolution from the House.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The understanding was that no business should be considered except unobjectioned pension bills. The Chair is of the opinion that a motion such as the Senator from Oklahoma desires to make would be in contravention of the understanding.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand that under the unanimous-consent agreement nothing can be considered except the pension bills.

Mr. GORE. Very well.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 11, 1909, at 12 o'clock m.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10, 1909.*

##### CONSUL-GENERAL.

Robert E. Mansfield, of Indiana, now consul of class 4 at St. Gall, to be consul-general of the United States of class 5 at Zurich, Switzerland, vice Hector de Castro, deceased.

##### CONSULS.

Dominic I. Murphy, of the District of Columbia, now consul of class 5 at Bordeaux, to be consul of the United States of class 4 at St. Gall, Switzerland, vice Robert E. Mansfield, nominated to be consul-general of class 5 at Zurich.

Alfred K. Moe, of New Jersey, now consul of class 5 at Dublin, to be consul of the United States of class 5 at Bordeaux, France, vice Dominic I. Murphy, nominated to be consul of class 4 at St. Gall.

Thomas P. Moffat, of New York, now consul of class 7 at La Guaira, to be consul of the United States of class 7 at Trinidad, West Indies, vice William W. Handley, promoted to be consul-general of class 5 at Boma.

Isaac A. Manning, of Oregon, now consul of class 9 at Cartagena, to be consul of the United States of class 7 at La Guaira, Venezuela, vice Thomas P. Moffat, nominated to be consul of class 7 at Trinidad.

##### SECRETARY OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

Newton W. Gilbert, of Indiana, to be secretary of public instruction in the government of the Philippine Islands, to be effective March 1, 1909, vice W. Morgan Shuster, whose resignation has been accepted to take effect on that date.

##### SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Robert B. Junk, of Iowa, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Burlington, in the State of Iowa, in place of George H. Ludde, deceased.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 10, 1909.*

##### CONSUL.

Stuart K. Lupton, of Tennessee, to be consul of class 7 at Catania, Italy.

##### PUBLIC HEALTH AND MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Asst. Surg. Joseph Pettyjohn to be passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

Asst. Surg. Francis H. McKeon to be passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

Asst. Surg. Eugene H. Mullan to be passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

Asst. Surg. Wade H. Frost to be passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

##### APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

John D. Pringle, of Pennsylvania, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of Pittsburgh, Pa.

##### POSTMASTERS.

###### ARKANSAS.

John W. Terry, at Marvell, Ark.  
James W. Willoughby, at McGehee, Ark.

###### INDIANA.

Solomon C. Dickey, at Winona Lake, Ind.

###### MINNESOTA.

J. B. Pallansch, at Albany, Minn.

###### MONTANA.

George W. Crane, at Fort Benton, Mont.

###### NEBRASKA.

Albert W. Searl, at Elwood, Nebr.

###### NORTH DAKOTA.

Charles Lano, at Mohall, N. Dak.

###### OHIO.

Milton B. Dickerson, at Marion, Ohio.

###### OKLAHOMA.

William N. Walker, at Stillwater, Okla.

###### PENNSYLVANIA.

William C. Smith, at Dunbar, Pa.

###### SOUTH DAKOTA.

Lenore Green, at Kadoka, S. Dak.  
Philip Schamber, at Eureka, S. Dak.

#### WITHDRAWAL.

*Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 10, 1909.*

W. E. Singleton to be postmaster at Mansfield, in the State of Louisiana.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 10, 1909.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, offered the following prayer:

Infinite and Eternal Spirit, never very far from any of us, we would draw near to Thee after the manner of the world's great Exemplar that we may receive abundantly that life which quickens, ennobles, and enlarges the soul's capacity for righteousness, truth, justice, honesty, and integrity.

We thank Thee for the object lesson which will be afforded the world here to-day of American honesty and integrity in the selection of a President and Vice-President of our Republic. Let Thy richest blessings descend upon those who shall be selected, that they may honor their respective offices by a wise, faithful, and efficient service to their country, and we will ascribe all praise to Thee, for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever and ever. Amen.

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

##### PANAMA CANAL ZONE.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill under consideration yesterday upon which the previous question was ordered.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, on the passage of the bill I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WALDO. Mr. Speaker, let the Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the title to the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

The bill (H. R. 27250) to provide for the government of the Canal Zone, the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 203, nays 101, answered "present" 9, not voting 73, as follows:

## YEAS—203.

Acheson	Douglas	Huff	Nye
Adair	Draper	Hull, Iowa	Olcott
Adamson	Driscoll	Humphrey, Wash.	Olmsted
Alexander, Mo.	Edwards, Ky.	Humphreys, Miss.	Overstreet
Alexander, N. Y.	Ellis, Mo.	James, Addison D.	Padgett
Allen	Ellis, Oreg.	Jenkins	Parker
Anthony	Englebright	Jones, Wash.	Parsons
Barchfeld	Esch	Kahn	Payne
Barclay	Fairchild	Kennedy, Iowa	Pearre
Bartholdt	Floyd	Kennedy, Ohio	Perkins
Bartlett, Ga.	Foelker	Kinkaid	Pollard
Beale, Pa.	Foss	Knapp	Porter
Bede	Foster, Ind.	Knopf	Pray
Bennet, N. Y.	Foster, Vt.	Knowland	Prince
Bennett, Ky.	Foulkrod	Kustermann	Ransdell, La.
Bingham	French	Landis	Reynolds
Birdsall	Fuller	Langley	Roberts
Bonyne	Gaines, W. Va.	Lanier	Robinson
Routell	Gardner, Mass.	Law	Rodenberg
Boy	Gilliams	Lawrence	Russell, Tex.
Broussard	Gillespie	Lindbergh	Ryan
Brownlow	Gillet	Lindsay	Scott
Burke	Goebel	Livingston	Shackleford
Burleson	Goulden	Longworth	Smith, Cal.
Burton, Del.	Graff	Loud	Smith, Iowa
Butler	Greene	Loudenslager	Smith, Mo.
Calder	Gregg	Lowder	Snapp
Calderhead	Gronna	McCreary	Sperry
Caldwell	Guernsey	McGavin	Stafford
Campbell	Hackney	McGuire	Stevens
Capron	Haggott	McLachlan, Cal.	Stevens, Minn.
Caulfield	Hale	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sturgiss
Chaney	Hall	McMillan	Sulloway
Chapman	Hamill	Madden	Swasey
Cockran	Hamilton, Mich.	Madison	Tawney
Cocks, N. Y.	Hammond	Malby	Taylor, Ala.
Cole	Harding	Mann	Thistlewood
Cook, Colo.	Haskins	Marshall	Thomas, Ohio
Cook, Pa.	Haugen	Martin	Tirrell
Cooper, Pa.	Hawley	Miller	Townsend
Cooper, Tex.	Hayes	Mondell	Volstead
Crumppacker	Henry, Conn.	Moore, Pa.	Waldo
Currier	Hepburn	Moore, Pa.	Wanger
Cushman	Hill, Conn.	Morse	Washburn
Dalzell	Hinschaw	Mouser	Watkins
Darragh	Hobson	Mudd	Watson
Davis	Holliday	Murdock	Weeks
Dawson	Howell, N. J.	Needham	Wheeler
De Armond	Howell, Utah	Nelson	Wilson, Ill.
Denby	Hubbard, W. Va.	Norris	Woodyard
Diekema			

## NAYS—101.

Alken	Ferris	Johnson, S. C.	Rauch
Ansberry	Finley	Jones, Va.	Reid
Ashbrook	Fitzgerald	Keifer	Rhinock
Beall, Tex.	Flood	Kipp	Richardson
Booher	Fornes	Kitchin	Rothermel
Bowers	Foster, Ill.	Lamb	Rucker
Brantley	Fulton	Lee	Russell, Mo.
Brodhead	Garner	Lenahan	Sabath
Brundidge	Garrett	Lever	Sheppard
Burgess	Gill	Lloyd	Sherley
Burnett	Gordon	McDermott	Sims
Byrd	Hackett	McHenry	Slayden
Candler	Hamilton, Iowa	McLain	Small
Carlin	Hardwick	Macon	Smith, Tex.
Carter	Hardy	Maynard	Sparkman
Clark, Mo.	Harrison	Moore, Tenn.	Spight
Clayton	Hay	Moore, Tex.	Stanley
Cox, Ind.	Heflin	Murphy	Thomas, N. C.
Craig	Helm	Nicholls	Tou Velle
Cravens	Henry, Tex.	O'Connell	Underwood
Crawford	Hitchcock	Page	Wallace
Davenport	Houston	Patterson	Webb
Denver	Hughes, N. J.	Peters	Williams
Dixon	Hull, Tenn.	Pou	
Edwards, Ga.	James, Ollie M.	Rainey	
Ellerbe	Johnson, Ky.	Randell, Tex.	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—9.

Barnhart	Cary	Higgins	Stephens, Tex.
Bartlett, Nev.	Cousins	Sherman	Sterling
Bell, Ga.			

## NOT VOTING—73.

Ames	Focht	Kimball	Sherwood
Andrus	Fordney	Lafean	Slemp
Bannon	Fowler	Lamar, Fla.	Smith, Mich.
Bates	Gaines, Tenn.	Lamar, Mo.	Southwick
Bradley	Gardner, Mich.	Lassiter	Sulzer
Burleigh	Gardner, N. J.	Leake	Talbott
Burton, Ohio	Glass	Legare	Taylor, Ohio
Cassel	Godwin	Lewis	Vreeland
Clark, Fla.	Goldfogle	Lorimer	Weems
Conner	Graham	McCall	Weisse
Cooper, Wis.	Granger	McKinlay, Cal.	Wiley
Coudrey	Griggs	McKinley, Ill.	Willett
Davidson	Hamlin	McKinney	Wilson, Pa.
Dawes	Hill, Miss.	McMorran	Wolf
Durey	Howard	Pratt	Wood
Dwight	Hubbard, Iowa	Pujo	Young
Estopinal	Hughes, W. Va.	Reeder	
Fassett	Jackson	Riordan	
Favrot	Kelther	Saunders	

So the bill was passed.

The following pairs were announced:

For the session:

Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. McMorran with Mr. PUJO.

Until further notice:

Mr. AMES with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. BRADLEY with Mr. GAINES of Tennessee.

Mr. BURLEIGH with Mr. GLASS.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. CARY with Mr. FAVROT.

Mr. COUDREY with Mr. GRANGER.

Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. GRIGGS.

Mr. DAWES with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. DWIGHT with Mr. KELIHER.

Mr. FASSETT with Mr. KIMBALL.

Mr. FOCHT with Mr. LAMAR of Florida.

Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. LAMAR of Missouri.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. LASSITER.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia with Mr. LEGARE.

Mr. LAFEAN with Mr. LEWIS.

Mr. McKINNEY with Mr. PRATT.

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. SAUNDERS.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan with Mr. SHERWOOD.

Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. WEISSE.

Mr. STERLING with Mr. WILEY.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio with Mr. WILLETT.

Mr. YOUNG with Mr. WOLF.

Mr. VREELAND with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. McKINLAY of California with Mr. BARTLETT of Nevada.

Mr. McCALL with Mr. BELL of Georgia.

Mr. LORIMER with Mr. LEAKE.

Mr. ANDRUS with Mr. SULZER.

Mr. BATES with Mr. HILL of Mississippi.

Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois with Mr. GODWIN.

Mr. HARDING with Mr. TALBOTT.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. BARNHART.

Mr. CASSEL with Mr. HAMLIN.

Mr. WOOD with Mr. ESTOPINAL.

On this vote:

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin with Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. MANN, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

## ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of House joint resolution 254, creating a commission to recommend a design and site for a monument or monumental memorial to Abraham Lincoln, and for other purposes, and consider the same in the House at this time, which House joint resolution I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

## House joint resolution 254.

*Resolved, etc.*, That the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of War, the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Building and Grounds; Daniel S. Burnham, of Evanston, Ill.; Charles F. McKim and John M. Carrere, both of New York City, be, and they hereby are, created a commission to prepare, or approve of, a general design for a monument or monumental memorial to be erected to Abraham Lincoln in the city of Washington, said monument or monumental memorial to cost, exclusive of the site, about, but not exceeding, the sum of \$1,250,000, and to consider the selection of a suitable site for said monument or monumental memorial; and that the said commission report to Congress on the first Monday in December, 1909, concerning the design and the site for such monument or monumental memorial.

Sec. 2. That to enable the commission to carry out the purposes of this act, the expenditure of \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized. The members of the said commission shall serve without compensation, but shall be paid their necessary traveling expenses; and disbursements made under this act shall be made by the Secretary of the Interior on vouchers approved by the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Building and Grounds as the appropriations for the Capitol building are approved and disbursed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] if he receives unanimous consent for the consideration of this resolution, he proposes to allow debate on it and amendment?

Mr. McCALL. Well, Mr. Speaker, the matter would scarcely be in my control to that extent. I would say that this resolution has the simple purpose of creating a commission for the purpose of taking preliminary steps which may result in erecting in the city of Washington a monument to Abraham Lincoln. It does not involve the question whether some highway or some other monument be built outside of the city of Washington.



Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no objection to the gentleman's resolution at all, but I want to know whether, if he receives unanimous consent for its consideration now, he proposes to choke off debate and choke off consideration, or whether he is going to allow an opportunity for debate and for amendment.

Mr. McCALL. I have not any desire to shut off debate. As for the proposition, it is a simple one. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] yesterday insisted upon complicating a resolution to make the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln a holiday with an independent and different proposition, and the result is that we can not have Friday as a legal holiday. This resolution simply proposes to have a commission consider the question of some suitable design and location in the city of Washington for a memorial to Mr. Lincoln.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman receives unanimous consent, will he allow five minutes' debate on this side?

Mr. McCALL. I certainly will.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask whether the adoption of this resolution would not, in effect, practically and substantially cut out the proposition to build a memorial road, or Lincoln Way, from Washington to Gettysburg?

Mr. McCALL. It would not have any such effect. If that memorial road were built, it seems to me it would still be the duty of the United States to erect in the Capital City some suitable memorial to Abraham Lincoln. He has been dead for nearly half a century. His name is as great as any name in the history of the country. We have our squares and circles thronged with memorials to different generals and statesmen, and there is no memorial at this capital to Abraham Lincoln. This resolution presents simply that naked question.

Mr. OLMSTED. Then, may I ask the gentleman why his committee has not permitted to come before the House for its consideration the amendment put on by the Senate to another resolution providing for a survey of that memorial road to Gettysburg?

Mr. McCALL. This committee has had no control over it. There is now upon the calendar of the Committee of the Whole House a report from this committee, but there is no way of getting at that report except by unanimous consent. I have twice tried to call it up by unanimous consent, and it has been insisted that a certain appropriation should be made for the survey of the highway as a condition precedent to having a holiday on Friday—an entirely different proposition from that. I would say that this highway proposition can be considered separately upon its own merits.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of a splendid memorial to Abraham Lincoln. I think the whole proposition ought to be considered together, and therefore, for the present, because I think the adoption of this resolution would cut out all further consideration of the Lincoln Way between here and Gettysburg, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania objects.

#### IMMIGRATION STATION AT BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 13851) providing for a site and the erection of a new immigration station thereon at the city of Boston, Mass., and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman calls up the conference report and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The conference report is as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (H. R. 13851) entitled "An act providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a new immigration station thereon at the city of Boston, Mass.," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, striking out all the said amendment of the House to the Senate amendment, and inserting:

"Provided, That this act shall not be construed to amend, modify, or repeal joint resolution numbered seventeen authorizing the use and improvement of Castle Island, in Boston Harbor, approved May 1, 1890."

Also, on page 1, line 5, strike out the words "a site now owned by or to be ceded" and insert the words "any site ex-

cept Castle Island now owned or controlled by the Government of the United States or upon any site to be ceded."

And the House agree to the same.

BENJ. F. HOWELL,  
BURTON L. FRENCH,  
JOHN L. BURNETT,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

WILLIAM P. DILLINGHAM,  
H. C. LODGE,  
A. J. McLAURIN,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

The Clerk read the statement, as follows:

#### STATEMENT.

The only matter in difference between the two Houses was whether or not Castle Island should be removed from the provisions of the bill. The Senate recedes from its disagreement from the amendment of the House to the Senate amendment and agrees to the bill with an amendment which removes Castle Island from the provisions of the bill, and an amendment which recites that the bill shall not be regarded as disturbing a resolution touching upon the ownership, use, or control of Castle Island.

BENJ. F. HOWELL,  
BURTON L. FRENCH,  
JOHN L. BURNETT,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—REPORT OF COMMISSION ON COUNTRY LIFE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President, which was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

[For message see proceedings of Senate of yesterday.]

#### COUNTING THE ELECTORAL VOTE.

The SPEAKER. Under the law governing the counting of the electoral vote the Senate will be seated on the right of the Speaker. It has been customary for Members to vacate from the center aisle to the wall the first four rows of seats for the Senate. Gentlemen will be kind enough to vacate those seats and accommodate themselves elsewhere.

At 1 o'clock the Doorkeeper announced the Vice-President and the Senate of the United States.

The Senate entered the Hall, preceded by their Sergeant-at-Arms and headed by the Vice-President and the Secretary of the Senate, the Members and officers of the House rising to receive them.

The Vice-President took his seat as presiding officer of the joint convention of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House occupying the chair on his left.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE. The two Houses of Congress have assembled pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and the laws of the United States for the purpose of counting the votes of the electors of the several States for President and Vice-President. Agreeably to the well-established practice, the reading of the formal portion of the certificate will be omitted unless there is demand to the contrary. Having ascertained that the certificates are in due form and properly authenticated, the tellers will count and make a list of the electoral votes of the several States in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the State of Alabama.

Senators BURROWS and BAILEY, the tellers appointed on the part of the Senate, and Representatives GAINES of West Virginia and RUCKER of Missouri, the tellers on the part of the House, took their places at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. BURROWS (one of the tellers). Mr. President, from the duly formed certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Alabama it appears that William J. Bryan received 11 votes for the office of President [applause] and John W. Kern 11 votes for the office of Vice-President.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE. The Chair is obliged to suggest that all manifestations of applause or approval are in contravention of the proprieties of the occasion. They disturb the dignity and decorum which should characterize the great transaction now proceeding in the presence of the American people. The Chair is confident that a repetition of this admonition will be unnecessary.

The tellers then proceeded to announce the electoral votes of the several States in their alphabetical order.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE. The certificates of all the States have now been opened and read. The tellers will now make a final ascertainment of the result and report the same to the President of the Senate.

Mr. BAILEY (one of the tellers). Mr. President, the certificate from the State of Wisconsin recites that its electoral vote was cast for "William H. Taft, of New York, for President," and for "JAMES S. SHERMAN, of New York, for Vice-President." Under the Constitution, it is not permissible for electors to vote for a candidate for President and Vice-President both from the same State with themselves; and we are not, therefore, at liberty to treat this as surplusage, because it is proper, and I might almost say essential, to designate the State of the candidate voted for, so as to show that the candidates for President and Vice-President are not both of the same State as the electors. Your tellers perfectly understand, however, that this is a clerical error and, with the permission of the body controlling it, they would be glad, with this explanation, to report the vote of the State of Wisconsin as having been cast for William H. Taft, of Ohio, for whom all the other electoral votes were cast, and the tellers ask the President of the Senate to submit that question.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE. Unless there is objection to so doing, the vote of Wisconsin will be recorded for William H. Taft, of Ohio. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. BURROWS (one of the tellers). Mr. President, the tellers report the result of the ascertainment and the counting of the electoral votes for President and Vice-President of the United States, for the term beginning March 4, 1909, as follows:

Number of electoral votes to which each State is entitled.	States.	For President.		For Vice-President.	
		William Howard Taft, of Ohio.	William Jennings Bryan, of Nebraska.	James Schoolcraft Sherman, of New York.	John Worth Kern, of Indiana.
11	Alabama.....		11		11
9	Arkansas.....		9		9
10	California.....	10		10	
5	Colorado.....		5		5
7	Connecticut.....	7		7	
3	Delaware.....	3		3	
5	Florida.....		5		5
13	Georgia.....		13		13
3	Idaho.....	3		3	
27	Illinois.....	27		27	
15	Indiana.....	15		15	
13	Iowa.....	13		13	
10	Kansas.....	10		10	
13	Kentucky.....		13		13
9	Louisiana.....		9		9
6	Maine.....	6		6	
8	Maryland.....	2	6	2	6
16	Massachusetts.....	16		16	
14	Michigan.....	14		14	
11	Minnesota.....	11		11	
10	Mississippi.....		10		10
18	Missouri.....	18		18	
3	Montana.....	3		3	
8	Nebraska.....		8		8
3	Nevada.....		3		3
4	New Hampshire.....	4		4	
12	New Jersey.....	12		12	
39	New York.....	39		39	
12	North Carolina.....		12		12
4	North Dakota.....	4		4	
23	Ohio.....	23		23	
7	Oklahoma.....		7		7
4	Oregon.....	4		4	
34	Pennsylvania.....	34		34	
4	Rhode Island.....	4		4	
9	South Carolina.....		9		9
4	South Dakota.....	4		4	
12	Tennessee.....		12		12
18	Texas.....		18		18
3	Utah.....	3		3	
4	Vermont.....	4		4	
12	Virginia.....		12		12
5	Washington.....	5		5	
7	West Virginia.....	7		7	
13	Wisconsin.....	13		13	
3	Wyoming.....	3		3	
483	Total.....	321	162	321	162

J. C. BURROWS,  
J. W. BAILEY,  
*Tellers on the part of the Senate.*

JOSEPH H. GAINES,  
W. W. RUCKER,  
*Tellers on the part of the House of Representatives.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE. The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 483, of which a majority is 242.

William Howard Taft, of the State of Ohio, has received for President of the United States 321 votes;

William Jennings Bryan, of the State of Nebraska, has received 162 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice-President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice-President of the United States is 483, of which a majority is 242.

James Schoolcraft Sherman, of the State of New York, has received 321 votes;

John Worth Kern, of the State of Indiana, has received 162 votes.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice-President of the United States, each for the term beginning March 4, 1909, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Gentlemen, the great business for which the two Houses of Congress were assembled having been completed, the joint meeting is dissolved. The Senate will now return to its Chamber.

The Senate retired from the Hall, and (at 1 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Speaker resumed the chair and called the House to order.

#### RECESS.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey moves that the House stand in recess for five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.), the House took a recess for five minutes.

The recess having expired,

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

#### AMENDMENT TO NAVIGATION LAWS.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 27970) to amend section 8 of the act approved May 28, 1908, entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 27970) to amend section 8 of the act approved May 28, 1908, entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes."

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 8 of the act approved May 28, 1908, entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes," be amended by inserting in line 8, page 427, of the Statutes at Large, first session Sixtieth Congress, after the word "sides," the words "or ends," and on line 21, after the word "dollars," the following:

*Provided, however,* That the foregoing requirement in regard to life line or rope shall not apply to any scow or boat the deck outside the coaming or rail of which shall not exceed 1 foot in width."

Also the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the requirements in regard to life line or rope contained in section 8 of the act approved May 28, 1908 (being chapter 212 of the Statutes at Large, first session Sixtieth Congress), entitled 'An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes,' shall not apply to any scow or boat the deck outside the coaming or rail of which shall not exceed 1 foot in width. On any such scow or boat its name or number and owner's name painted in letters and numbers, at least 14 inches long on both ends of such scow or boat, shall be a compliance with the provisions of the said section in regard to name, number, and owner's name."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

#### HAZING AT MILITARY ACADEMY.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs to report the following privileged resolution, with a recommendation that it do pass.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.



The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 543.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of War be directed to furnish to the House of Representatives of the United States copies of all reports, recommendations, and other correspondence of record in the War Department or at the United States Military Academy at West Point relative to the subject of hazing at the Military Academy since January 1, 1908; also copies of all reports, recommendations, and other correspondence of record in the War Department relative to cadets of the Military Academy reported as deficient in either conduct or studies, or both, as a result of the last general examination held at the Military Academy.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

After the word "Academy," in line 12, strike out the period and insert a comma and the words "omitting the names of such cadets found deficient in conduct or studies."

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

The question was taken, and the committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HAY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid upon the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 18417. An act for the relief of Clark County, Ky.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege and present the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 553.

Whereas it appears from the RECORD of February 9, 1909, that House resolutions Nos. 548 and 551 purport to have been introduced by a number of Members of the House; and

Whereas it is a question of serious doubt whether such practice is in conformity with and is authorized under the parliamentary procedure governing the control and the conduct of the business of this House; and

Whereas it is desirable to determine whether bills or resolutions may be presented to the House in the name of more than one Member:

*Resolved*, That the Speaker be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint a select committee of five Members of the House to investigate and report as to the right of Members to present bills or resolutions as provided by the rules with the name of more than one Member of the House attached thereto.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, in presenting this resolution I have no desire whatever to interfere with the two resolutions mentioned in this resolution. There has been recently a practice initiated to present bills with the names of two Members or more appended thereto. The resolutions mentioned illustrate the development of the innovation. One of them purports to be introduced by 8 Members, the other by 29 Members. There are serious objections to this practice. In the first place, the introduction of bills or resolutions originally was a question of leave, and only by a gradual evolution have Members been permitted to present, as under our present rules, private bills to the Clerk and public bills to the Speaker. In effect, the presentation of bills and resolutions is a motion to introduce or to be permitted to introduce such bills in the House. If bills of a scandalous character are introduced, under the practice of the House they may be stricken from the files. If bills are introduced with the name of a Member attached thereto without his authority, they may be stricken from the files. If a number of names be attached to a bill and the inference allowed or the statement made that a particular bill is introduced by more than one Member, it may be a very difficult matter at some time to fix the responsibility for scandalous matter or to determine whether a particular Member authorized the use of his name.

At any rate, the practice, which in my opinion is unwarranted, has been growing to such an extent that it seems to me that in the interest of proper procedure in this House it is desirable, after a careful examination, to determine whether more than one Member can attach his name to a bill. As illustrating the results of this procedure a question might arise in this way: Suppose a resolution of inquiry were introduced in the name of more than one Member. If not reported within a certain time it would be a privileged motion to discharge the committee from the consideration of the resolution. It might be a difficult matter for the Speaker to determine which of the two or three or a dozen Members whose names were attached to the resolution would be entitled to recognition to make the privileged motion. Under all the circumstances, it seems most desirable that the proper practice be determined at this time, so that the House may conduct its business in conformity with the rules of procedure that from time immemorial have regulated such matters.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield to the gentleman for that purpose. If he wishes to make any comment, I shall yield him time. Otherwise, I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the previous question upon the resolution.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

Mr. WALDO. I ask that the resolution be read.

A MEMBER. I object.

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

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. KEIFER. Division!

The House proceeded to divide,

Mr. WALDO. Mr. Speaker, I again request that the resolution be read. I am unable to ascertain what the gentleman is trying to do, and I want to know before I vote.

The SPEAKER. The House is dividing. Objection was made to reporting the resolution again.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 120, noes 6.

So the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. FITZGERALD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the appointment of the following Members as the committee provided for under the resolution: Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. OLMSTED, Mr. CURRIER, Mr. TOWNSEND, and Mr. SHERLEY.

SALE OF TIMBER ON ALLOTTED INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 4548.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4548) to provide for the sale of timber on allotted Indian land, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That any adult Indian of any reservation to whom an allotment has been or hereafter shall be made and a trust or other patent containing restrictions on alienation issued, or hereafter shall be issued therefor, is, with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior and under such regulations as he may prescribe, hereby authorized to sell the timber on his allotment.

Timber on the allotments of minors may likewise be sold by the father, mother, or Indian agent, or other officer in charge, in the order named, and the Secretary of the Interior shall make such regulations for the disposition of the proceeds of said sales as may be necessary to protect the interest of said Indians, including such minors.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman what is the reason for giving this permission, not only to sell the timber on lands allotted of Indians, but of minors?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Well, Mr. Speaker, the reason is simply this: At the present time there is no law by which the timber on allotted Indian lands may be sold, no matter what the necessity or what advantage it may be to the Indians. For instance, there is a particular case in my State in the Colville Indian Reservation, where we granted by a special act to a smelting company the right to build a smelter there. There is no land in the neighborhood excepting that belonging to the Indians; and while we authorized this company to use such timber as it needed, there was no way by which the people who went in there and settled up the country could obtain lumber. The company could not buy the timber from the Indians and sell lumber to the people; there is no lumber there, and so far the people simply have to live in tents. There is no railroad and they can get no lumber. That is one illustration. The adult Indians can not sell. If the land is allotted to a minor, he can not work it, nor can he sell the timber to anyone.

And it does seem it would be well, in the interests of the Indians as well as the community, that, under proper regulations, down timber or ripe timber could be sold; and in case even the timber were only fit for cord wood, that could be sold instead of being wasted, and the Indians' interests protected by restrictions that would be imposed by the Interior Department. The Secretary of the Interior controls all that, just as he does in the case of the lands themselves, and it seems to me that it would be very greatly to the interest of the Indians, and also to the various communities of the country, if something of this kind could be enacted into law. It might be well for the Indian to clear 5 or 10 acres of his allotment for cultivation, and yet, as it is now, the timber can not be sold, the land can not be cleared, and the Indian is encouraged to live in idleness.

Mr. MANN. Well, of course, no doubt there ought to be some method by which mature timber and down timber and dead timber could be disposed of; but does the gentleman go so far as

to say that we ought to authorize the cutting of all timber on all Indian allotted lands, including minors' lands, practically without restriction, at this time, when we are endeavoring to conserve our timber resources?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Well, I think the Secretary of the Interior, with his officials, and the Department of Agriculture, through the Forestry Division, can be depended upon to see that it is not wasted. The committee considered the proposition of putting in the words "mature and down timber," but it was thought best not to limit it at all.

Mr. MANN. I do not see what the Forestry Service has got to do with it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That was struck out in the Senate, but I referred to it as it had been in, and I have no doubt but that the Interior Department would ask the cooperation of the Agricultural Department.

Mr. MANN. I have not that confidence in the Interior Department in regard to timber that the gentleman has, though I have great confidence in the department.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Well, in answer to that, I will say that they are looking after the Indians' welfare very closely, and I do not expect that they will sell that timber, except on a limited number of allotments and in a fair and reasonable way.

Mr. MANN. I saw last summer I do not know how many million feet of logs lying on the ground in the Menominee Reservation, in Wisconsin, half of which was destroyed, spoiled, and of no value, and most of the balance probably will be, because the Interior Department had permitted it to be cut.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That was the reservation that we passed a special act for, I presume.

Mr. MANN. Before the sawmills had been taken onto the ground perhaps most of the timber was valueless. They will not cut enough timber with that sawmill out of this immense quantity of saw logs to pay the expense of cutting and selling the timber.

Mr. JONES of Washington. A situation like that should not be permitted, of course. I do not anticipate that anything of that kind will result from the passage of this bill.

Mr. MANN. That is just the situation that grew up, when they did not even have the authority to cut all the timber on the land. Now, the Interior Department are not timber experts.

Mr. JONES of Washington. They have men in connection with the Indian Department who are pretty familiar with the timber conditions.

Mr. MANN. Can the gentleman tell us how much timber this would affect?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not know. In our section it would affect, I suppose, quite a good deal, because there are some of the reservations that contain considerable timber. It is limited, however, to allotted lands, and most of these are agricultural in character, with possibly a small amount of timber, much of which it would be well to sell.

Mr. MANN. It would affect a great deal of timber elsewhere, probably.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Possibly so, although the great part of the timber on these reservations will be on unallotted lands.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think we ought to know something about what amount of timber is to be affected, and the effect of that timber cutting, before we pass a bill drawn primarily in the interest of some particular section of the country, with reference to which it may be perfectly proper?

Mr. JONES of Washington. So far as the bill is concerned, it is one in which I have no personal interest. It was introduced in the Senate by Senator Knox, at the suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior himself, and this particular instance I have referred to was called to my attention, and I began to look the matter up and found this situation.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt there ought to be relief.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It seems to me there ought to be legislation along these lines, because the timber is absolutely going to waste now.

Mr. MANN. But this bill, if it becomes a law, is an invitation to every timber speculator and to every sawmill man to immediately commence work to get hold of the timber belonging to the Indians; and if this bill becomes a law, there will not be enough timber on Indian allotted lands in five years to be worth bothering about.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have great confidence in the Secretary of the Interior and those looking after the Indians. I do not believe there will be any such difficulty as the gentleman thinks; but if he believes that, why, he is justified in objecting to the bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Would the gentleman have any objection to specifying what kind of timber should be cut?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not think it would be wise to put in any provision of that kind.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman had better let it lie over until we can investigate it a little further and see if we can not prepare a measure that will not turn everything absolutely loose and still will grant the relief which the gentleman seeks.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not think this turns the matter loose. I would not be willing to put any restrictions in reference to the character of the timber that should be sold. I would have no objection to allowing the Forestry Service of the Agricultural Department to look after that.

Mr. MANN. I would be perfectly willing if the Forestry Service, devoted to that subject, had control of it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That was in the original bill as introduced, but was stricken out, for what reasons I do not know.

Mr. MANN. Now, I understand, as a matter of fact, if this bill should become a law, the Interior Department, as at present constituted, would ask the Forestry Service for its assistance.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am inclined to think so.

Mr. MANN. That might not be the case to-morrow.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suggest to the gentleman, however, that matters relating to the Indians are entirely under the control of the Secretary of the Interior, and there might be a very serious question as to the advisability of having a divided control with reference to these lands.

Now, this timber is a part of the real estate, and, as a matter of fact, the adult Indians could sell their allotments, timber and all, under laws that we have passed and under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MANN. That is not the case all over the country.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is, except where you may have special legislation, because we passed that legislation in the last session of Congress.

Mr. MANN. We have several bills to that effect now on the calendar.

Mr. JONES of Washington. We passed general legislation in the last session applying to allotments all over the country, applying to every reservation, possibly, except those in Oklahoma. Now, if we can trust the Secretary of the Interior to look after the allotments, to allow the sale of them upon such regulations as he may prescribe, it seems to me we can grant him the same authority with reference to the timber on the allotments, and permit him to sell it separate from the fee title to the real estate.

I very seriously doubt the advisability of dividing the responsibility and power between two departments of the Government. It rather seems to me that we ought to depend on the Interior Department, and if that department needs the advice of the Secretary of Agriculture it will get it, but it would be unwise to divide the responsibility. We should have to do that if we brought the Forestry Department into the matter by the terms of the bill. I have no doubt that is why this provision was stricken out of the bill. I think it would be wise to pass this legislation in this way.

Mr. MANN. I can not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Of course the gentleman has a right to object.

Mr. MANN. Yes; and for the present I object.

#### TELEPHONE SYSTEM IN HAWAII.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 25139) to amend an act entitled "An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize and provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telephone system on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii," approved June 20, 1906.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the time for construction of that portion of the telephone system of the Standard Telephone Company prescribed in the act entitled "An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize and provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telephone system on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii," be, and is hereby, extended to three years from and after the passage of this act, during which extended period the rights and privileges conferred upon the said Standard Telephone Company in and by said acts shall continue in full force and effect, but subject to the forfeiture therein provided on the failure of said company to otherwise comply with the provisions of time limitations therein prescribed within such extended period.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if there is anything in the act except an extension of time?

Mr. COLE. That is all.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman if the company has commenced its work?



Mr. COLE. Yes. Now, a word in connection with the bill. The territorial legislature of Hawaii passed this measure three years ago. It was investigated and confirmed by Congress two years ago. The company that was constructing the telephone business was composed of men from San Francisco. By the earthquake and fire they lost their property, and on that account they could not complete the work within the time prescribed by law. Now they ask for an extension of time for two years.

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

There was no objection.

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

EXTENDING TIME FOR FINAL ENTRY OF MINERAL CLAIMS WITHIN SHOSHONE OR WIND RIVER RESERVATION, WYO.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be discharged from further consideration, and for the present consideration, of the bill (H. R. 23473) extending the time for final entry of mineral claims within the Shoshone or Wind River Reservation in Wyoming.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 2 of chapter 1452 of the Statutes of the Fifty-eighth Congress (U. S. Stat. L., vol. 33, pt. 1), being "An act to ratify and amend an agreement with the Indians residing on the Shoshone or Wind River Indian Reservation, in the State of Wyoming, and to make appropriations to carry the same into effect," be, and the same is hereby, amended so that all claimants and locators of mineral lands within the ceded portion of said reservation shall have five years from the date of location within which to make entry and payment instead of three years, as now provided by the said act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have the matter explained.

Mr. MONDELL. The mineral locator of public lands at large is not obliged to make final proof and entry of his lands. He may hold them indefinitely and work them, if he desires. The middle entrymen on the Indian reservation are required under the act to make final proof within three years. It is a departure of legislation of this character. The middle entrymen are mostly poor men, and they find it impossible to make a final proof and entry as required by the act; and this proposes to give them an extension of two years, so as to give them the same length of time that a homesteader has within which to make final proof. It is reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. REEDER. Is there any time limit when they can make the original entry?

Mr. MONDELL. Most of the original entries were made about the time the reservation was opened. They can make them at any time.

Mr. REEDER. They can make them at any time, and then this gives them five years from the time they make them?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. REEDER. Why can they not make the proof earlier?

Mr. MONDELL. In a mineral claim the entryman must spend \$100 a year on his claim, and \$500 in all.

Mr. REEDER. The gentleman says this was reported by the Indian Committee?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. FOSTER of Vermont in the chair.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I would like unanimous consent to make a brief statement, and then present a request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to make a brief statement. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose on Thursday of last week there was pending a demand for tellers on the question of the adoption of an amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]. The purport of that amendment was to strike out of the appropriation bill any authority that it might contain for the continuation of what is known as the "board of referees of consulting chemists."

Mr. BURLESON. I think the gentleman is mistaken in that, because the gentleman from South Carolina denies that there

was any authority whatever for the creation of that board of referees.

Mr. SCOTT. The Chair has ruled that there was such authority, and the purpose of the amendment, as I understood it, was to make it very certain that the law should not be so construed.

Mr. BURLESON. I did not understand the Chair to so rule. The Chair ruled that certain language in the bill was authorized by law. The question is open whether under that language the board of referees is authorized.

Mr. SCOTT. I think the gentleman from South Carolina will not deny that if his amendment prevails it will result in the abolition of the board of referees of consulting chemists.

Mr. BURLESON. Undoubtedly that was his purpose.

Mr. SCOTT. That was the only statement I intended to make. In view of the importance of this proposition, and in view, further, of the fact that a great many gentlemen are present now who were not in the House at that time, I ask unanimous consent that debate be permitted to continue on the amendment for forty minutes, the time to be equally divided between the two sides and to be controlled on the side of the minority by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] and on this side by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that debate may be had on the pending question for forty minutes, to be equally divided between the two sides, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Kansas to use some little time, to give me some idea as to the number of speeches to be made on that side.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, before debate begins I would like to have the amendment again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, strike out all after the word "dollars," in line 71, down to and including the word "dollars," in line 21, and insert, on line 17, page 27, after the semicolon, the following:

"For the examination of specimens of foods and drugs made in the Bureau of Chemistry, under the direction and supervision of such bureau, for the purpose of determination from such examination whether such articles be adulterated or misbranded within the meaning of said act, in the city of Washington, \$200,000; out of the city of Washington, \$266,460."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB].

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, this is perhaps one of the most embarrassing cases that we have had before the Committee on Agriculture. Those of you who listened to the very temperate and able speech of my colleague from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] will remember that he discussed this question from the viewpoint of there being no law or authority for the appointment of this board. Now, under the rulings of the Chair a few days ago we were led to believe that the very law creating this Department of Agriculture gave authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the law touching the pure food and drug act. I am ready to admit, Mr. Chairman, that upon the naked technical question of whether or not this referee board should have been appointed there is considerable doubt, but when we take into consideration the magnitude of the interests involved, the importance to the whole country of carrying out this pure food and drug act, I think, upon a calm consideration of the whole matter, this committee must come to the conclusion that the Secretary of Agriculture acted judiciously and within the provisions of the law construed liberally. This very section here quoted by my friend will, in my judgment, give ample authority. Mr. Chairman, I have not the time to read section 3 of this act, for I suppose gentlemen here are as well posted as I am, but if they will turn to section 3 of the food and drug act they will see, I think, that there is provision even in that act for the appointment of these experts.

Brought down to its last analysis, the question presented for us to decide to-day is just this, whether we are going to leave all of this administration work in the hands of one man, whether we are going to turn the Department of Agriculture over to the rulings of one of the chiefs of a bureau in that department, or leave it in the hands where it belongs, the Secretary of Agriculture. If there be no law for the creation of this referee board, then I ask you under what law and by what authority are there to-day serving perhaps 75 or 100 appointees under this inspection law, recommended by the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry and confirmed by the Secretary of Agriculture? If you adopt this amendment and turn this department over to the

rulings of the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, what becomes not only of this referee board but of these other appointees? In other words, if there be no law and no authority for the action of the referee board, what authority is there for the other board, composed of the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, Mr. Dunlap, a scientist, and Mr. McCabe? If the Secretary of Agriculture can not control his own department, then we had as well abolish the office of Secretary of Agriculture. There is more at stake here than one would think who had not studied the question carefully. It is a question reaching down to every article of food consumed in this country, and while I have the highest regard for the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, it is well known not only to the members of the Agricultural Committee, but to Members of this House, that he has made rulings on the pure-food question that affect the manufacture of articles all over the country and comes home to every farmer. I will give an illustration. Let us take the question of saltpeter. If the rulings of the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry are carried out, we in Virginia and other States will not be allowed to put saltpeter on the hams that we send in interstate commerce, and I say to you now, as I have said before, that if saltpeter would kill people there would be scarcely a man living in eastern Virginia to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB] has referred to the magnitude of the interests involved in my amendment. What are the interests involved? To what interest does the gentleman from Virginia refer. To the lives and health of 90,000,000 of the consumers of this country, or the few hundred packers who have persistently and flagrantly since the enactment of the pure-food law of 1906 evaded and violated its provisions? The interests are enormous, but as far as I am concerned, I prefer to stand by the interests of the great consuming public, rather than to place myself on the side of the illegitimate and dishonest packers who have violated and are now violating the law, and endeavoring by every device to hamper the thorough enforcement of its provisions against food frauds and poisons. I want to say in the outset, Mr. Chairman, that my amendment is not prompted by any partisan feeling or political motive, and—

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question just for information. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it takes it from the board and simply places all power in the hand of this chemist. Am I right?

Mr. LEVER. My proposition is to see to it that the law is enforced by the official upon whom the law places the enforcement—the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry—as is set out in section 4 of the pure food and drugs act.

Mr. GRONNA. And is that decision final?

Mr. LEVER. That decision is final as far as facts are concerned. The facts are referred to the Secretary of Agriculture under the law; and in his discretion he passes the facts up to the proper federal district attorney, as the law provides, and the district attorney brings suit in the name of the Government against the offending packer, as is directed by this same section 4 of the act, which is our work and will.

Mr. GRONNA. Does the gentleman believe it would be well upon such an important question as this to make it possible for anyone to take it to the court?

Mr. LEVER. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I did not catch that.

Mr. GRONNA. Does the gentleman believe it would be well upon a proposition of this kind, of such importance, to compel a man to take the decision of this one man, for, as I understand the gentleman, his decision would be final and no appeal could be taken from that decision?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Will my colleague allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. LEVER. One moment—the gentleman from South Carolina finds no discretion in this matter. The law itself points out what appeal an aggrieved manufacturer may have and to what court he can take an appeal. The language of the law is unmistakable on this point. Congress provided the machinery in the law and we ought to see to it that the law is obeyed or else amended.

Mr. GRONNA. I understand that is what you are trying to change by your amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Not at all. Let me say to my friend that the President, acting through the Secretary of Agriculture, some months ago appointed a referee board of consulting chemists, with jurisdiction over and above that now exercised by the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry under his statutory authority. The law gives the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry a specific duty to perform, a duty imposed by us, but the referee board is appointed in the meantime, without authority of law, and in

the exercise of its powers supersedes the authority of the Bureau of Chemistry and takes into its own hands the enforcement of the law. That is the point to this.

Mr. HAYES. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEVER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HAYES. I would like to ask the gentleman, with his permission, if it is not true that this will not destroy this referee board completely, but simply prevents them from receiving pay for their services.

Mr. LEVER. I may say to the gentleman from California frankly that if my amendment prevails here, or if it does not prevail, I intend to follow it up by offering another amendment to take care of the question which the gentleman has raised.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Is the order of the President creating or appointing this referee board at the command of the gentleman?

Mr. LEVER. I think I might find it here somewhere.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I thought it might be well to have it read.

Mr. LEVER. It was read in my speech of the 3d instant, and it is in the RECORD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I was saying when interrupted—and it is well-nigh impossible to make a logical statement with all these interruptions—that I hope this matter will not take on a partisan aspect. I have been in this House many years, and I have my first political speech to make.

I have been sent here, as I understand it, to represent the business interests—the farmers, merchants, professional men, and all—of the district which I have the honor to represent, and I feel that I can be of more service to my people by looking after their business, material interests, than I can in taking up time in discussing academic political questions which others are better prepared and more inclined to discuss. Mr. Chairman, I want it distinctly understood that this amendment is not intended as a criticism of the Secretary of Agriculture. No man in this House, no man in the country, has a higher regard for Secretary James Wilson than I have. In my contact with him, socially and officially, I have found him courteous, frank, and always ready to give ear to any statement that may have in it an idea or suggestion calculated to be of use to the agricultural interests of any section of the country. In the administration of his great office he knows neither political nor sectional lines, and we in the South have come to look upon him as our special friend, as somewhat one of us. [Loud applause.]

His work in my State has been of extreme benefit to us, and our farmers feel they have no more earnest friend than he. He has been among us, and has a most comprehensive understanding of our agricultural problems and a most sincere sympathy with us in solving them.

He has done as much for the State that I in part represent and for the entire South in the last twelve years as any man living to-day, and I have for him not only a profound admiration, but almost a feeling that amounts to veneration, and I would be the last to criticize him or wound his feelings. [Applause.] But the matter of the diversion of \$100,000 from the purposes for which it was appropriated came to the attention of the committee. It struck me as bad administration, bad business, and it occurred to me that if the President of the United States, acting through the Secretary of Agriculture, had deliberately diverted an appropriation from the purposes for which it was appropriated and had applied it to the payment of the expenses of a referee board created in violation of law, then it was time for somebody to protest on the floor of this House. If the time has come when executive impulses are to take the place of well-deliberated legislative action, then this House, in the interest of economy, ought to adjourn sine die, go home, and stay there. [Applause.] And to bring this situation to the attention of the House is my only motive, save the greater one of my interest in the strict enforcement of the law against fraudulent and dangerous foods.

Mr. COLE. How much of this appropriation has been expended for the purpose?

Mr. LEVER. I understand about \$27,000 have already been expended in the examination of one of the subjects referred to and that there are two more to be examined.

Mr. COLE. Will a part of this remaining \$100,000 be available for this purpose unless the appropriation provided for in this bill is carried?

Mr. LEVER. It is available, and it is being used.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to request the gentleman to inform the committee what appeal there is now from the chemist when he renders a decision?

Mr. LEVER. An appeal to a federal court, as laid down by the act; and let me read to the gentleman from Nebraska the act, so that the committee may know just what the law says about it:

Sec. 4. That the examinations of specimens of foods and drugs shall be made in the Bureau of Chemistry of the Department of Agriculture, or under the direction and supervision of such bureau, for the purpose



of determining from such examinations whether such articles are adulterated or misbranded within the meaning of this act; and if it shall appear from any such examination that any of such specimens is adulterated or misbranded within the meaning of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause notice thereof to be given to the party from whom such sample was obtained. Any party so notified shall be given an opportunity to be heard, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed as aforesaid, and if it appears that any of the provisions of this act have been violated by such party, then the Secretary of Agriculture shall at once certify the facts to the proper United States district attorney, with a copy of the results of the analysis or the examination of such article duly authenticated by the analyst or officer making such examination, under the oath of such officer. After judgment of the court notice shall be given by publication in such manner as may be prescribed by the rules and regulations aforesaid.

Sec. 5. That it shall be the duty of each district attorney to whom the Secretary of Agriculture shall report any violation of this act, or to whom any health or food or drug officer or agent of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia shall present satisfactory evidence of any such violation, to cause appropriate proceedings to be commenced and prosecuted in the proper courts of the United States, without delay, for the enforcement of the penalties as in such case herein provided.

Does that answer the gentleman?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is to say, then, that the decision of the chemist does not of itself shut the manufacturer out of the market, but the process of the court must be appealed to before he can be prevented?

Mr. LEVER. That is entirely correct; and that, Mr. Chairman, is the proposition we are standing for—a proposition of permitting the law to stand as it now stands; of allowing the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry to perform, unhampered and unhindered, the duties imposed on him by the law. If there is an aggrieved manufacturer, if somebody feels that he has been badly treated, he has his recourse under the act, and that recourse is in the federal court when his case reaches it. That is all. For sixteen or eighteen years the great consuming public of this country demanded pure-food legislation—

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEVER. I will.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The gentleman says that if any manufacturer feels aggrieved at the decision of the chemist, he has his remedy by going to the federal court. Is it not the law that the Government must go to the federal court?

Mr. LEVER. That is true.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The procedure, as I understand it, must be begun by the Government against the manufacturer.

Mr. LEVER. That is very true; but the manufacturer has his remedy in the court. He meets the prosecution arranged by the Government; he brings his expert chemists to testify, and the Government brings its chemists to testify; and the evidence is taken and the case is heard like any other case in any other court and decision made from the facts presented. No one can be injured by such a course, and the public is saved the great risk in eating preserved foods.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The point I had in mind was that the burden is not on the manufacturer. The burden is on the Government.

Mr. LEVER. The burden is on the Government to prove its case. The manufacturer has been protected by the law. He has been leniently treated. In fact, I fear he has been hugged to the bosom of the Government, and we want to hug him a little bit more by creating a sort of a filtration plant of referee boards and commissions, through which justice must slowly filter while the great consuming public suffers. My amendment proposes to give consideration to the public, protect the people against the greed of food adulterators and misbranders.

Responding to the demand of the people during sixteen years for pure-food legislation, Congress in 1906 enacted a pure-food law; and in the enactment of that law I want to call the attention of the committee to this fact. It is a most important fact as showing the intention of Congress in the matter of this referee board. The House sent its bill to the Senate with a provision in it carrying a commission with authority exactly like this now carried by the referee board. The Senate debated that proposition, and pointedly and deliberately struck it from the House bill. The bill as amended went to conference, and the conferees agreed that this provision should be stricken from it. It became a law and was signed by the present Chief Executive without this provision.

Yet, in face of the fact that Congress enacted this legislation, pointedly, specifically, deliberately cutting out a referee-board idea, and after the law has been in operation for only two years, this same President, at the behest of the manufacturers—perhaps legitimate, very likely illegitimate—directed the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint a referee board. The expressed and positive will of Congress is of no avail against his hasty impulse to listen to siren song of the insidious packer. How was this law enforced? The Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, Doctor Wiley, enforced it in the spirit in which it was enacted.

What was that spirit? The spirit of protecting the health and life of the consumer against preservatives, drugs, poisons, and misbranding. He enforced the law liberally; it was his duty to enforce it liberally. It is presumed Congress intended and the country expected a liberal enforcement in the protection of the public against poisonous preservatives and fraudulent food-stuffs.

Some have criticised the chief of the bureau for being enthusiastic. Enthusiastic in what, gentlemen? Enthusiastic in the interests of the great consumers of this country, enthusiastic for a strict enforcement of the spirit of the pure-food act. If such enthusiasm be a crime, would that more of the public officials of this country were tainted with that crime. [Applause.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman submit to a question?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Does not the gentleman think that the manufacturers of the country ought to be protected from technical decisions in matters that affect their business?

Mr. LEVER. Of course.

Mr. ANTHONY. I would like to state to the committee that the flour millers of the country understand Doctor Wiley has made a decision restricting them from electric bleaching, because he says that it introduces a nitreous element in the flour, and he has prohibited the use of the process. Now, the facts are that the process only causes about one-millionth part of nitreous condition to form in the flour, and that means a man would have to eat 10,000 loaves of bread to be injured.

Mr. LEVER. Now, let me tell you the facts about it.

Mr. ANTHONY. Now, why should not the flour manufacturers be protected against such a ruling as that?

Mr. LEVER. Now, what are the facts as to that? I am perfectly familiar with the ruling. Let me call the attention of the gentleman from Kansas to the fact that not more than three or four weeks ago the supreme court of North Dakota passed upon this very flour case, and held that the bleaching of flour was in violation of the law of the State of North Dakota, on the ground that bleaching covered up inferior material.

What is the purpose of bleaching? It is to take inferior wheat, bleach it, and make the flour look as if it were ground from first-class wheat. [Applause.] Not only that, but it will be remembered some years ago we introduced the growing of durum wheat into this country. Durum wheat does not make as white flour as does hard wheat. Durum wheat, to be used, has to go through this bleaching process to get white flour, so that it can go on the market in competition with the hard wheat of the country. This durum wheat, mind you, sells in the market, I am told, for 20 cents per bushel less than the hard and fine grades of wheat, and it is of importance to the durum dealers that they should be able to bleach this flour, and thereby sell it under a deception and fraud as having been made from the best grade of wheat.

Mr. ANTHONY. Does not the gentleman admit that the process allows the farmer to find a better market for his wheat?

Mr. LEVER. I do not admit it. The durum wheat grower comes in competition with the grower of first-class wheat, and sells his cheap wheat for just as good a price as does the grower of the first-class wheat, and to that extent limits the market for first-class wheat.

Mr. GRONNA. Will the gentleman allow me a moment? I am glad the gentleman has brought this matter up. I say that it is a fraud upon the farmers to permit this bleaching process. Under the pure-food law they should not be permitted to use this process. As the gentleman has well explained, the durum wheat is sold at from 10 to 20 cents a bushel less, and the flour is not the same as that which is made from hard wheat.

Mr. LEVER. This is another case where your preservatives and artificial processes permit gross frauds upon the consuming public, and positive injury to the legitimate industry. The pure-food act is intended to remedy this abuse which had grown to alarming proportions before the enactment of the law, and which will again become a scandalous abuse under the present system of hampering and retarding the enforcement of the act in all its strength and spirit of protection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I have not used twenty minutes, have I?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used twenty minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I should like to have opportunity to conclude my remarks.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina be allowed five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina may have five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I think we will have to object, unless this side can have five minutes more.

Mr. GRONNA. Then I will ask unanimous consent that five minutes more be given to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Scott].

Mr. LAMB. Will my friend agree that the gentleman from South Carolina may have five minutes if he can also have five minutes?

Mr. SCOTT. If we can have five minutes on this side, I will not object. I will ask unanimous consent that the time for debate be extended ten minutes, the gentleman from South Carolina to have five minutes and this side to have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Now, I do not know, because I am not a chemist, whether benzoate of soda is a dangerous preservative or not. I know that the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry says it is a dangerous substance. I know that the great food experts of the world are almost unanimous in the opinion that it is a dangerous preservative. I know that the great chemists of the world and the medical profession say that it is harmful. I know that the great preponderance of the evidence is against its use, and that is sufficient reason for my objecting to its use.

I know that the state food and dairy commission in their convention have protested strongly against its use; that the convention of canners held at Louisville, Ky., only a few days ago, 3,000 strong, unanimously adopted resolutions against its use and commendatory of Doctor Wiley's great work. I know that my mail for the past week has been literally flooded with letters, resolutions, newspaper articles, and petitions sustaining my position and urging me in the interest of the consuming millions to continue the fight for the integrity of the pure food and drugs act and its enforcement in the spirit of its enactment.

I say I do not know that benzoate of soda is a dangerous preservative. I believe that it is; but whether it is or not, I do not wish to take the chance of permitting it in the foods of this country in the face of the opinions of so many great experts who firmly believe in its deleteriousness. This is the situation: Your child is lying sick. A half dozen physicians are called in. Five of them say that the use of a certain drug can do the child no good, but at the same time can do it no harm. The one says that to administer this drug may bring fatal results. These men are of equal ability and standing in their profession. Life and death hang upon the decision. Shall the drug which can do no good but may do harm in the opinions of the five be administered, when the one positively declares that its use may be fatal? Prudence and common sense would forbid the use of the drug. And this is the exact situation with respect to the use of preservatives in foods. No one claims them to have any food value. The very fact that they are used to preserve foods from decomposing shows conclusively that they can not aid digestion, for digestion is a process of decomposing food and not preserving it.

If benzoate of soda as a preservative may be harmful and is pronounced by those who should know best to be harmful, if it has no food value, if it is not necessary in the manufacture of foods from wholesome first-class materials, if it works no good and may work so much harm, what justification is there for its use? Why does a certain class of manufacturers insist upon its use? There is but one answer—they desire to palm off upon an unsuspecting public cheap and inferior goods.

They desire to fatten their purses at the risk of the lives and health of their customers. It is cheaper to use cores, peelings, and refuse; cheaper to employ insanitary methods in manufacture; cheaper to employ cheap labor, than it is to use first-class raw material, first-class sanitary methods, and first-class, well-paid labor. It is the old fight of dividends over again. No one denies that these preservatives can be, and in many cases are, used to cover up the methods I have mentioned to put upon the market food frauds, and it is against these practices, against these methods, that the strong arm of the law was raised, and when it was about to be brought down upon the heads of conscienceless manufacturers by the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, these concerns rushed to cover behind this new creation—the referee board.

My amendment proposes to leave the enforcement of the law where the law put it, and my whole desire is to maintain the integrity of this act, which is a part of our law, because the consuming public demanded protection against the intolerable methods of food manufacturers. If the law needs amendment, let it be amended in the proper way; but I protest against these insidious plans to nullify its provisions and to lay down the gap for the return of the methods in vogue before its passage. [Loud applause.]

Under the leave given me to print certain statements, letters, and other documents, I insert the following.

This is an advertisement of one of the largest and most reputable manufacturers in the country:

#### A PUBLIC STATEMENT.

#### THE PEOPLE'S HEALTH OR THE FOOD MANUFACTURER'S PROFIT.

Experts always disagree on scientific questions, and so they naturally differ about the danger of benzoate of soda in prepared foods. Some of them say it is a harmless substance in small quantities, while many other leading authorities of both Europe and America pronounce it a dangerous drug. Thus a doubt exists about the safety of its use.

Benzoate of soda is not used to improve any good article of food. There is no difference of opinion on that point.

Why, then, do any manufacturers contend for the privilege of using benzoate of soda? Simply because it permits a cheapening of the cost of product through a reduction of food value, employment of loose methods, and too often of unfit raw material.

All that is necessary to say to any thinking person is that reputable manufacturers who use only fresh fruit and vegetables and who employ only sanitary methods in their preparation (and there are many) do not find it necessary to use any chemical preservative.

Also this letter:

COLUMBIA CONSERVE COMPANY,  
Indianapolis, Ind., February 6, 1909.

A. F. LEVER, M. C., Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Your telegram of January 30, addressed to the Columbia Conserve Company, was received during my absence. I regret very much the unavoidable delay in answering it.

We are distinctly opposed to the use of benzoate of soda in foods. I have never claimed that I knew anything about the physiological effect of benzoate on the consumer, and I do not feel that I know anything more about it now than I have for several years. Scientists seem to be very evenly divided with reference to this matter.

My position is that it is not necessary in those products which we pack, namely, condiments; and that therefore as there is doubt as to its healthfulness I can see no reason why the public should not be given the benefit of the doubt.

My principal objection to its use is that it permits, and in fact, fosters unsanitary conditions in the packing of food products, and also admits and fosters the use of unsanitary food materials.

With reference to the matter of tomato catsup, there is several times as much catsup made from refuse material in this country to-day as there is catsup made from whole, ripe tomatoes. I doubt very much that the use of this refuse material can be prohibited if artificial preservative is not prohibited, unless the national and state governments put into effect an adequate system of factory inspection. This same result could be secured, in my judgment, by the very much cheaper system of prohibiting chemicals.

Yours, very truly,

WM P. HAPGOOD.

#### REFERENCES AND QUOTATIONS RE ARTIFICIAL PRESERVATIVES.

The society strongly disapproves of the practice of adding preservative chemicals to milk and other foods. (Resolution of British Society of Medical Officers of Health.)

An opinion inimical to the use of preservatives \* \* \* on the ground that these substances were added to food for the purpose of destroying or preventing the development therein of living organisms, and hence that these same substances when introduced into the highly organized animal could not behave indifferently to living matter, but must also tend to exert upon it some influence. (Conclusion 93.)

Both of above from the "Report of the departmental committee appointed to inquire into the use of preservatives and coloring matters in foods." (London, 1901.)

I believe that, in general, preservatives and antiseptics in food are unfavorable to digestion and injurious to health, and they invite the use of certain grades of foods which would otherwise not obtain. (Prof. A. B. Prescott, of Ann Arbor, Mich. Evidence before Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House of Representatives, 1902.)

On general principles, one would object to the use of antiseptics. The substance that would destroy the life of micro-organisms could not be expected to be beneficial to the life of a higher organism. It would be largely a matter of dose. I mean to say that the same dose that would kill a bacterium would not necessarily kill a man, but still it would be hostile to the protoplasmic actions that constitute the life of even a high animal like man. (Dr. W. D. Halliburton, F. R. S., professor of physiology, King's College, London. Testimony before the departmental committee, London, 1901.)

S. A. Vasey, F. C. S., F. I. S., member S. P. A.:

"In the case of benzoic acid, the presence of that acid—certainly in the case of invalid foods, and, possibly, ordinary foods—might be objectionable on the score of increasing the acidity of the urine and possibly setting up irritation in the urinary tract. It gives, as you know, hippuric acid." (P. 69.)

Dr. William Williams, representing the Incorporated Society of Medical Officers of Health:

"\* \* \* and in the present state of our knowledge regarding these substances (preservatives), it would probably be better to prohibit their use altogether, for there can be no doubt that the principle is utterly bad, and the practice of drugging the public promiscuously and without their knowledge, and by incompetent persons, when they are in good health is very dangerous." (P. 71.)

Maj. C. E. Cassal, public health officer of Great Britain:

"The admixture of certain chemicals with articles of food for the purpose of keeping them in a salable state, and also for the purpose of enabling sale of inferior and even actually bad articles, to be palmed off on the public as good and fresh, is a practice which has become very widespread. It is alleged by the apologists for this practice and by those who are obviously interested in its unrestricted continuance that the 'public demand' for many articles of food can only be met by the use of preservative chemicals. Apart from the question of 'cheapness,' this argument is disposed of from the fact that the articles in question are largely and successfully sold without the admixture of any preservative chemicals at all. If a preservative chemical is present in a food in sufficient amount to exert its specific effect on that food, that fact is in itself sufficient to show that the digestion of the food by the consumer must be injuriously affected, and such admixtures must therefore be regarded as injurious to health."



"In my opinion, the use of preservative chemicals is unnecessary, as far as public advantage is concerned, while no doubt their use may be advantageous to certain manufacturers and vendors for pecuniary reasons." (P. 130.)

Harold Faber, commissioner of Danish Government:

"I think there may be two objections in principle to the use of preservatives. In the first place, they are chemicals, and the people using them, not being generally chemists, are unable to judge of the quality of the article they use; they are also generally ignorant of the effects of them. It therefore seems less safe to leave it to them to decide whether to use them and in what quantities and so on. That is my objection in the first instance. Secondly, the idea of adding preservatives to foods is to prevent them from decomposing, but in the course of digestion these same articles of food are intended to be decomposed, and I therefore think, as far as the preservatives prevent these foods from decomposing by their use, they are also liable to prevent the proper digestion of them." (P. 145.)

Dr. A. Grunbaum, lecturer on chemical physiology, University College, Liverpool:

"I should like to say that it seems to me that, on general grounds, preservatives should be forbidden." (P. 222.)

Interview in Washington (D. C.) Post, January 27, 1909:

Dr. H. S. Blackmore, consulting chemist to State of New York:

"Benzoate of soda, of which we have heard so much of late as being employed as a food preservative, has all of the earmarks of a most dangerous substance."

"Commercial benzoic acid is manufactured from horse or other animal urine or artificially made from coal tar. All these facts would point to the possibility of benzoic acid, or its compounds, not only being of a composition most dangerous to health, if continuously used, but, to say the least, an unclean substance as a constituent of an article of food."

Minutes incorporated, Sanitary Association of Scotland, Congress at Perth, September 8, 1904:

"I would urge that in the present state of our knowledge it is not right or safe in the interests of public health that any unskilled person should be permitted to dose the public with preservatives, even with less harmful preservatives." (James Hendrick.)

When we consider that the excretion of most of these substances (preservative) falls chiefly upon the kidneys and recognize the fact that kidney disease is a main cause of the loss of one kind or another of vitality in middle life, and, indeed, figures very largely in mortality records, we can not but feel that the legalization of potent germicide is a matter of the most serious kind."—Doctor Magill, address before British Medical Association, Toronto, August, 1906.

These decisions (Food Inspection Decision, 101-102, United States Agricultural Department), as every practicing physician must know, are fraught with great danger to the public health. There is considerable difference between the foods of any poison or irritant given in a few experiments in the laboratory and those of the same poison taken continuously after long periods, even in small quantities. I have not the slightest doubt that sodium benzoate, and especially the commercial or synthetic benzoate, taken in foods more or less continuously will derange digestion and set up irritation and degenerate changes in the gastro-enteric mucus. (Dr. S. Solis Cohen, Philadelphia; General Medical Association, January, 1909.)

International Congress of Medicine, Madrid, April, 1903:

"Long-continued use of food containing antiseptics may cause grave digestive disturbances, the real cause perhaps not being recognized by physicians. The substance administered in small daily doses for a long time may show its toxic effects very different from those caused by the single administration of a medical dose of the substance. The statement on the label of the presence of the antiseptic is not sufficient for the protection of the consumer, as in most cases the latter is ignorant of the danger of the chemical preservative." (Dr. P. Bronardel, delegate of Legal Society of Medicine of France.)

Presidential address, North Wales Branch British Medical Association:

"In actual practice the ingredients are daily used in unknown quantities, and often under distressing and lowering circumstances. It is also proved that fully 80 per cent of preservatives used in food are excreted unchanged by the kidneys. This statement has been confirmed by Doctor Hannington, who states that in his investigations he found 'the kidneys inflammatory.' The action becomes insidious, and although there may be but few instances of acute poisoning, it is interesting to note the comparative prevalence of diseases of the alimentary system in 1904 as compared with twenty years ago, when the use of these preservatives was not carried on to such an enormous extent as it is in these days." (Dr. Richard Jones.)

You may take it when antiseptics are added it is because the proper means are not adopted to insure sterilization; to prevent, in other words, the ill results from bad working or the use of poor or dirty material. As a rule you will only find antiseptics added by second-rate firms and to the cheapest articles.

There is no doubt that the unrestricted use of these should be condemned, for although in the case of those more commonly employed the recorded instances in which the practice has caused harm to the consumer are few, the ignorant employment of large quantities may effect slight and indirect injury to health, and are capable of seriously interfering with digestion. Salicylic acid is depressing, benzoic acid is irritating, sulphurous acid is a gastric irritant, and formaldehyde has a strong tendency to combine with protids and to harden them and reduce their digestibility.

Moreover, the use of chemical antiseptics is not necessary, and they facilitate an uncleanly, slovenly treatment of food, and render it possible to preserve articles in incipient decomposition for some time with every appearance of freshness. (Journal of the Sanitary Institute, vol. 26, 1905-6, pp. 276-277. H. R. Kenwood, professor of public health, University College, London.)

It is not permissible to agree to the proposition that the maximum amount of any single preservative shall be determined. As in the case of strong poisons, views of experts as to toxic doses in single or repeated use are widely divergent, and it is much more difficult to determine with scientific accuracy the active qualities of preservatives which may be used for years. Even if it were possible to determine the quantity of every preservative which would not injure health when consumed with the food in a single day, further difficulty would arise when this daily dose of the material under consideration would have to be distributed among the foods to be preserved thereby, and which would be consumed in the various meals. (Deutscher Reichs-Anzeiger, Berlin, Feb., 1902.)

International Congress for Hygiene, Berlin, 1907:

"The application of chemical methods of preserving food increases dangers to health in many ways:

"(a) The added preservative may be directly injurious to the human body. In this connection the dangers to children, invalids, and old people should be considered. The general use of chemical preservatives may cause a considerable amount thereof to be ingested in one's daily food, even though each single article of food contains very little.

"(b) The preservative may decrease the nutritive value of the food.

"(c) The addition of a preservative may permit a careless and dirty method of manufacture.

"(d) The addition of a preservative stops the growth of bacteria that has already begun in the food and thereby keeps it in an apparently unchanged, fresh state, when in this food poisons quite sufficient to make it dangerous to health have already been formed. If the preservative had not been added, the food would have continued to decay, when its condition would have been a warning against the use of it.

"(e) The added preservative may only apparently stop decay of the food, when the latter may become poisonous. In these cases the preservative has not removed the danger from decayed or stale food, but it has removed the warning of the danger, viz, the changed appearance of food that is not sound or fresh.

"This effect is specially dangerous when the preservative has no perceptible taste or smell by which the purchaser or the consumer may know he has to deal with a food containing a chemical preservative.

"For the protection of the health of the people, it is not sufficient to prohibit such preservatives as have been already proved to be harmful, because the injurious effects of many substances are manifested very slowly and may not be noticed for a long time. The principle should be that no added preservative shall be permitted that has not been proved harmless by long-continued experiments on animals and on human beings." (Dr. M. Gruber, Prof. K. B. Lehmann, Dr. Th. Paul.)

"Concur in the opinion of Messrs. Gruber, Lehmann, and Paul that all chemical preservatives should be prohibited by law except those that have been used for centuries and have been found to be harmless." (Dr. Abel, Berlin.)

If benzoate of soda is used in food for human beings it may cause grave injury to health, especially when consumed by invalids and delicate people.

Benzoate of soda should be included in the list of preservatives injurious to health. (Dr. Doeppner, University of Königsberg.)

I have long held the opinion that the practice of adding antiseptics to articles of food which are daily and habitually consumed by individuals of all ages is not a desirable practice. (Sir Henry Thompson.)

Because no tangible evidence is forthcoming of injury to health arising from the employment of antiseptics in small quantities for the preservation of articles of food, I do not consider that our knowledge can be regarded as sufficiently extended and complete upon the point to permit its being absolutely taken for granted that no injury is producible. By the use of antiseptics it is the vender and not the consumer that is benefited. (Dr. Pavy.)

The onus of proof rests with those who use preservative substances in foodstuffs. We know that the question of idiosyncrasy enters largely as to whether the substances used—salicylic acid, boric acid, and the like—are dangerous. And what may be comparatively harmless in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred may be exceedingly harmful in the hundredth case. Also, what may be considered harmless when given in a single dose, or for a short period, may have very serious effects if continued over a lengthened period and the physiological effect of multiple doses, especially if the substances have an accumulative action, may be exceedingly harmful. (Dr. G. Sims Woodhead.)

On general a priori grounds it can hardly be doubted that the continued use of even small quantities of antiseptics is injurious. (Dr. W. D. Halliburton, The Lancet (London) 1897.)

(Meeting American Public Health Association, Boston, 1905.)

Formol, or formaldehyde, acid benzoic, salicylic, sulphites, bisulphites and hyposulphites, boric acid, boratium of soda, and silicate of soda, as also fluoruros and fluorates, are products dangerous to health, and which are recommended against the opinions of hygienists who, with reason, proscribe all these additions.

The foods conserved with these products are less assimilable and their digestion slower and incomplete. Some of these foods certainly increase mortality.

Studies of great importance have been made with other products, such as sulphite of soda and all the remaining compounds which owe their properties to sulphurous acid.

The fatty degeneration of the parenchyma of the kidneys is due to the continued use of this product, as shown by Doctor Kionka, who has since 1896 experimented with these substances on a grand scale on dogs. (Prof. Jose D. Morales, Mexico.)

#### COMPARATIVE EXAMINATION OF THE PHARMACOLOGICAL ACTION OF ORGANIC COMBINED SULPHUROUS ACID AND NEUTRAL SODIUM SULPHITE.

[By Reg.-Rat. Dr. E. Rost and Dr. med. Fr. Franz.]

1. The principal result of the preceding experiment is, first, the determination that sulphurous acid in no way loses its poisonous properties, for all conditions, by its combination with aldehyde, sugar, and acetone. The addition products are neither inactive, as has been claimed by some, nor have they a peculiar action independent of the properties of their single constituents, but they act according to their wont, not other than sodium sulphite or sulphurous acid.

2. A further result is therefore: The dissolution of the organic bonds of the combined sulphurous acid is the necessary precedent for the appearance of the action. The speed with which this dissolution proceeds determines the quantity and concentration of the active constituent broken off, the same for all the compounds examined, and therefore the degree of the poisonous action and the speed of its appearance.

3. The third result of the preceding investigation is therefore: The poisonous series determined under the experimental conditions maintained proceeds parallel with the series in which the four compounds concerned appear according to their dissociation which proceeds gradually in aqueous solution, measured with iodine solution (at ordinary temperature) by the part of the combined sulphurous acid which could be titrated.

In the single experimental series in which all experimental conditions were maintained the same, so that the results of the series concerned were comparable, the four combined sulphurous acids examined differed always in the same way one from the other. In all experimental series the glucose compound showed sulphite action strong-

est: It dissociates fastest in aqueous solution; in all experimental series the acetaldehyde compound was less poisonous; it dissociates to a less degree in aqueous solution. Only the formaldehyde compound, being still less dissociable, showed itself less poisonous in our experiments. (Arbeiten aus dem Kaiserlichen Gesundheitsamte, 1904, vol. 21. Work from the Imperial Health Department (Germany), 1904, vol. 21.)

NORTH DAKOTA AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE,  
February 1, 1909.

Hon. A. F. LEVER, M. C., Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your favor of January 30, I am in receipt of your telegram reading as follows:

"Does your association oppose the use of all chemical preservatives in foods? Are you officially and personally opposed to the use of all chemical preservatives in foods? Will the legalization of an unrestricted use of benzoate of soda result in harm to infants and invalids? Would you favor letting all questions go to courts instead of being officially decided by the referee board of consulting chemists? Wire answer and write full particulars at once."

The Association of State and National Dairy and Food Departments at their annual conference at Mackinac August 4 to 7, 1908, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this association is convinced that all chemical preservatives are harmful in foods, and that all kinds of food products are and may be prepared and distributed without them, and pledges its best efforts to use all moral and legal means at its disposal to exclude chemical preservatives from food products, and to this end we ask the cordial support of all national, state, and municipal authorities charged with the enforcement of food and drug laws. And in this connection we desire to express our gratitude for the helpful services of the medical profession generally, and especially to the American Medical Association."

Thus placing themselves on record as squarely opposed to the use of chemical preservatives of any kind in the preparation of food products, and this came as the result of the experience of food men of the country, both food commissioners and chemists, after many years of study and observation.

Personally and officially I am opposed to the use of all chemical preservatives, and the legalization of an unrestricted use of benzoate of soda will, in my judgment, result in harm to infants and invalids and introduces into the system a product which is not a food but a drug and medicine, a product which is recognized by the physician to modify some vital action of the body without itself furnishing any nutriment to the body.

I am opposed to the use of benzoate of soda for the further reason, without regard to its effect upon health, that where benzoate of soda is used we often find vegetable products which have become decayed and are unfit for human food and could not and would not be utilized if benzoate of soda were not employed as a preservative agent.

At the present time our examinations show, for example in catsup, that when catsup is made from ripe tomatoes without the use of preservatives the product keeps and there are very few mycelium present, indicating little or no decay. In the majority of cases where benzoate of soda is used, an abundance of mycelium may be found by the use of the microscope, showing clearly the refuse character of the material employed, and that decayed material is largely admitted. The same thing is true with regard to other food products.

Personally, it seems to me that the only place for testing the law or for deciding the questions involved under the law is in the courts, and that the official in charge of the food law should be allowed the greatest degree of latitude. Where there is a difference of opinion between the food official and the manufacturers the courts should decide each individual case and establish the precedents to be followed.

Yours, very truly,

E. F. LADD.

LETTER FROM A CALIFORNIA WINE PRODUCER STATING WHAT THE PERMISSION OF BENZOATE OF SODA WOULD MEAN TO THE CALIFORNIA WINE PRODUCER.

[From letter of Percy T. Morgan, dated February 1, 1909.]

You can, I think, well understand how much "up in the air" we are at this decision of the "referee board" on benzoates. For ten years we have been fighting the use of preservatives in wine. Now, it would seem that all the labor we have expended, all the trouble we have gone to, all our immense investments in permanent structures for storing and maturing wines, and in fact everything that made the wine business attractive to settled capital and tended to withdraw it from the realms of pure gambling from season to season has, all at one sweep of the pen, been nullified. If deleterious fermentations can be arrested and held by the use of antiseptics, then skill and care in wine making will become old-fashioned and obsolete. The careful nursing of wines, the elimination of distillation of those developing poorly will be commercially unnecessary, because in the initial stages all defects will be able to be covered up by sophistication.

As I have said before, we do not know where we stand; we do not know what course to take, because it is perfectly patent to anybody who knows anything of the wine business that the greatest items of expense in connection with it are interest, taxes, insurance, and evaporation upon the maturing product. If it is not necessary in order to make wine marketable, to mature it so that clarification is a natural process; if all imperfections can be concealed and the wines rendered clear and marketable through the addition of extraneous agents, then all a wine merchant needs for the ordinary line of trade, namely, the supplying of the daily wine consumer (who looks to the price of his beverage as one of its most important things), is a shed, a few tanks, and a good supply of bill heads.

I print here parts of an editorial from the February number of the National Food Magazine:

The people of the United States believe chemical preservatives to be harmful—the farmer and the urbanite are of one opinion on this subject.

While chemists have detected their harmful qualities from laboratory experiments, the people have learned of them through sad experience.

It is probable that there is not a man, woman, or child in the United States, not interested in a food factory, who would not vote against the use of chemical preservatives in foods.

With the preponderance of evidence to the effect that chemicals in foods are harmful and poisonous, it would at least seem that there is room for doubt as to their legality and wholesomeness. As long as there is such a doubt, why should not the people be given the benefit of

it instead of the manufacturers of chemical foods? Are the people not as worthy?

Even, however, if we should disregard this mighty array of evidence that chemicals are harmful, there is still another reason why they are illegal and should not be used. This consists in the facts that they are not foods; they contain absolutely no food value, and the only possible excuse for their use is to lessen the cost of production, conceal inferiority, and encourage slovenliness and insanitation in food factories.

THE PEOPLE MUST KNOW THE CAUSE.

But there are manufacturers of legitimate foods who have souls and consciences, and who would rather go out of business than to be responsible for such widespread disaster as they firmly believe results from the chemical treatment of food products. They say that chemicals are unnecessary for the preserving of foods when pure raw products are employed and when absolute cleanliness is observed in the manufacture. It would seem that our national authorities ought to side with this class of manufacturers and with the people instead of with the class of manufacturers which caused the pollutions of America's food supply before the enactment of the national food law.

PURE-FOOD MANUFACTURERS ORGANIZE.

The attempt to nullify the provisions of the national food law has aroused new and powerful forces into action. The highest class of manufacturers, who originally favored the enactment of a national food law, and who have been satisfied to abide by its provisions, both in letter and in spirit—regardless of the numerous exceptions and rulings that have been made in favor of the manufacturers of low-grade materials—are now up in arms to secure their own protection from the vilest kind of competition to which they have been subjected.

These manufacturers of strictly pure, high-grade foods have organized themselves into a mighty force. The organization will represent a combined capital of millions of dollars. It will expose the graft there is in the manufacture of food frauds. It will open the eyes of the people to where they are being robbed and swindled by the meanest kind of deception. It will bring into view conditions existing in many food factories worse than Upton Sinclair ever pictured in Packing Town.

This organization of pure-food manufacturers proposes to make itself felt with the administration at Washington and with the food department in every State.

Also parts of an editorial from The Outlook of January 30, 1909, a paper with which President Roosevelt is to become identified after the 4th of March:

PURE FOOD AND DECENT FOOD.

One of the best results of the operation of the pure-food law has been to make it possible for people to learn for themselves what prepared food products are mixed with chemicals and what not, and to decide, apart from any question of possible poisoning, which kind they prefer to eat.

There are certain chemical substances concerning which, among scientists, some doubt may exist as to their injurious effects; yet if even these are used, the label on the bottle or package must state the fact. Now, it is urged, with much force and truth, that even where chemicals used for preservative reasons are not in themselves poisonous, yet their use allows the manufacturer to put up inferior fruit, or meat, or what not, and even to put up refuse material—in some cases it is alleged that the material rejected and thrown on the floor when putting up the superior brands is swept up and included in goods of the cheaper brand. If it is true that the use of chemical preservatives allows such abominations to go undetected, then the consumer may well, for his own sake, refuse to buy tinned or bottled food products when the label shows, in however small print, that a chemical preservative has been used. But this raises another question, namely: Is it possible to put food products on the market without the use of chemical preservatives? Here we find another exceedingly encouraging result of the pure-food law. Several of the larger and better-known manufacturers of such products, actuated evidently both by genuine interest in the consumer's welfare and by a sound commercial instinct, have declared that in most if not in all cases the use of preservatives is quite unnecessary. Every housewife knows that fruit, for instance, if carefully selected, with the rejection of all tainted parts, carefully handled, not diluted with water, and protected accurately and positively from the air, will "keep" perfectly well with only the addition of sugar and, if desired, of spices. What can be done by the ordinary housewife can be done with far more certainty if performed on a large scale with the increased accuracy of measurement, mixing, and handling which naturally and necessarily accompanies wholesale manufacture. It is true that some large manufacturers declare that unless chemicals are used there is danger of ptomaine poisoning, and that their rivals who will not use chemicals bring about the same result to some extent by the excessive use of condiments, and that these in turn may serve to conceal the early stages of taint. The best authorities in this country, however, and we may add the practical experience in every household, confirm the reasoning of those who believe that "pure food" means "nothing but food"—that is, no chemicals. Furthermore, the consumer must be very careful not to assume that a chemical is not in fact injurious. Take, for instance, benzoate of soda. The chemist of the Department of Agriculture has never declared that this substance is altogether harmless, and, as we understand it, entertains a contrary belief. Yet, since there is a fair difference of opinion among scientists on this point, and as regards certain other chemical substances used in the preparation of food, their use in limited quantities and with the fact stated on the label has been permitted temporarily.

The resolutions of the canners referred to in the body of my remarks are as follows:

[Louisville Courier-Journal, February 5, 1909.]

THREE THOUSAND CANNERS ADOPT RESOLUTIONS.

The committee on resolutions, composed of Hugh Orem, of Baltimore, chairman; S. F. Hazerot, of New York; William R. Roach, of Hart, Mich.; L. A. Sears, of Chillicothe, Ohio; and George G. Bailey, of Rome, N. Y., offered several resolutions regarding important legislation that were unanimously adopted. These resolutions follow:

"Prior to the enactment of the food and drugs act by the Congress of the United States, in 1906, the National Canners' Association, in convention at Atlantic City, N. J., placed itself upon record and published its findings to the consumers of the United States, declaring its unequivocal, unalterable, and inflexible opposition to the use of chemical preservatives in whatever form or by or under whatever name.

"To this positive, definite, and advanced action and the influence of the National Canners' Association, which was brought to bear upon the



representatives in Congress, the adoption of the pure-food law was largely due.

"Since the adoption of the federal law various state laws have been enacted regulating the canning and selling of hermetically sealed fruits and vegetables. In the main these laws accomplish the same purpose of the federal law, but not infrequently they differ in some minor provision, subjecting the canner to a useless and unnecessary expense in his desire to comply therewith. Uniformity of state laws with the national law is most desired and earnestly recommended. It is therefore

*Resolved*, That the National Canners' Association in convention reaffirm every action in the past wherein it has protested against the use of chemical preservatives in the manufacture of canned food as entirely useless and unnecessary, sterilization by heat being the only preservative known or of any use to the canner.

#### NOT INTERESTED IN CHEMICALS.

*Resolved*, That the membership is not interested in the merits of chemical preservatives of any kind, nor, indeed, has it any knowledge either as to their beneficial or harmful effects. Our interest is confined exclusively and entirely in acquainting the public that such preservatives have not been nor are they now used by the canner in the preparation of his food output.

*Resolved*, That the thanks of this association are due and are thus conveyed to Dr. Harvey W. Wiley for the many favors given this association, and for his hearty cooperation with us in upholding the letter and the spirit of the law. His services have been invaluable to the consuming public and he is justly entitled to the gratitude he is receiving from the American people.

*Resolved*, That the legislative committee of this association shall be instructed to adopt ways and means whereby the various state pure-food laws may be amended to conform more closely to the act of Congress known as the 'Food and drugs act.'

#### NAVY SNUB FOR DOCTOR WILEY—DEPARTMENT ORDERS CATSUP PRESERVED WITH SODA BENZOATE.

NEW YORK, February 6, 1909.

That the Navy Department and Doctor Wiley are at odds on the poisonous character of benzoate of soda is shown in the latest proposal from the Navy Department. On October 3, 1908, the Navy Department called for proposals for 600 gallons of tomato catsup. The specifications describing the catsup say that it is to be made of whole ripe tomatoes and must be guaranteed to keep at least three months.

It is right here the proposal and Doctor Wiley come into conflict. Doctor Wiley, after extensive study last June, came to the conclusion that benzoate of soda as a preservative was deleterious. President Roosevelt's board took up the matter and disagreed with the doctor. Now, to clinch the matter, the navy proposal specifies outright that the benzoate of soda is to be the only preservative used.

Doctor Wellman, who it is presumed has something to do with the specifications for the catsup, has not been heard from so far, but it is expected that the controversy may lead to an investigation of the Navy Department's method.

#### NAVY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS, Washington, D. C., February 9, 1909.

SIR: Referring to your visit to the bureau to-day, the attached article in the Washington Post, headed "Navy snub for Doctor Wiley," in representing that the Navy Department has disagreed with Doctor Wiley as to the use of benzoate of soda is incorrect and without foundation. On the other hand, this bureau has been only too pleased to follow the wishes of the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry in regard to any provision in the specifications for any article which it purchases for the naval service. The facts are that when the question of preparing the specifications for catsup was under consideration the bureau consulted with Doctor Wiley's office as to the use of benzoate of soda; and inasmuch as it had not been then determined as to whether this article should be prohibited commercially under the pure food and drugs act, it was decided to incorporate into the specifications a provision requiring each bidder to state the percentage of benzoate of soda which was used by him. In accord with this arrangement those firms who offered their products in which this article was used stipulated the percentage, and other manufacturers who did not use it omitted filling in the amount used.

The bureau did not require the use of any preservative. Some firms submitted bids on catsup put up with not more than one-tenth of 1 per cent of benzoate of soda, and others used no preservative at all. This arrangement was made, as stated above, solely because it was not specifically prohibited in commercial use, and the bureau was awaiting the decision of the Bureau of Chemistry as to whether or not it should be used.

Since the passage of the pure food and drugs act the bureau has been working in entire harmony with Doctor Wiley's office in regard to any changes or amendments in specifications, and all of its contracts for provisions contain the following clause:

"It shall be expressly understood that all of the provisions to be furnished under this contract are guaranteed by the contractor to conform to the provisions of the national food and drugs act, approved June 30, 1906, as well as conforming to any state law in which deliveries are made, in so far as they apply; compliance therewith will be proved by tests made at the navy-yard, or under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and shall conform to the standards prescribed in Circular No. 19, office of the Secretary of Agriculture, dated June 26, 1906, or to such other standards as may be subsequently adopted by that department."

The bureau considers itself very fortunate in obtaining the expert assistance of the inspectors of the Bureau of Animal Industry, Bureau of Chemistry, and other bureaus of the Department of Agriculture. Its inspectors now inspect all meats and meat-food products, groceries, butter, etc., which are purchased for the enlisted men of the naval service and which forms part of the ration allowed each man by law. This assistance has been rendered with hearty cooperation, and has resulted in improving very materially the quality of the food furnished the enlisted men. No changes in specifications for any article are adopted until after the approval of the proper bureau of the Department of Agriculture, and this bureau is in constant consultation with that department in regard to questions which arise in conducting official business.

The bureau is pleased to take this opportunity to express its highest appreciation of the valuable assistance which it has received from the officials of the Department of Agriculture, particularly those of Doctor Wiley's office, and it is always only too glad to follow their wishes in any question which may arise.

Respectfully,

E. B. ROGERS,  
Paymaster-General, U. S. Navy.

The Hon. A. F. LEVER,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from South Carolina may be extended for five minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. I shall have to object to that.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. I now yield two minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, the question before the House is a very important one and yet not a very difficult one to understand. The thing that we are all trying to do is to discover the truth. The pure-food law passed a few years ago made it unlawful to place upon the market foods that had been adulterated or treated in a manner which rendered them injurious to health.

I shall speak particularly with reference to the treatment of dried fruit, as that is the one that interests my constituents, and it is a question with which I am most familiar. It is the practice in California, where fruits are dried in the sun, to give them a smudge of sulphur. Doctor Wiley, the eminent chemist which we admit him to be, does not say that all applications of sulphur fumes are injurious, but he admits that they may be used up to a certain point. We differ from him as to the amount of sulphur that may be safely used. It is the judgment of the fruit growers of California that if we were limited to the very small amount that he suggests, it would practically drive us out of the dried-fruit business, unless we could discover a new treatment.

The question was considered of sufficient importance for the President to refer the matter to five of the most eminent chemists in the land. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], urging his point, does not object to a rehearing of the matter; he does not urge that the opinion of Doctor Wiley shall be conclusive. But he says, "go to the courts."

Mr. LEVER. Where the law says you must go.

Mr. SMITH of California. We say, "go to the most eminent aggregation of men on this subject that you can possibly have in the Nation."

Suppose we take up the course suggested by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] and take the matter into court. What results? We stand before a lawyer and ask him to determine a purely scientific and hygienic question. Of course no upright judge would undertake to solve the question by the knowledge he had obtained from the law books. He would be obliged to take testimony, and expert testimony, of course, and hence we should, by a circuitous route, get back to the point where we now stand, except that it is doubtful if any court in the land could command the testimony of such eminent and disinterested witnesses as the President has called in in the present instance. The question involving the sulphuring of fruit would probably be tried in the West, where sulphur is used, where the defendants reside. If the use of the benzoate of soda is to be tested, that would go to the courts in the jurisdiction where that preservative is chiefly used, and so on through the list of disputed points. Is it probable that any of these courts will sit in entirely disinterested surroundings? And could and would a judge in California call in the best men from the East, South, or Middle West?

Let it not be forgotten that the fruit and vegetable growers will suffer seriously by having this case dragging through the courts, with the attendant notoriety, not to mention the injury done by the preliminary order resting on Doctor Wiley's finding.

Why should these roundabout and injurious methods be chosen when there is now in session a "court" of ideal composition quietly seeking for the truth? This body has been at work for a year past, and to cut it down now would be to cast aside all it has accomplished. From every point of view I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. PERKINS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 23464) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, and for other purposes.

## AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield three minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment submitted by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] is a most remarkable proposition. Its purpose and effect is to make the chief of a division in the Department of Agriculture paramount to the head of the department himself.

It seems to me there can be no escape from the proposition that the responsibility for the administration of the pure-food law must rest with the Secretary of Agriculture as the head of that department. The Secretary of Agriculture ought not to be simply a scientist or a chemist—he should be an eminently practical man, such as the present Secretary, Hon. James Wilson, who has filled that position for the past twelve years with such great distinction to himself and such vast and far-reaching benefits to his country, and whose service in that department I trust may continue for many years to come.

Now, we are confronted with the question—with responsibility for the enforcement of the pure-food law placed upon the Secretary, are we to deny him the right to call in such expert assistants as he may require for the proper determination of scientific questions arising under that law? Secretary Wilson gives it as his personal opinion that it is necessary for him to have the assistance of eminent and distinguished experts. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, there can be no reasonable doubt that this House ought not to set up a chief of division—even so eminent and able a man as Doctor Wiley—not only above the Secretary of Agriculture, but above the President of the United States. Surely it is not wise to make the chief of a division the final arbiter in such important matters, especially when final responsibility rests with the Secretary.

Mr. LANDIS. Is it not true that the Bureau of Chemistry is now composed of expert chemists?

Mr. DAWSON. To be sure; but the expert scientific gentlemen everywhere are always in controversy as to what the real truth is.

Mr. LANDIS. How much nearer the truth are you if you refer it to this board of chemists composed of the heads of colleges?

Mr. DAWSON. The Secretary of Agriculture, upon whom rests the responsibility in the last analysis for the enforcement of the pure-food law, ought to have the power to call in such experts as he may wish in regard to determining technical and scientific questions and to assist him in reaching an intelligent judgment in these matters. That is the nub of the whole question.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER].

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I believe I am as firm a friend to the pure food and drug legislation as any man in this House. I think that when we have heard to-day the statement in reference to pure food, and that this means that we are not to continue investigations in reference to poison put in food, I think it is a mistake. The idea is this: If conditions continue to go on as they are now, Doctor Wiley, for whom I have as high a regard as any man in the House, will be supreme in his decisions. His decision will be final; and when he makes a decision there will be no appeal, except if in his judgment we violate the law we will be permitted to go into the court, permit ourselves to be arrested, and demonstrate whether Doctor Wiley is right or wrong.

Now, if this referee board is appointed, it simply means this: That you have that much more evidence, if they agree with Doctor Wiley, that he is right. It is sometimes the case that men are mistaken in these things; sometimes as good men as Doctor Wiley are mistaken in their opinions in reference to what is deleterious to health, and, in my judgment, I believe this board ought to be kept in force so the Secretary of Agriculture may have these questions referred for final decision, that are matters of dispute in the medical profession and among scientists.

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. In the event that the Supreme Court of the United States should render a decision which was manifestly erroneous and oppressive to the great majority of people and to the President of the United States, and the President should appoint a commission to review that decision of the Supreme Court, would the gentleman approve that act or regard it as legal?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that is an analogous case to the one we are discussing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I want to say just one word in addition, if the committee will bear with me, that so far as benzoate of soda is concerned, if used in small quantities it may likely not be deleterious to health, yet I think the greatest caution should be exercised in the use of any preservative. Nothing, in my judgment, should be done to impair the effects of the pure food and drug law. I believe a referee board, where those who are dissatisfied may go for appeal, will have a tendency to strengthen the act.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DRISCOLL].

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, we are all working to the same end, that the pure-food law may be enforced and that only healthful and wholesome food may be allowed to go into trade. Chemistry is an occult science about which the ordinary man knows but little, and it is quite true that great chemists may differ as to their analyses of various things. This is an important question not only to the consumer but also to the producer, and the best ability obtainable in the decision about which there is grave dispute should be secured. And no man should arrogate to himself all the ability or knowledge of this important matter. The good judge of an inferior court is always glad to be reviewed by a court of appeals. He has no pride, and he is willing to have his judgments reviewed and to follow the decision of the higher court in his next decision. This board of referees is a court of appeals in this matter of the analysis of foods. I do not know any of them except the chairman, Dr. Ira Remsen. Thirty-odd years ago, when I was in Williams College, Doctor Remsen was the professor of chemistry and physics in that institution. He was a young man then and he was an able chemist and a great physicist. He was accurate in all his analyses. He was an honest man and he was fearless. He has been growing ever since and he is now the president of Johns Hopkins University. He is the foremost chemist in the United States to-day. Notwithstanding my respect for Doctor Wiley, for his ability, his character, his honesty, I do not think he ought to refuse to be reviewed or to have any of his examinations on important matters reviewed by so great a man as Doctor Remsen, and I do not think that we ought to deprive ourselves or the people of the country of the protection assured to them by the scientific knowledge of that great chemist and honest man who is now the president of Johns Hopkins University. This proposed amendment should fail.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND].

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, personally I object to the statement that has been made or intimated to the effect that all of those who would oppose this amendment are not friendly to the enforcement of the pure-food law. I also dissent from the statement that the manufacturers of this country are opposed to that law. I myself was a member of the committee which framed the pure-food act and which sat and took the testimony of gentlemen who were interested, and I saw only one disposition, and that was to have a law that would protect the public against impure food and drugs and at the same time afford protection to the manufacturing interests of this country which would try to obey that law. What do gentlemen propose? It is to prevent as far as may be the possibility of obtaining the highest, fullest, and best information on foods and food preservatives—to prevent fullest information on doubtful and yet most important questions and leave the decision to one man. And the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] has served notice that he has others if this shall fail. Nobody on this floor has attacked for one moment the finding of the referee board about benzoate of soda.

There is not a man who has questioned the honesty, character, or ability of the gentlemen who constitute that board. I submit that it is not a question of pure food, it is not a question of using deleterious preservatives, but it is a question, in spite of all that gentlemen may say to the contrary, as to whether one man shall decide this question, because the amendment proposes—

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TOWNSEND. Oh, I do not want to be discourteous, but I would like to finish this statement.



Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield then?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Certainly, if I have time. Under the law as it exists now, when the Chief Chemist decides that a substance used as a preservative is not fit or that any form of food is not proper to use, and a dealer or manufacturer violates such opinion of the Chief Chemist, suit may be brought. The defendant is brought into court and is tried by the standard which the Chief Chemist has laid down. The defendant has the burden of proving the harmlessness of the thing used and must bring in the men of superior expert ability to make his defense. Why not let a board of such experts pass on these questions of general importance before the man is branded as a criminal and his business injured, if not ruined? I submit, gentlemen, that what the Secretary of Agriculture did in suggesting this board of referees was just what Doctor Wiley, in the printed testimony before our committee, said should be done.

Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES. But Congress refused to do it?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; the House passed a bill including a provision for a board of referees, and it went out in the Senate; but when the question was brought up to Doctor Wiley before our committee he was asked what objection there was to a board of this kind, and he said there was no objection to experts that he could see, but it was not necessary to put it in the law, for the Secretary of Agriculture would take advantage of all these opportunities in finding out what were deleterious and what were harmless.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes, I will; but the gentleman must remember I have only five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I understand; but I would like very much to ask the gentleman from Michigan what reason there is for the use of these preservatives at all.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not know, and for that reason I want a board which does know to tell me about it. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. And for that reason I want to protect the public against the use of them. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes; the gentleman wants one man to sit in judgment, who may have already prejudged the question. Now, I have a great deal of confidence in Doctor Wiley, but if he is the eminent scientist which gentlemen claim for him he will not object to sitting in council with the eminent gentlemen who constituted that board. What we are after is to get at the truth of this matter, and we can get at it no more directly than through the provisions adopted by the Secretary of Agriculture. [Applause.]

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am anxious that the Members of this House should understand exactly what the issue is which is brought up by the pending amendment, because I am sure that if the House does understand it the amendment will be voted down.

An impression seems to prevail in the minds of some gentlemen that if this amendment is defeated in some way there will be an attack made upon the pure-food law. I wish to give assurance that there is no thought of that kind in the mind of anyone who opposes this amendment. I wish to suggest that the most beneficent law can be broken down by a harsh, uncompromising, unreasonable, and unreasoning construction and enforcement of it.

I wish also emphatically to deny that any of us who oppose this amendment do so through antagonism to Doctor Wiley, the eminent Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry. My own relations with him have long been intimate and cordial, and I have had the highest regard for his professional attainments.

But I take the position that it is the Secretary of Agriculture, and not a subordinate official of his department, upon whom has been imposed by Congress the duty of enforcing the pure-food law. I know the law prescribes that to the Bureau of Chemistry shall be referred the question of determining the character of the ingredients of foods and drugs; but that law also provides that in case any citizen feels himself aggrieved by the determination of the Bureau of Chemistry he shall have a chance "to be heard." Heard by whom? Not by the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, but by the Secretary of Agriculture. And why heard if not that in the Secretary of Agriculture there rests discretion to overturn the decision of the Bureau of Chemistry, if in his judgment the facts so warrant? Why should you give to the man an opportunity to be heard if you deny to his judge the privilege of rendering a verdict in his favor? There can be no question of the intent of Congress when it made the Secretary a court of appeal to whom a man who believed himself to be aggrieved by a decision of the Bureau of Chemistry

could come; and there is no doubt that Congress intended to give the Secretary discretion to get information in whatever way he thought best in order to enable him rightly and fairly to determine the matter.

And if the Secretary believes that in order to get the right information it is necessary for him to call in the aid of this distinguished board of chemists, undoubtedly he is within his rights in so doing. Moreover, Congress has distinctly declared him to be within his rights, in my judgment, because in the appropriation act—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield—

Mr. SCOTT. I can not yield now, I desire to finish this statement—because in the appropriation act for the Department of Agriculture, immediately succeeding the passage of the pure-food law, authority was given the Secretary of Agriculture—not the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry—to enforce this law, and to enable him to do so authority was given him "to employ such assistants, clerks, and other persons" as he—the Secretary of Agriculture, not the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry—might consider to be necessary. Under such language it seems to me that Congress plainly foresaw the necessity of the Secretary to employ experts other than those in his own bureau in order to reach a wise decision, and intended to give him the authority to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], and on this question tellers have been ordered. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] will take their places as tellers.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 70, noes 111.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 27, at the end of line 21, insert:  
"Provided, That no part of the moneys appropriated herein shall be used for payment of compensation or expenses of any member of any board of referees or other body constituted without specific authority of law for the purpose of revising, modifying, or overruling the action of any official of the Department of Agriculture had under the said act of June 30, 1906."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT] makes a point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw my point of order and ask for a vote.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on the amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to inquire of the Chair whether or not debate was closed by vote of the House on this section?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I did not understand that debate was closed on this paragraph. I do not think, and I do not understand, that debate was closed on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The matter is being investigated and report will be made in a moment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the RECORD shows as follows:

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the debate on the pending paragraph close at 5 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. On what page is that?

Mr. SCOTT. That is on page 1916 of the RECORD. This morning unanimous consent was given to continue the debate for fifty minutes, but I do not think that it recalls the action of the House taken on last Thursday.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that even though the RECORD shows as the gentleman from Kansas has stated, that would not prevent the offering of amendments and debate upon amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inform the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] that amendments are in order, but if the time was all consumed on Thursday last by limitation, no debate is in order.

Mr. LEVER. I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the unanimous consent or agreement entered into this morning referred to the amendment that was pending and not to future amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands it. The question depends wholly upon the action that was taken when the bill was under consideration on last Thursday. It is the recollection of the Chair that the time for debate on this paragraph was limited and was consumed last Thursday. Therefore the

question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, that being the case, in order that the committee may know what it is voting upon, I ask that the amendment be reported once more.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 53, yeas 79.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 21, page 37, after the word "dollars," insert: "Of which sum not to exceed \$60,000 may be used for the payment of all expenses of the referee board of consulting chemists."

Mr. SCOTT. I have no objection to that amendment.

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order on this amendment, or I make the point of order. It is clearly subject to the point of order. I do not see how it could be otherwise. It is a specific authorization of \$60,000 for purposes not now allowed by law. It is not a limitation, it is an authorization.

Mr. LEVER. I understood the Chair to rule that the point of order would not lay against the original language, because there was no law for this very thing.

Mr. MANN. It is not the original language at all. Here is a specific authorization for a board of referees not now created by law. Whether you can pay a board of referees out of the appropriation is one thing. This is a specific authorization for a particular class of employees. It is practically obligatory.

Mr. LEVER. Will the Chair permit me just a word on the point of order? I agree fully with the gentleman from Illinois that this referee board was not authorized by law and is not authorized by law. This amendment is offered largely for the purpose of permitting gentlemen on that side, and a few on this side, to chew their own cud for a little while. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation of soils, and for indicating upon maps and plats, by coloring or otherwise, the results of such investigations, \$137,360.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 5, change "one" to "two," so as to read "\$237,360."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment increases the appropriation for soil-survey work \$100,000. The reason I offer this amendment is that I believe the most important work that is being done by the Department of Agriculture is the base work, on which all of its investigations must depend, and that is upon the soil. Unless the farmer, or whoever is interested in agricultural developments, knows what is in the soil, all of your scientific investigations go for naught, because they are absolutely based upon the soil as the foundation stone of the entire investigation. The soil survey to agriculture is like a chart of the seas to navigation. In order that you may sail to the port in safety that you desire to reach you must have a chart of the seas. In order that you may accomplish what you want through scientific agriculture, you must have a knowledge of the soils to begin with before you can expect to accomplish anything.

Now, this Government is spending vast sums of money building a navy, maintaining an army, building public buildings throughout the country. I believe the appropriations for the last session of Congress amounted to something like \$800,000,000; and yet for this basic proposition of soil survey, the base of all agriculture, the committee brings in the pitiful appropriation of \$137,000.

Now, I know the answer to that is, they say the Secretary of Agriculture does not want any more money and that somebody else does not want any more money. I believe that the Agricultural Department is an excellent adjunct to agriculture. I believe in many ways it is doing great work. But the Department of Agriculture is going to science too much and to the farm too little. What good is all this investigation of scientific problems in agriculture if you do not bring it home to the farmer? To accomplish anything by it toward developing your agricultural resources, the first proposition to bring to the farmer is a knowledge of the soil he is cultivating, and then send a utiliza-

tion man to him to explain how scientific agriculture can be taken advantage of by the man who tills the soil.

The development of agriculture in this country for the last few years has grown to an untold amount. The reports show that the products of agriculture in the last year amounted to \$8,000,000,000, and that that amount has been trebled in the last twelve years; in other words, that our wealth attained through agriculture twelve years ago was only a third of what it is today. It is true the country has grown some, and population has grown some, but that does not account for the development of agriculture. It means that scientific methods, better farming, better utilization of the information that we have, has created all this great development in the field of agriculture; and if you will give them an opportunity to carry this scientific knowledge to the farm and farmer, in the next twelve years we will double the products of agriculture again. But this is the base, this is the foundation rock on which you have got to build, and I say that there is a great demand all over this country from the people, from societies, organizations, farmers' unions, from everybody, demanding that this part of the work be done, that this foundation work be carried out; and yet the committee has brought in this insignificant appropriation and asked this House to vote upon it.

The Bureau of Soils is intrusted with the study of the soil resources of the United States. The first step in such a study is to ascertain accurately, by actual field investigations, the extent, location, and character of each and every distinct soil type in the country and to determine the actual condition and efficiency of each of the different soils as a factor in the annual production of new agricultural wealth. This work is accomplished through the soil survey.

A soil survey determines the exact character of each soil, the kind of crops which it is best suited to produce, and the methods of tillage and fertilization which will lead to the most efficient cultivation of each soil. The survey ascertains by personal observation in the field the present use and capabilities of the different soils and also investigates the results which are being obtained by the most successful practical farmers owning and operating the lands in each district studied. The soil survey summarizes all present knowledge of soils, whether obtained by field investigations or by the chemical, physical, and soil fertility investigations at the bureau's laboratories. It also summarizes the experimental and research work of the various state institutions which are investigating the agricultural resources of the different States and Territories. The soil survey presents an unprejudiced statement of fact concerning each soil and its most profitable uses in each area investigated, and in the vast majority of cases also forecasts and advises additional and more profitable cultivation for each soil.

It presents to the farmer a summarized statement of the best agricultural practice in connection with the soils which he owns and works, and it also summarizes the methods of soil management and soil treatment which are used by successful farmers elsewhere on the same class of soil.

It furnishes to the state institutions engaged in local investigation an opportunity for the application of their experiments and research in connection with individual classes of soils and enables them to advise directly with the farmers in regard to the most successful treatment to increase the crop-producing power of their soils.

The soil surveys also call attention to undeveloped and unused soils and their capabilities, and direct the line of occupation of which these soils are capable, calling attention to new crops which may be introduced and to new methods of cultivation which may be employed.

The importance of the soil survey as a fundamental factor in national development may be judged from the fact that the annual production from the soils of the United States has now reached the enormous figure of \$8,000,000,000, having been trebled in the last twelve years. It is the conservative estimate of the experts in the Bureau of Soils that this stupendous amount may easily be doubled within the next fifteen or twenty years through a complete study of the capabilities of soils now cultivated and through the discovery of the proper uses for soils not now occupied as farm lands.

Such an undertaking is of the greatest national importance, not only to secure a firm foundation for the agricultural activities of the nation, but also in order that the necessities of the rapidly growing population of the whole country may be met through the increased efficiency of the farmers and the farms of the United States.

In the conduct of these soil surveys in the various parts of the United States there has at all times been hearty cooperation between the Bureau of Soils and the various state organizations interested in soil study.



In the State of Maine an extension of soil-survey work has been requested by the State College of Agriculture as a basis for recommendations by the state college in connection with the improvement of the general agriculture of the State.

The state college and experiment station in New Hampshire have requested additional soil surveys to assist them in the development of the horticultural interests of the State. In the State of New York a definite agreement has been entered into between the New York State College of Agriculture and the Bureau of Soils, providing that the state college shall furnish both men and funds for the extension of the soil-survey work within the State to serve as a basis for horticultural and agricultural surveys and the agricultural extension work of the New York state college.

In the State of Pennsylvania the dean of the college of agriculture and the director of the experiment station have requested the broad extension of soil-survey work to serve as a basis for both horticultural and agricultural work on the part of the college and station.

In the State of Maryland cooperation exists between the Maryland geological survey and the Bureau of Soils. In the State of West Virginia the field expenses of the soil-survey work are paid by the West Virginia geological survey in order that a larger amount of soil-survey work may be done each year.

The director of the Virginia agricultural experiment station has highly commended the work of the Bureau of Soils already done within that State, and has requested that additional soil-survey work throughout the State be completed as rapidly as possible.

In the State of North Carolina the North Carolina department of agriculture is cooperating actively with the Bureau of Soils, furnishing both men and money, in order to secure additional soil-survey work within the State. The North Carolina state department of agriculture is also following up the soil-survey work with direct demonstrations of the utility of each soil for the production of staple and special crops, and is using the soil surveys as a basis for its experimental work and for the work in connection with farmers' institutes.

The director of the South Carolina experiment station has requested additional soil-survey work in the State as a basis for agricultural extension work on the part of the experiment station in all parts of the State.

The state officials of Georgia have repeatedly in the past requested that soil surveys should be made in every county in which the 11 congressional-district agricultural high schools are located and in contiguous counties as rapidly as possible.

The State of Alabama has appropriated for use by the state department of agriculture the sum of \$10,000 annually to be expended in cooperation with the Bureau of Soils in making soil surveys in that State, and the commissioner of agriculture for Alabama says:

The soil-survey work in the State of Alabama is of the utmost importance to every agricultural interest. The experiments conducted upon the experimental farms in the different congressional districts of the State show that it is easily possible by procuring the right character of cotton for each of the different soil types of the State to increase the profit of cotton production from ten to twenty dollars per acre over that which is attained at the present time. A thorough knowledge of the soils of the State is essential in order to bring about this great increase in the value of the cotton crop of the State.

In Louisiana the officers of the state college and experiment station desire the rapid extension of the soil-survey work in connection with the experimental and demonstration work being carried on by these organizations.

The authorities of the state college of agriculture of the State of Missouri have recently requested that the Bureau of Soils should enter into cooperation with them in making at the earliest possible date a complete soil survey of that State to serve as a basis for further investigations on the part of the college of agriculture. They desire to expend from seven to ten thousand dollars annually of state funds to make this cooperation effective.

The chemist of the state college of agriculture desires the Bureau of Soils also to undertake cooperative work in making soil surveys in the State of Arkansas and has inquired as to the best methods for arranging such cooperation at an early date.

A similar request comes from the authorities of the state college of agriculture of the State of Washington.

A cooperative agreement between the North Dakota agricultural and economic survey and the Bureau of Soils has been in effect for nearly five years, and the State of North Dakota is furnishing both men and funds in order to secure the extension of the work in the State of North Dakota.

Wherever these cooperative agreements have been entered into between the Bureau of Soils and the various state organi-

zations a great impetus has been given to the agricultural progress of the States involved and the state authorities have in all cases requested the Bureau of Soils to allot larger funds for the work within their States as soon as the effects of the soil-survey work and its influence on agricultural uplift have become known.

The soil survey constitutes the first and most fundamental step in the development and maintenance of the agricultural resources of the United States. The work has only been in progress for a period of eight or nine years, and thus far only a beginning has been made in ascertaining the total soil resources of the United States. The work has been so distributed as to give the largest amount of information possible in regard to the different agricultural and soil regions of the country and has proved of inestimable value in the uplift of agricultural conditions throughout the entire country.

There are now on file at the Bureau of Soils the requests for over 500 different soil surveys, covering an area of more than 500,000 square miles. These requests come from every State in the Union and are supported by the petitions of agricultural societies, local and state granges, horticultural societies, and farmers' organizations of every description. In many instances they are also supported by boards of trade, chambers of commerce, and industrial associations of various localities. The funds which have been provided for the prosecution of this soil-survey work during the current fiscal year have not been sufficient to enable the bureau to meet even the new requests which have been placed on file during the year, and at the present rate of appropriation for the conduct of this work the requests on file at the present time could not be met during the next ten years. It is therefore absolutely essential, in order that the wishes of the people of the United States, as expressed to the Department of Agriculture, may be met, that this appropriation should be increased materially.

#### APPENDIX.

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE, COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,  
Orono, Me., September 23, 1908.

Dr. J. A. BONSTEEL,  
Bureau of Soils, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DR. BONSTEEL: I know that the soil-survey work which Mr. Westover has carried on in Aroostook County this summer is most valuable; but, as I have explained in other letters, the conditions are entirely different than in the southern part of the State. The soils of Aroostook County are not varying in character, while in the southern part we have all types, and there is a desire on the part of these people there to use these lands to the best advantage.

I would like to make application through you for a soil survey in southern Maine for next summer, and I trust the Bureau of Soils will see to it that this is allowed.

Assuring you that the university will do all that it can to help in this work, or any other work you desire to carry out, I remain,

Very truly, yours,

W. D. HURD,  
Dean and Professor of Agronomy.

CLEMSON AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,  
Clemson College, S. C., March 20, 1908.

Prof. MILTON WHITNEY,  
Chief Bureau of Soils, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR PROFESSOR WHITNEY: I have hoped to make a visit to Washington this winter to talk with you regarding your bureau cooperating with this experiment station in some cotton work that I would like to undertake in this State. There is no doubt but that the different soil types of the State greatly influence the lint of cotton grown, and I would like for your bureau to cooperate with me in determining the exact influence of the different soil types found in the State upon the staple and yield of cotton. Some of the varieties of cotton that have led at Clemson College in yield are poor yielders on other types of soil found in the State, whereas some of the poorest yielders here at the college give the very best results when grown on other soil types. Just why this is and how much the soil's physical make-up has to do with it is a problem worth solving. In other words, if we can determine and know the different soil types found in the State and then determine the best variety for these different soil types we would have solved a problem of great importance to the farmers.

Very truly, yours,

J. N. HARPER, Director.

LINCOLN, NEBR., September 26, 1906.

A day or so ago Mr. J. L. Burgess, of your bureau, brought a soil map of the Nebraska Experiment Station farm to my office, where it was examined by myself and Dean Bessey, of the Industrial College. We were greatly pleased with it. I wish to express my high appreciation of the kind and quality of the work which has been done by your men in making this survey. It was a revelation to us in regard to the work of the bureau and impressed me greatly as to its high value to the farmers of the country. With such a map of the experiment station farm to show the kinds of soil on which its crops are grown, the farmer in any surveyed part of the State may draw safe conclusions in regard to similar crops on his farm. When all the State is mapped by your bureau the value of the work of our experiment station will be greatly enhanced.

E. BENJ. ANDREWS,  
Chancellor of the University of Nebraska.

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY,  
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, SEATTLE,  
University Station, December 23, 1908.

Dr. MILTON WHITNEY,  
Bureau of Soils, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to acknowledge your valued favor in regard to the cooperation of your survey with a similar survey of logged-off lands in this State. The association has taken definite action and is quite enthusiastic over the prospect of having an appropriation of \$10,000 made by the state legislature for our end of the work.

Now, what I should like to have from you, after giving me the arrangements you have with various States, is an outline of the next steps necessary to secure work in this territory. To what extent will it be necessary for us to petition, and to what extent shall we get the assistance of our Congressmen and Senators in having requests made to your bureau?

Any suggestions that you can give me will be promptly acted upon and the movement started in earnest.

Sincerely, yours,

H. K. BENSON.

SEATTLE, WASH., December 21, 1908.

United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I am a member of the state legislature and know some little of the work of the Geodetic Survey, and I have just had placed in my hands a copy of the soil survey in the vicinity of Everett. I should be pleased to have you inform me what appropriation should be made by the State of Washington to get this work carried on to completion in the State of Washington. I am advised the department helps those who help themselves, and I would like to have an expression of what this survey would cost and what appropriation should be contributed by the State, and how much annually, to accomplish this result.

Yours, truly,

E. B. PALMER.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., January 16, 1909.

Prof. MILTON WHITNEY,  
Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Soils, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are having frequent calls for the soil maps which the department has issued for this valley. They are extremely interesting and valuable. Can you tell me where we can get copies for distribution; and if the edition was exhausted, can you tell me whether another edition will be soon issued?

Awaiting a reply at your convenience, I am,

Yours, very truly,

B. A. FOWLER,  
President Salt River Valley Water Users' Association.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY,  
SOUTH TEXAS GARDEN, FORT BROWN,  
Brownsville, Tex., December 22, 1908.

MILTON WHITNEY,  
Chief Bureau of Soils, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I beg to acknowledge your favor of December 14, transmitting a map and report covering the Fort Brown soil survey, for which kindly accept my thanks. A year's experience upon this land shows me that the map and description is remarkably accurate, and these papers will prove of considerable value here in the office.

There are a great many inquiries for copies of the Soil Survey of the Brownsville Area, and we have distributed to people wanting them about 25 copies from this office. I should esteem it a favor if you could send us 25 or 50 more of these bulletins, as our supply is exhausted. The planters and ranchmen about here have spoken very highly of this bulletin, stating that on their own lands the characters of the soil indicated upon the map can be accurately traced.

Thanking you, I am,

Very truly,

E. C. GREEN, In Charge.

LINCOLN, NEBR., June 15, 1908.

United States Department of Agriculture,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The copy of Soil Survey of Lancaster County has been received, and I think it a very valuable publication and should be in the hands of every farmer and landowner in the county.

I have owned land here now three years, and have continually advocated plowing deep, clover and alfalfa, etc., as recommended in this pamphlet. It is almost impossible to convince the old timers, but believe the younger men may yet take heed. I will very much appreciate it if you will kindly send copies of above survey to the following farmers, who own land adjoining mine, in the hope they may profit thereby. I shall call their attention to its importance from a scientific as well as practical importance.

George Stabler, Robert Casey, George Trumble, Mr. Feather, Levi Wilhelm, Louis Rust, Frank Hansen, Havelock, R. F. D.; D. T. Jewett, Waverly, R. F. D.

I could use a few extra copies, if the department will send them to me. Thanking you for the favor, I am,

Respectfully, yours,

IRA E. ATKINSON.

We, the undersigned, as members of the Roxanna Grange, of southern Delaware, desire to express our great appreciation for the most excellent work being done in this section by the Bureau of Soils, through Mr. J. W. Nelson, and we wish to thank our Secretary of Agriculture (Hon. James Wilson) and Professor Whitney, of the Bureau of Soils, for the valuable assistance given us in selecting and testing for us the most suitable types of soil for strawberry growing and other truck crops, and also advising with us as to the preparation and treatment of the various types for these industries.

We consider this work as the most valuable for our farmers that can be taken up, as it will aid us in choosing the soils best adapted to the crops we desire to grow and thereby enable us to avoid the failures in the past by enabling us to plant our crops on soil types which are suited to them.

We therefore hope the Bureau of Soils will continue its good work of educating our farmers on this important question of "our soils."

P. W. MURRAY, W. M.  
J. C. EVANS, Secretary.

MAY 1, 1908.

VIRGINIA AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION,  
Blacksburg, Va., March 31, 1908.

Mr. MILTON WHITNEY,  
Chief of Bureau of Soils,  
United States Department of Agriculture,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have received 12 copies of your report of the soil survey of Chesterfield County, Va., and thank you for the courtesy. I hope it may be your plan to extend the survey work in this State. I have not been in this State long, but have been here long enough to have heard of the keen interest that many of our people take in this work.

I have just spent a week in deciding locations for tobacco experiment stations, and found your survey of Louisa and Hanover areas very valuable indeed as a guide in determining the best location.

If your files will permit, I shall be glad to have 12 copies of each of the other areas surveyed in Virginia.

Yours, very truly,

S. W. FLETCHER.

BLACKSBURG, VA., November 24, 1908.

Mr. MILTON WHITNEY,  
Chief of Bureau of Soils,  
United States Department of Agriculture,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have received the soil survey of Montgomery County. It will be very useful to us.

I appreciate the work that the bureau has done in this State, and have occasion very frequently to refer to it.

Yours, very truly,

S. W. FLETCHER,  
Director Virginia Experiment Station.

NORTH MILWAUKEE, WIS.,  
January 28, 1908.

Hon. WILLIAM H. STAFFORD,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Would you be so kind to mail me the reports (together with the maps) of the Field Operations of the Division of Soils. I would like to have the first report (1899) and the sixth (1904) report, and all following. I have already the years 1900 to 1903 (second to fifth report). Valuable as they are, I can not miss a single report, for I use them freely to make extracts for our agricultural and horticultural papers. To help both our farmers and intending settlers we can not do better but to distribute the knowledge gained by these documents (what crops to raise on a certain soil in a certain area). And in the future much good will come for our unsettled land in northern Wisconsin, when these districts will be mapped out and the various soils described.

Thanking you in advance for your kindness, I am,

Very truly, yours,

W. A. RICHTER.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama, proposing an increase for the Bureau of Soils in the Agricultural Department. I am convinced that the soil survey and investigation work as conducted by this bureau is of great importance and benefit to the farmers of this country, as well as of great value to its commercial interest. I believe that the main opposition to the soil survey springs from a lack of knowledge of its true merits. You take the Members of this House who have been reared on farms or who have had practical experience in farming, and they are all impressed with the importance of the soil survey, almost without exception. It is easy to explain why this is; in fact, it is self-explanatory. These Members of the House have a practical experience in farming; they know something of the trials and obstacles that farmers have to encounter; they are in sympathy with the farmers; they know that the soil survey is a great blessing to the farmer; they know that the farmers are entitled to a great deal more than they are receiving from the Congress of the United States; they want to better conditions on the farms throughout the country; they want to place it in the power of the farmer to better understand, if possible, the soil upon which he is supporting himself, his family, and helping to support the rest of the world; they want to show, if possible, how the yield of the farm can be doubled, thus putting surplus dollars into the pockets of our farmers. No one can do anything successfully unless he knows what he is doing. There are many of our farmers who are running their farms and getting along very well without knowing the classification of the soil upon which they are farming. I know this is a fact—I was raised on a farm and spent many years of my life in farming, and I am running two small farms now.

We all must admit that farming for many years has been conducted not wholly, but almost entirely, without regard to scientific methods. If money can be made in loose farming—I might say in chance farming—how much better would it be if our farmers could be brought to understand that farming is not only a science, but the most important industry of the world, and that it should be conducted upon practical lines under the guidance of scientific methods. The farmers are coming to understand this. The people as a whole are coming to understand it, and farming to-day is being done upon a more scientific and businesslike scale than ever before in the history of the world. The necessity of educated farmers is being recognized more than ever before, and statistics show that within the last few years



there has been a great increase in the number of agricultural institutions throughout the country and that farmers are educating their sons and daughters to a greater extent than ever before. This is gratifying, for it means greater things for the agricultural industry. [Applause.]

You will pardon this digression from my subject. This subject of the education of our country boys and girls is one of intense interest to me. I know from actual experience the hardships and obstacles they encounter in an effort to secure knowledge. They are not provided with as good schools and facilities of obtaining an education as the boys and girls in the cities and towns. Any action looking to the improvement of the rural schools has my hearty indorsement, and anything that tends to give assistance to the farmers whereby they will be in better position to supply better educational advantages for their boys and girls also has my support.

Now, then, let us go back to the soil survey. I am so deeply interested in this vital matter of better educational facilities for the boys and girls in the rural districts that I was about to lose sight of the topic I had under discussion.

What is the soil survey for—what are its purposes? I have not the time to go into a full discussion of it, but as I understand it, the object of the work of the Bureau of Soils is to investigate and map out the important soil areas in accordance with their geological relations and their agricultural value. These maps are of such a character as to show farmers or prospective settlers the character of the soil and the nature of the crops or the general classes of crops adapted to the general soil formations of the different regions. The soils adapted to the certain classes of crops should also be thoroughly investigated and mapped so that one could see by consulting the maps the areas adapted to certain classes of tobacco, truck, horticultural, or other crops. Such work forms an essentially new line of agricultural geology, and requires for its successful prosecution persons trained in the difficult problems of surface geology and who have a broad appreciation and knowledge of the relation of soils to crops.

There are still large areas of land along the Atlantic coast and in other parts of the country, so we are told by the Agricultural Department, lying out as waste lands, which are adapted admirably to the raising of early truck crops. There are large areas of land in many of our States, well adapted to the different classes of tobacco and to other agricultural and horticultural crops, which are at present not used to the best advantage, because the relations of the soils to crops are not fully understood or appreciated.

The soil survey and examination work is to help us know the soils, by giving us a scientific investigation, which is to be fully shown upon a soil map showing beyond doubt, and as accurately as can be done, the classification of the soils. Who can say that such an examination is not of vital help to the agricultural interest of the country? What farmer is there in this whole country who would not be glad to get without cost to himself a soil survey of his lands and be furnished a map of that survey showing up the character of his soils, showing what crops it is best adapted to, showing in what plant food his soils are deficient, showing what treatment his soils need? The farmers usually get this knowledge, but how have they been getting it? By experimenting a lifetime, trying first one fertilizer and then another; in many cases it is purely guesswork. Many have lived a long life and died without ever knowing their soils. It just seems to me that this is of the most vital importance to the farmers, and especially the young farmers, or those who are seeking new fields in which to apply the art or science of farming. It strikes me that a young farmer with the benefit of one of these soil surveys, provided with the usual soil map, showing up the character of soils, their crop adaptation, the treatment needed, the best kind of fertilizers to be used, will save not only many years of experimenting, but will save thousands and thousands of dollars that, in my opinion, are now spent uselessly in fertilizers that are misapplied and not what the lands need. This would be a blessing not only to the farmer himself, but to the whole world, for the farmer is the "Atlas" who supports the world. [Applause.]

Showing the many strong points in favor of the Bureau of Soils, I beg to refer here to an article from the New York Tribune, which is as follows:

The greatest fear of the American soil tillers—exhaustion and unproductiveness of land—is rapidly being dispelled by the experiments and investigations of the Bureau of Soils. This branch of the Department of Agriculture has received little advertising; it does its work quietly and the cities hear little of it, but to the great and small farming districts, to the hesitating planter, and to the dependent settler it is a great boon and a daily counselor. It has shown the way to scientific farming; it has made briar patches into grassy, fertile plains; swamps into blooming cornfields; sandy prairies into acres of production. In short, a man can learn in an hour from the Bureau of Soils what his father spent years in ascertaining, and he can learn it with greater ac-

curacy. From a map or a report he can see what crop his land will best produce, what it will not yield, and, perhaps, that it will bring him undreamed of produce and wealth. The Bureau of Soils has made many farmers rich, and the number that make use of the bureau is increasing daily.

Its possibilities seem unlimited; its results at present are extraordinary, but its scope is of necessity limited because of a lack of funds with which to carry on the work completely and comprehensively. The authorities of the bureau, under the direction of Prof. Milton Whitney, have asked for \$500,000 for the fiscal year 1909, and they have some assurances that this amount will be appropriated by Congress. Representatives who have studied the workings of the bureau and who have satisfied themselves of its utility say that half a million is insufficient, and that the tremendous advantages it is working to the country, both monetary and otherwise, warrant a much larger expenditure. The authorities of the bureau, however, have been wisely modest in their request and are daily engaged in explaining the work of the institution to all who are interested. What will be accomplished with the \$500,000, if it is granted, can best be gauged by a consideration of what has been done with the \$200,000 spent in 1907.

In the main, the Bureau of Soils devotes a large portion of its attention to surveying, mapping, and classifying the land of the United States and determining the constituents of soil in such a precise manner that a farmer wishing to plant a certain crop can determine in advance the advisability of such a course by a moment's reference to the report of the bureau. Irrigation and its success must be largely credited to this department. Reclamation owes its inception to the bureau; fertilization and erosion are studied in their most technical phases and reported in simple language, while the transplanting of seed and the adaptability of soil complete the main uses of the bureau.

The maps issued are used not only by farmers and agriculturists but by landowners of all classes, including real estate and railroad men. From every part of the country come requests asking that particular portions of land be surveyed; thousands of maps and reports are asked for, and many letters of appreciation and thanks are on file at the bureau. To chart every necessary portion of land in the country is the ultimate aim, but at present the bureau is ten years behind, even in those regions where a survey will mean a certain and immediate increase in the value of soil. More than 40,000 requests come to the bureau in a year from struggling farmers, from cattle raisers, from important chambers of commerce, from boards of trade, and from various state departments of agriculture and geological surveys. Several States have cooperated with the bureau to a considerable extent, Alabama having given \$10,000 for this purpose and, it is said, has received thousands in return. Only a small proportion of the requests can be complied with, as the force of surveyors is small. A systematic plan is being followed out, which in the course of time will give satisfaction to all regions, and which an increased appropriation would greatly facilitate.

That is an able newspaper argument for a good cause.

I wish to quote from a report of the Agricultural Department, which sheds further light upon the real necessity and importance of this soil survey, which is as follows:

The soil is fundamental in its uses. For these reasons the study of the soil must always occupy a fundamental position in the development of the resources of the United States and in the arrangement of its economic conditions. Only within recent years has the great variety which actually exists in the soil resources of the United States been understood. Beginning in 1899 the soil survey of the Bureau of Soils has been engaged in the classification of soils, in the representation, upon soil maps, of the occurrence of the various types discovered, and in the preparation of reports which describe the characteristics and the uses of the different soils encountered. Since the beginning of this work in 1899 approximately 100,000 square miles of the agricultural regions of the United States have been surveyed. Nearly 600 different types of soil have been encountered, and special studies have been made not only of the soils adapted to the growing of the cereal crops, but also of those special-purpose soils which have a high value for the production of fruit of various kinds, of truck, of market-garden crops, of different varieties of tobacco, of sugar beets, and of many newly introduced crops.

Studies along the Atlantic seaboard have demonstrated that the Norfolk sand, Norfolk fine sand, and the Norfolk fine sandy loam are peculiarly adapted to the production of those early vegetables and fruits which furnish the supply for the northern city markets. It has also been shown in this connection that where transportation is adequate land belonging to these three soil types which formerly had a value of \$5 an acre can readily be made to have a value of from \$100 to \$200 an acre for the production of the truck crops.

The recent improvement of the rice industry in Louisiana and Texas has led to investigations of the soils best adapted for growing this crop. It has been found that in general the heavy silt loams and clay loams of the Louisiana and Texas seacoast prairies are well adapted to rice production, and it has been upon soils of this character that the wonderful strides in rice production have been made possible.

It was through the soil surveys that the rich tobacco lands of Florida and south Georgia were discovered. Lands that were considered ordinary lands and of small value are now yielding large and valuable crops and are greatly enhanced in value.

I was greatly interested in a speech made during the last session of this Congress by Hon. J. E. ELLERBE of South Carolina, and to further show in this connection the great importance of the soil survey I wish to quote the following from his remarks:

Such was the work on the tobacco soils and to such extent with the tobacco problems that soils are now chosen by the growers in the leading tobacco districts of the United States, and favorable results are certain from the start, and the industry has been placed on a very permanent and profitable basis.

As another illustration, it is found that not only are the different types of soils of widely different value for growing cotton, but also that the different varieties of cotton require different soils for their most profitable growth, and that the working out of the soil preferences for each of the many varieties of that crop is a most necessary and entirely possible problem, the solution of which would save the southern planters hundreds of thousands of dollars each year. Sufficient progress has now been made in soil studies to be certain that many of our crops are not only grown to the best advantage on certain classes of soils, but that the

different varieties thereof are very definite in their soil preferences or requirements.

In my own district there are thousands of acres of land planted to cotton and producing \$10 to \$15 per acre, that could, if devoted to other crops, produce from \$100 to \$500 per acre. Some men have been pioneers in this great work and deserves the "well done" of every man who delights in the prosperity of his country.

McIver Williamson, of Darlington County, S. C., has revolutionized corn growing in my State and proven that with proper selection, preparation, fertilization, and cultivation of soil from 75 to 150 bushels of corn can be grown per acre instead of 10 to 15 bushels, as formerly.

Captain Drake, of Marlboro County, some years ago contested for the prize of \$500 offered by the Orange Judd Publishing Company for the most corn grown on 1 acre. This was open to every State in the Union. He opened the eyes of the people of this country when he grew 254 bushels and 50 pounds of corn on a measured acre of Marlboro land.

Some years ago the managers of the Raleigh and Charleston Railroad, in their efforts to develop the country through which their road ran, sent a man to Marion, S. C., who sold one crop of lettuce from a single acre of Marion soil for more than \$1,800.

Captain Westbrook, of North Carolina, made \$23,000 above expenses on 20 acres of land, considered by many to be of little value. Strawberries were grown entirely.

There can be no doubt about the soil survey and soil maps being of great help to the farmers. The question is, Are we going to continue to make a farce, so to speak, out of the bureau from which this great help emanates, or are we going to back it up with funds and assistance such as it needs in order that this good work can go forward? I am in favor of making sufficient appropriations for this bureau, so that it will be in position to be of material help to the farmers. We have long since passed the experimental stage with it. It has been abundantly shown that it is one of the most important branches of the Agricultural Department, and that if the work was not so hampered from time to time by small appropriations it could and would result in great blessings to the farmers, and this Bureau of Soils should receive more favorable consideration at the hands of Congress than it does. It is not treated fairly, and by discriminating against it the farmers are discriminated against.

I have known for a long time that the soil survey was a good thing for the farmers, and for nearly two years I have been pleading for soil surveys in certain counties of the district which I represent, particularly for Bulloch County, in which is located, at Statesboro, Ga., the agricultural college for that district. I thought at one time that I almost had the soil survey for Bulloch County, which had been requested through a formal resolution of many of the citizens of that county, but I was doomed to disappointment, for the answer finally came "not now," "not sufficient funds at this time," or words to that effect. I have had it up with the department and with the Bureau of Soils on several occasions, and it is always "a lack of funds" to postpone this important work. [Applause.]

I am tired of that answer; I am tired of the delay. This bureau should be given sufficient funds with which to operate, because, as I have already said, it has long since passed the experimental stage, and it should be permitted to grow and develop in usefulness. It should be properly cared for and permitted to expand its great work. The farmers want it to be taken care of; they want it to expand; and the fact that there are to-day something like 500 applications on file in that bureau for soil surveys in various parts of the United States is sufficient evidence of its merit. The Bureau of Soils has been investigating soil conditions in the United States for over ten years, and in that time there has been only nine soil surveys made in the great State of Georgia, and not a single one of the nine, except the small area at the agricultural college at Statesboro, Ga., is in the First Congressional District. My people want a soil survey, and we must have it; and if we do not get it, I want them to know that I am not to blame in the matter. In the nine soil surveys that have been made thus far in Georgia, I am advised that a total area of 3,300 square miles has been covered, at an expense of less than \$9,000. I am advised that, including my requests for soil surveys, there are 31 requests on file for surveys and maps in Georgia at the present time, covering a total of something like 12,350 square miles.

The Chief of the Bureau of Soils, in his annual report, has recommended that \$4,500 to \$5,000 should be expended annually in Georgia for the conduct of this soil-survey work. He says in his annual report for 1908:

This work is being done at the request of the governor of Georgia and of other state officials. These officials request and desire that detailed soil-survey maps on the scale of 1 inch to the mile should be made in the 11 counties in Georgia within which the agricultural high schools are located, in order that the results of the experimental work conducted at these high schools may be applied immediately throughout the county surrounding each school. It is thoroughly appreciated by those having the agricultural development of the State and its educational facilities in charge that the value of the work of these schools will be largely increased if such soil surveys can be made at an early date. There are also other agricultural interests, including those of the tobacco growers in southwest Georgia, the fruit growers in central Georgia, and the rice and sea-island cotton growers in eastern Georgia, that are urgently calling for the extension of soil-survey work in these

different localities. The amount of money expended in the State might well be increased to \$4,500 or \$5,000 annually in consideration of the valuable results which might be obtained during the next few years.

Soil surveys already made in Georgia have shown the existence of large areas of low-priced land well suited to the production of both filler and wrapper tobacco, and have aided enormously in the development of the tobacco industry in Georgia. At the present time individuals and corporations desiring to engage in the tobacco industry will only purchase land for that purpose according to the findings of the soil survey. As a result of the soil-survey work in southwest Georgia, the revenue from tobacco paid into the United States Treasury annually has in the last five years increased sufficiently to more than pay the total cost of the soil-survey work in the entire United States. [Applause.]

The soil surveys in central Georgia have aided in the extension and development of the peach industry, and Georgia, because of these soil surveys and of the information about peach soils which is contained in these soil surveys, is rapidly becoming one of the leading peach-producing States.

No soil surveys have yet been made in the Atlantic coast section of Georgia, and work of this character should be undertaken at once, in order to determine the relationship of the soils along the Atlantic coast to those in South Carolina similarly situated and upon which extremely valuable crops of cabbage, lettuce, and other winter vegetables are produced.

Soil surveys are also needed in Georgia to show the character and extent of the swamp lands which are capable of reclamation and agricultural occupation along the seaboard.

The farmers of Georgia are alert and desirous of using every known agency for the improvement of their farm conditions. Since 1880 there has been an increase of 86,000 in the number of Georgia farms. During that length of time there has been an increase of nearly 350,000 acres of land held in farms in the State, while for the same period there has been an increase of nearly two and one-half million acres in the improved land of the State. These figures show (1) that there is an increased demand for Georgia lands; (2) that Georgia farmers are going into intensive farming and are using the land which they possess to increasing advantage; (3) that Georgia farmers are building up for themselves an increasing number of prosperous farm homes. In this same period of time the value of Georgia farms and farm buildings has increased seventy-one and one-half million dollars.

In order that there may be increased specialization in crop production, in order that additional crops suited to Georgia soils and climate may be grown, in order that both the citizens of Georgia and their neighbors throughout the United States may know the exact resources of Georgia soils, these soil surveys must be extended as rapidly as possible throughout the unsurveyed portion of Georgia.

The citizens of Georgia are so much in earnest in desiring to improve their agricultural conditions and in desiring to develop their agricultural resources that they have provided 11 agricultural colleges, 1 for each of the 11 congressional districts of the State. They have requested, through their state officials, through their local boards of trade, through various farmers' organizations, and through their Representatives in Congress, that this soil-survey work should be extended as a sure foundation for additional growth in agricultural wealth and prosperity. The farmers of Georgia annually contribute their share to the support of the Federal Government, and they annually desire their just share in the work which the Bureau of Soils and the United States Department of Agriculture are doing for the improvement of farm conditions and the increase of agricultural efficiency.

There are now on file requests for over 500 additional soil surveys in the United States, covering an area of more than 500,000 square miles.

It would take the present force of the Bureau of Soils ten years to comply with these requests under the appropriation as it exists, and more new requests are placed on file each year than can be complied with during that year.

Since May 1, 1890, when the soil-survey work was first begun, surveys have been made of 160,000 square miles, located in 44 different States and 2 Territories.

The cost of this field work has been a little over \$400,000, and the demand for this class of work for the last seven years has been far in excess of any of the sums appropriated for its conduct.

The soils of the United States constitute its greatest economic resource, and, unlike the mines, the forests, and the fisheries, the soils are usually held by small individual owners, who have not the facilities for securing expert advice which lie within the reach of great corporations and extensive mill operators. The farmers of the United States, who own its soil, must depend largely upon the investigations and knowledge of the United



States Department of Agriculture and their own state experiment stations for expert knowledge and businesslike advice.

The people not only want these soil surveys and soil maps of their lands, but they are clamoring for them. We can a great deal better make appropriations for a productive and important interest of this kind than for huge battle ships costing into the millions, in the building and maintenance of which we are literally wasting the people's money. I am opposed to all such extravagant and wasteful appropriations, and think it is high time that the Government, which is now at peace with the rest of the world, should cease to increase its already unreasonable appropriations for a larger army and a larger navy. These large and extravagant appropriations should and could be applied with better advantage and with better grace to the payment of the public debt and to purposes that will be productive instead of destructive to the Nation's wealth.

I want to see the appropriations for the Agricultural Department generally increased until that department, which is intended to help the farmers, is in a position to really do what it was intended that it should do. The appropriations that are made for the benefit of the farmers are so miserably small as compared with the other appropriations that they are all out of proportion. It seems that Congress never dreams of real economy in making appropriations until appropriations are to be made for the agricultural interests, then economy is had, as usual, at the expense of the farmers. [Applause.]

Before concluding my remarks upon this very important matter, I wish to submit an extract from the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Soils, which will further illustrate the value of this work to the American farmers:

#### PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL INVESTIGATIONS.

During the last fiscal year the Bureau of Soils has made mechanical analyses of about 2,000 soils for the use of the Soil Survey of the Bureau. It has made upward of 800 chemical examinations of soils for the field parties of the bureau, and about 4,500 chemical examinations of soils, drainage waters, and fertilizers for other bureaus and outside parties entitled to such assistance. The bureau has devised several new forms of apparatus and new methods for the analysis of soils, descriptions of which have been given in appropriate places in literature. Besides this routine work, the laboratories have continued investigations upon the fundamental properties of soils. The absorption of vapors, especially water vapor and carbon dioxide, has been thoroughly investigated, as well as the absorption of dissolved substances from solution, properties of the utmost importance as affecting the physical condition of soils. The retention of soluble fertilizers and the reclamation of soils "affected by alkali" have been studied, and the investigations which have been carried on for some years past by this bureau and the results obtained by other investigators in these lines of investigation throughout the world have been brought together and made available for scientific workers in two bulletins of this bureau. Work has been continued on the closely related subjects of flocculation and sedimentation, with results which throw light not only on the physical structure and arrangement of the soils, but also on the nature of flowing waters and soil wastage, etc., and the investigation of this subject is now being actively continued.

I sincerely hope that this amendment to increase the appropriation for the Bureau of Soils will be agreed to, for I think it is one of the most meritorious appeals that has been before Congress during this session. It will be money spent for a good purpose in a field that will prove of vast benefit to the agricultural and commercial interests of this country. [Applause.]

Mr. POLLARD. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the Bureau of Soils make chemical analyses of soils?

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. That is my understanding, that they examine soils.

Mr. POLLARD. The gentleman is in error when he says they make chemical analyses of soils.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. What is the gentleman's understanding of the analysis that is made?

Mr. POLLARD. They simply make a physical analysis of the soil.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Do they not determine the chemical properties of the soil as well?

Mr. POLLARD. Not at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I understand it, the Bureau of Soils, in making an examination, determine what class of soil a particular specimen is, and at times they make chemical analyses of the soil where it is necessary; but they determine the class of soil it belongs to, so that they will know how to apply scientific agriculture to the particular soil that is on a man's farm.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. I am not so far wrong, then, when I say they do make chemical analyses.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Sometimes.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman from Georgia is doubtless acquainted with Dr. H. C. White, of Georgia University?

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. Appearing before the Committee on Agriculture and asked whether he believed that any beneficial result had come from the soil survey in the State of Georgia, he said:

I can not now recall that any advantage has come to our farming interests.

Does the gentleman think he is qualified to pass upon that subject?

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. I will reply to the gentleman in this way: That there has never been a sufficient amount of work done by the Bureau of Soils in the State of Georgia upon which to fix an intelligent conclusion. We have not had a thorough test.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the gentleman think Doctor White would express a conclusion that was not intelligent?

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. I think Doctor White is entirely wrong on this proposition. I have a high regard for him, but I differ with him in this. Doctor White is like a great many other gentlemen who are trying to conduct farming at long range and telling the farmers what they need without having practical experience themselves. I know Doctor White well and I have a high regard for him, but I disagree with him in this instance.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman say that the Bureau of Soils or anybody connected with it has had any practical experience in farming?

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Yes; I think there are a great many practical farmers who are connected with it.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is really convinced, then, that the work of the Bureau of Soils is of some use to the farmers of the country?

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Yes; I am thoroughly convinced of that fact.

Mr. MACON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. MACON. I would like to ask the gentleman if he can call to mind a single farmer who ever profited by any soil survey made by the National Government?

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Yes; I can in my own State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Georgia may continue for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may continue for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to say that I have one of the largest farms in the State of Illinois, which I operate, and in connection with which I have never asked or received any information from the Bureau of Soils.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. That accounts for the lack of knowledge which the gentleman displays on the floor, because he has not investigated this bureau and does not know what it is really doing. I am a farmer, and was raised on a farm, and have made some study of this matter. I have become thoroughly convinced, although I may not be able to convince the gentleman from Illinois, that the Bureau of Soils is a great thing for the farmer.

Mr. MACON. I want to ask the gentleman a further question. I want to know in what respect any farmer has ever been benefited by a soil survey made by the National Government?

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. We have but one soil survey in my district, the first district, which I have the honor to represent. That survey is a small one, and was made under the direction of the Bureau of Soils, I think, and was made on the site where the agricultural college is located at Statesboro; and they have profited greatly, as I understand it, through this survey. They have had only a small number of surveys made in the State, and I have talked with many farmers about them, and have learned that great good has resulted from these soil surveys.

I understand further that through the soil survey the tobacco lands of southwest Georgia, as I stated a while ago, were discovered, and that the tobacco lands of Florida were found to be adapted to the growing of that fine grade of tobacco that they are now producing.

Mr. MACON. The gentleman claims that this great improvement came from the investigation of the Bureau of Soils?

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. I do.

Mr. MACON. I am anxious to do anything to better the condition of the farmers, and I am trying to find out something about it. I have never heard any farmer say that he got any benefit from this Bureau of Soils. I am trying to find out about it.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. I have told you of those that we have in my State, and I have looked into it with some care. I would like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas a question. Have you had a survey made in your district?

Mr. MACON. No; but they have right across the river from me.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the farmers of Texas have benefited immensely by these soil surveys. The land in certain regions there was used only for grazing, and since investigations by the Bureau of Soils the great rice industry has assumed enormous proportions in these regions. The Bureau of Soils has also made important discoveries as to the practicability of growing tobacco in certain parts of Texas.

Mr. MACON. And it was the result of the surveys by the Bureau of Soils?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It was; and I consider it one of the most valuable bureaus of the Government.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. It is my information that it is a good thing, and the gentleman from Arkansas ought to go to the Bureau of Soils, or get in touch with it, and get a soil survey in the State of Arkansas, and if possible in his district, and learn something of this great work from practical experience. [Applause.]

Mr. POLLARD. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that the gentleman from Georgia began his speech by stating that he has looked into the question of soil surveys with great care, and then in the next statement says that the soil survey is a chemical analysis of the soil. In the first place, the experts in this department do not claim to make any chemical analysis of the soil.

Mr. COX of Indiana. What do they do?

Mr. POLLARD. They classify the soil.

Mr. COX of Indiana. What do you mean by "classify?"

Mr. POLLARD. They have divided the soils of the United States into about 400 different classes, and they go to a locality and classify that soil. They say this is marsh loam, and this is silt loam, and so forth; and, as I say, it is nothing but a description or classification of the soil. The soil survey is a physical, and not a chemical, analysis.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Do I understand you to say that they divide the soil into about four classes?

Mr. POLLARD. Four hundred classes.

Mr. COX of Indiana. If they have divided the soil into 400 classes and the farmer knows what each class is peculiarly adapted to, does not the gentleman think that in that way it will do the farmer a great deal of good?

Mr. POLLARD. If that was the case, I would say yes.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Is not it the case?

Mr. POLLARD. It is not the case at all, and there is the trouble with the whole proposition. The trouble with the soil surveys is this: That the soil surveys they send out over the country—and it is not alone confined to my part of the country, but to the South and East and every other part of the country—are oftentimes filled with as much misinformation or false information as with matters of fact.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Then, what does the committee provide for any of them for?

Mr. POLLARD. I will state, Mr. Chairman, I made these strong assertions at the beginning simply to attract the attention of the committee to what I propose to show. The committee is in favor of certain features of the work of the soil survey. The trouble with the question is that it is all yet an experimental question. It is an investigational question. We have not reached any conclusions yet that have been recognized by scientists of the United States or of the world.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLLARD. I will not yield to any more questions now until I make my statement. Then I will yield. The whole work is in an experimental stage, and the greatest harm that comes to the country from these soil surveys comes from the fact that a man goes into a certain part of the country and makes a soil survey, and he classifies the soil, and then he goes ahead and undertakes to tell what will grow in this kind of soil and what will grow in that kind of soil when he may not know a thing in the world about it. There is the trouble with the whole situation.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. POLLARD. I can not yield now. I will yield later if I have time. I want to make my statement. It is all an unknown problem. So far as their work is investigational we are heartily in favor of it. We want they should continue the investigations as far as possible, and we are in hopes that they will reach some conclusion somewhere along the line that we can tie to and we will know what we are talking about when we get out bulletins. As an instance of that to which I have referred, I want to call the attention of the committee to the hearings of last year. As an illustration of what the bureau undertakes to do, I read from page 397 of the hearings of this

year. I asked Mr. Whitney, the chief of the bureau, who was then before the committee, this question:

May I ask you whether you do any work of any experimental character with fruit?

His reply is:

Only so far as this—and I should like, if it would not have seemed discourteous, to have corrected Mr. UNDERWOOD in some of his remarks, as he preceded me. The only work we do in fruit is to study the adaptation of soils to fruit, and beyond that we do nothing—that is to say, we can determine from our soil surveys and from our utilization work the character of the soil that is adapted not only to any kind of fruit, but to any variety of fruit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLLARD. I ask unanimous consent to continue for ten minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. I object unless the gentleman will yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. POLLARD. I think the gentleman had ten minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Yes; but "the gentleman from Georgia" yielded very courteously to the gentleman from Nebraska when he was asked to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the objection if the gentleman will yield to a question in the ten minutes.

Mr. POLLARD. I have no objection to being interrupted when I make my statement, but I can not make a statement and be interrupted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to continue for ten minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLLARD. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says that the Bureau of Soils does not undertake to do any chemical examination. I hold in my hand the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Soils for 1908, by Mr. Whitney, the chief of the bureau, and on page 27 I find the following:

During the last fiscal year the Bureau of Soils has made mechanical analyses of about 200 soils for the use of the soil survey of the bureau. It has made upward of 800 chemical examinations of soils for the field parties of the bureau and about 4,500 chemical examinations of soils, drainage waters, and fertilizers for other bureaus and outside parties entitled to such assistance.

Mr. POLLARD. Mr. Chairman, I do not care about the gentleman using up my ten minutes in reading an article to the House. My statement was this, that in the soil surveys that are made in the field, which are mapped and distributed, no chemical analysis of the soil is made. On that question I am right, and I challenge the gentleman from Georgia to show to the contrary. They do make chemical analyses here in the bureau; there is no doubt about that. When samples of soil are sent in to the chemist in the bureau they make a chemical analysis of them.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. POLLARD. The gentleman from Alabama can not interrupt me. If the gentleman desires to ask me a question, all right; but I can not yield to him to make a speech.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to know if the gentleman does not know that when a forest survey is made in the field they bring the soil they get in the field to the laboratory and make a chemical analysis of it?

Mr. POLLARD. What I know is this, and the gentleman knows the same thing if he has investigated the question, that the soil surveys made broadcast over the country are not a chemical analysis of the soil at all. They are a physical analysis of the soil, wherein the soils are simply classified. Now, Mr. Chairman, this bureau has not only undertaken to go into the field and make a survey of the soil and tell whether apples can be grown or grapes can be grown there, but they also pretend to be able to tell what variety of grapes or apples can be grown. Now, this statement of Mr. Whitney's, which I was reading when interrupted, is absurd on its face, and to any thinking man is ridiculous.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLLARD. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. If the Bureau of Soils only guesses at what it does, would it not be a good idea to abolish it?

Mr. POLLARD. No; I do not think so, and I will tell the gentleman why I do not think so.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman admit they are only guessing at their work?

Mr. POLLARD. About half the time they guess right and about the other half of the time they guess wrong.

Mr. MADDEN. Then they must be guessing all the time, if they only guess right about half the time.



Mr. POLLARD. That is true. This statement, however, only applies to the advice given. The soil surveys themselves are accurate, so far as I know. As I said a moment ago, if the gentleman will give his attention, the investigational work they perform is of very great value, and that ought to be encouraged and carried on to the greatest extent. As an illustration of the point I have made, they went out into this same country from which the gentleman from Georgia comes, covering parts of Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Louisiana. After this soil survey was made, they told the people down there that the character of those soils were such that they could grow the finer grades of tobacco. They told them that they could grow Sumatra tobacco, the most valuable tobacco that is grown. The people who lived there believed this report of the Soils Bureau, simply because it came from the Government of the United States. They had confidence in it because they did not believe that the Government would send out any information unless it was reliable. Consequently, they began to grow the Sumatra tobacco, and the result was that millions of dollars worth of Sumatra tobacco were grown down there which was of such an inferior quality that the people could not market it—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I challenge that—

Mr. POLLARD (continuing). And they have not had a market for that—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I challenge the gentleman's statement on that proposition.

Mr. POLLARD. I have been informed to-day by a gentleman who has been on the ground that now there are upward of a million dollars' worth of tobacco in that country that the farmers can not sell simply because it is of such poor quality that it will not meet the demands of the trade. The business there has been virtually ruined on that account.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I know the gentleman will not stand for a statement unless it is true—

Mr. POLLARD. Certainly not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. A part of that Sumatra tobacco is raised in my district, and I know there has not been any of it that has been raised there that has not been sold for a good profit, and they are selling it to-day. Now, I challenge the gentleman to say where this tobacco has been raised that could not be sold. I know it has always been sold in my district, and at a profit.

Mr. POLLARD. Of course, I will admit the gentleman from Alabama knows more about what is being done in his district than I do, but I want to say this, that the information I received came from a man who has been on the ground and who has investigated the work—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Tell us who he is.

Mr. POLLARD. I can not do that. He is a man who went down there from the Bureau of Plant Industry after the work of the Bureau of Soils was found to be a failure. When they found they could not grow the high-grade tobacco with success, then they called upon the Bureau of Plant Industry to help them out. A man from the Plant Bureau was sent to save the property from loss. He has been compelled to develop by breeding a new species of that Sumatra tobacco that is acclimated to that country and can be grown at a profit.

I am told, also, that the same conditions prevailed up in the State of Connecticut, where they undertook to give advice concerning a matter that they had very little, if any, information about. They told the farmers of Connecticut they could grow Sumatra tobacco if planted and cultivated under shade. The shades were made at great expense, millions of dollars invested, and failure was the result. Again the Plant Bureau had to come in and develop by breeding a species of this tobacco that would grow in Connecticut. The trouble is that these men are soil men. They are not plant men. They make an analysis of the soil, and without taking into account the habits of the plant, without taking into account at all times the climatic conditions as well, they undertake to tell the farmers what they can do, and it oftentimes proves that their judgment is wrong.

The position of the committee on this matter is this, that we ought to go slowly, and that is why we did not increase the appropriation for this bureau. We thought that they ought to be required, so far as is possible, to confine their work to research work, to experimental work, and to investigational work, and not branch out into other lines until we know where we are, until we are sure of our ground; and we have not yet reached that point.

I can state other instances. Another instance occurred in the State of California, where the soil men had gone into the State and examined the soils in a particular region in the Sacramento Valley, I believe it was. They said the soil had a disease which prevented the people from raising potatoes. Last year Congress took from the Bureau of Soils the research

work they had been doing and turned it over to the Bureau of Plant Industry, and this work was put on the latter bureau. They sent a man out there, and they found that the trouble was not a soil problem at all, but that there was a disease of the tuber, a disease of the potato plant, that was making the trouble. It was not a soil problem in any sense of the word.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield for a question for information?

Mr. POLLARD. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Do the investigations of the Bureau of Soils throw any light on the question of fertilizers to enable the farmers to select more intelligently the kind of fertilizers that should be put on their crops?

Mr. POLLARD. To a limited extent I think that is true.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I would like to ask the gentleman, as I have never understood exactly, what the misinformation is that they are sending about over the country?

Mr. POLLARD. The misinformation I have just stated concerning the care of tobacco in the South, notably in the State of Florida and other parts of the South.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. That is a result of this investigational work that I understand the gentleman is in favor of?

Mr. POLLARD. They went in there and made a survey of the soil, and they told the people there that they could grow a particular type of tobacco. And when they came to grow the tobacco they found it did not grow successfully.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Let me see if I understand the situation. I am asking for information. It is the gentleman's idea and it is the committee's idea that they ought to ascertain the facts and not express an opinion on them?

Mr. POLLARD. No, sir. We want them to ascertain the facts. That is the trouble. They publish stuff that does not prove to be the facts. What we want them to do is to go slow and know their ground, and not publish any information until they are sure they are right. That is all. The fact is that we know very little about the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLLARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I favor this amendment, and I want to say to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture that I have not read the testimony of Doctor White given before that committee; but I know him to be a gentleman of very high literary attainments; a member of the faculty of the State University, at Athens, Ga., from which I graduated; a gentleman whom I personally know and that, too, very pleasantly. I understood the gentleman to read from his testimony in which he disapproved of the appropriation for soil surveys. There has been for some years past a difference between Doctor White and the practical farmers of the State on this and other matters as to the best methods to be used in advancing education in agriculture and in the application of the fund appropriated for the benefit of agricultural colleges. Doctor White lives in the city of Athens, the most aristocratic city in our State, and where the State University has always been situated, and there has been an effort going on to remove the experiment station from Griffin to Athens. While I have the utmost confidence in Doctor White as a teacher and a professor in the University of Georgia and in his sincerity, there are many farmers in the State of Georgia and in my own district, where some of these surveys have been made, whose opinions as to whether this survey has been of any practical benefit to the farmer or not I would readily accept in preference to his.

Now, I hold in my hand the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, and I want to read what is stated in reference to some of the soil surveys and the benefits that have resulted therefrom:

The importance of the soil survey as a factor in national development may be judged from the fact that the value of the annual products of the soil has now reached \$8,000,000,000, and in the conservative estimate of the experts of the Bureau of Soils this stupendous amount might easily be doubled within the next twenty years through a complete comprehension of the full capabilities of soils now cultivated and the discovery of the proper uses for soils not now cultivated. Such an undertaking is worthy the careful consideration of all who desire the present achievements of American agriculture to be surpassed by those of the immediate future and by all who desire to provide a secure foundation for all the industrial activities of the Nation.

I do not like that word "Nation" very much. Still, I will have to accept it.

The necessities of that population for which the United States must provide under normal conditions of increase of population demand that all agencies leading to the increased efficiency of soils should be fostered.

We foster and protect manufactures of all kinds; spend a hundred millions and more for battle ships a year, and many millions more which in no way add to or increase our material wealth—and surely the insignificant sum asked for to aid in increasing the products of agriculture should not meet such strenuous opposition.

Further on:

One of the most notable accomplishments of the Bureau of Soils is the development and extension of the tobacco industry in southern Georgia and northern Florida, in Alabama, and in east Texas, whereby the area planted to tobacco has been more than doubled since the inception of soil-survey work in the regions, and the profits derived by the farmers have been more than quadrupled in the last six years.

A statement, so far as Georgia is concerned, which I am satisfied is a fact—

Mr. SCOTT. May I inquire from what the gentleman is reading?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. From the report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1908.

Mr. SCOTT. I presume the Chief of the Bureau of Soils wrote that part of the report which the gentleman has been reading.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Certainly he did.

Mr. SCOTT. He is hardly a competent witness in a matter of his own work.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. He is not asking for this.

Mr. SCOTT. You are very much mistaken.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that so far as the Chief of the Bureau of Soils is concerned, and the expert men whom we employ for the purpose of making these soil surveys, I would take their statement over that of Doctor White, elegant and accomplished gentleman as he is. Now, this report states further:

In the Gulf States the development of special industries along the coast is showing uses for lands which have been previously considered of little or no agricultural importance, and lands once held at a nominal value for their timber stand now have a greater value for agricultural lands, even after the timber has been removed. This is largely due to the fact that their agricultural uses have been shown by a number of well-located soil surveys.

Do I understand the gentleman to discredit the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Soils, which has been transmitted to us by the Secretary of Agriculture with his apparent approval?

Mr. SCOTT. All I undertook to say was that it would be a poor chief of a bureau who would not claim that the work of his bureau was of use.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. It would be a poor and unworthy chief of a bureau who, when the work was not satisfactory or of no value, had not accomplished the results that were desired, would not have the honesty to tell Congress of it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have about three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks that his time may be extended three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SCOTT. There were four gentlemen before us connected with the National Association of Agricultural Colleges during this past year, each of whom testified that, in their judgment, the value of the work of the Bureau of Soils had been grossly exaggerated. Does not the gentleman think that their opinion is entitled to great weight?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Will the gentleman tell us their positions? I do not ask for their names.

Mr. SCOTT. They are connected with state agricultural colleges and experiment stations—Doctor White, Doctor Jordan, Doctor Stone, and Professor Curtiss.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Doctor White is the president of the agricultural college at Athens, and the experiment station for Georgia is in my district; and the survey of the lands in the county where it is located was made at my request, and at the instance of many prominent farmers.

Mr. SCOTT. Doctor White stated that a survey had been made on the experimental farm over which he had control, and he did not regard it of sufficient importance to consider it.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Doctor White, I apprehend, did not know what I know of the great number of applications that are made for information on this subject.

Mr. SCOTT. Then the State of Georgia better employ a more efficient man to protect its agricultural interests.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. A great many farmers in Georgia might agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. CANDLER. Does the gentleman know that the files of the Bureau of Soils are filled with requests for soil surveys, many of them coming from agricultural colleges?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Yes, sir; I do know it; and know it by reason of the fact that that has been given me as the reason why surveys could not be made in my district when asked for. All I desire to add is, that if the real farmers were consulted more by the committee we would be better informed what the farmers need. In the county in my district when the survey of the soils has been made, and it happens to be the one referred to by Doctor White, I know the farmers believe it has been of benefit. I am sorry Doctor White should express the opinion he does, as it is not sustained by the information I have received on the subject.

Mr. SCOTT. I believe the time has been equally divided between the two sides, and I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in twenty minutes. I believe that will be satisfactory.

Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES. I do not think that the time has been fairly divided.

The CHAIRMAN. Pretty nearly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would say half an hour would be satisfactory, if the time could be equally divided between the two sides.

Mr. SCOTT. I ask unanimous consent that debate close on this paragraph and amendments thereto in thirty minutes, the time to be equally divided between the two sides.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in thirty minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The time to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas and myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LAMB. Who controls the time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I would like to get permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, it is of course very difficult to say anything in two minutes; but in view of the statement of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. POLLARD], who challenges absolutely any benefits to be derived from the work which is being done by the Bureau of Soils, and in view of his statement that the experts who have made these soil surveys make reports which are practically valueless, I feel that in justice to the House and to myself I should say a word in reference to some surveys which have been made in my own district. The surveys there have developed the fact that alfalfa, which is one of the most beneficial crops now being raised in the United States and one of the most profitable, can be raised upon lands which heretofore were not thought at all suitable for the production of it. The information was given by the soil-survey experts in their report. This has been followed up by actual experiments by the farmers themselves, which have demonstrated the fact that the information given by those experts was absolutely reliable and that it could be depended upon, and the actual results which have come from the experiments made show the value of the soil survey. My observation is that some scientists may believe and these so-called "agriculturists" may think that these soil surveys are of no value; but whenever you get down to the soil itself and investigate it and analyze it and determine what crops can be grown upon it, it has been demonstrated oftentimes and in almost every instance that the information given by this bureau is of great value to the farmer himself. He is the man whom I am anxious always to benefit and to help, because, as I said upon this floor the other day, whenever you help him you help every other calling, business, and avocation of every other citizen of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am unable to say what benefits have resulted to other States from the soil survey, but I do know that it has been of very great service to the State of Florida. An investigation was started in my State some time ago, as was stated by the gentleman from Nebraska, to determine the adaptability of certain soils in Florida for the



production of tobacco, and as a result of those surveys large tobacco fields were established, yielding a very great income to those engaged in the business. Furthermore, these tobacco growers have produced and are producing a very fine quality of Sumatra tobacco; in fact, I think I risk nothing in asserting that they are producing a finer grade than the imported article, perhaps the finest and best that is being grown in this country. Only a few sections of the State were touched by these surveys, but as a result tobacco is being grown in large quantities in Pasco County, in the middle portion of the peninsula, and in Gadsden, Leon, and Jefferson counties, in the northern part of the State; and I have no doubt that if the investigations by the bureau were continued as they ought to be carried on soil well adapted to the growth of tobacco would be found in other portions of Florida.

I want to say further in this connection that the gentleman from Nebraska is entirely mistaken when he says, as I understood him to say, that the tobacco produced in Florida is useless and can not be sold; that while those engaged in the survey reported that they had found soil adapted to the growth of tobacco, that mistakes were made by those who acted upon the report of the bureau and, undertaking to grow tobacco not suited to the soil, had made failures, producing an article that could not be sold at remunerative prices, and that hence the business was languishing. This I deny, for, from the very beginning, the tobacco growers have received satisfactory prices for their products. It is true that during last year, for reasons which we can all understand, the price of tobacco was not as high as it had been theretofore; but the producers, knowing that they have a good article, one that could and should command fair returns, are holding for higher prices, and will no doubt get them.

I was down in the tobacco-growing section of northern Florida a few days ago and talked with several people engaged in that industry, and instead of finding them discouraged, as one would suppose from the remarks of the gentleman, I found them still enthusiastic over the results, as they expect within a very short time to be able to market the entire output of last year at fair prices.

Mr. POLLARD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have only a few minutes, and I hope the gentleman will excuse me.

Mr. Chairman, this work of the soil survey has not been carried on as yet to any great extent, comparatively speaking. I have been making an effort for the past two or three years to have it carried further, but without satisfactory results, owing to a lack of money with which to conduct it. Some gentleman here a moment ago said, as if apologizing for the bureau, that all one had to do to obtain a survey was to go to the department and ask it to be made and that it would be done. My experience, however, does not sustain that assertion, for I have been there time and again and have uniformly received the same answer—that the department did not have money enough to carry on surveys for the various States as rapidly as they should be carried on and as the department wished to carry them on. I am therefore in favor of this amendment, which proposes to increase the amount recommended by the committee, as I desire, within reasonable bounds of course, to place at the disposal of the department all the money it may need to perform this very important service, for important it is. It has been intimated here that the department was not only getting all the money it needed, but practically all it wished. I do not so understand the language of the Secretary of Agriculture in his annual reports, to say nothing of statements that have been made to me from time to time by department officials.

The Secretary of Agriculture, in his report for 1908, undertakes to show the importance of these surveys by stating their character and the extent to which they have been carried. Let me read a paragraph or two from this report:

A soil survey determines the exact character of the various soils, and their location and extent in each area is studied. It also ascertains their present use and capabilities by personal observation of the field force and the report of practical farmers owning and operating the soils and the farms investigated. It summarizes all of the present knowledge of these soils, whether obtained from the farmers who are cultivating them, from the chemical, physical, and fertility investigations of the bureau's laboratories, or from the experimental and research work of the various State institutions concerned. It also enables all soil investigators and agricultural experimenters, as well as the farmers, to make direct comparisons between the soils of any one locality and of all others in the United States. It presents an unprejudiced statement of fact concerning each soil and its uses in each area, and, wherever possible, also forecasts and advises additional and more profitable occupation for each soil. It presents to the farmer a statement of what the full capabilities of his soils are and of the crops produced and methods of cultivation and soil management employed throughout the region in the successful handling of these soils. It gives to the investor and the home seeker those statements of fact concerning soil and agricultural conditions which are essential to insure safe investment and a satisfactory home. It calls attention to

the undeveloped soils and their capabilities and the lines of their safe occupation and profitable development. It serves as a summary of the best that is known about soils and a forecast of the best that can be discovered. Such service is essential to the individual welfare of the citizen and to the well-balanced, systematic development of the national soil resources.

The importance of the soil survey as a factor in national development may be judged from the fact that the value of the annual products of the soil has now reached \$8,000,000,000, and in the conservative estimate of the experts of the Bureau of Soils this stupendous amount might easily be doubled within the next twenty years through a complete comprehension of the full capabilities of soils now cultivated and the discovery of the proper uses for soils not now cultivated. Such an undertaking is worthy the careful consideration of all who desire the present achievements of American agriculture to be surpassed by those of the immediate future and by all who desire to provide a secure foundation for all the industrial activities of the Nation. The necessities of that population for which the United States must provide under normal conditions of increase of population demand that all agencies leading to the increased efficiency of soils should be fostered.

Certainly a system which produces such results as these is well worthy of being fostered to any reasonable extent by Congress, and the appropriation proposed by the committee, enlarged as this amendment would enlarge it, would not be in excess of the amount required. Indeed, I think it could profitably be increased to a still greater amount.

Still further on the Secretary gives the results of the soil-survey investigations in some of the Southern States, as follows:

In the Gulf States the development of special industries along the coast is showing uses for lands which have previously been considered of little or no agricultural importance, and lands once held at a nominal value for their timber stand now have a greater value as agricultural lands even after the timber has been removed. This is largely due to the fact that their agricultural uses have been shown by a number of well-located soil surveys.

And in his report for 1907, in speaking of the results of these investigations in the matter of tobacco growing, he says:

As a direct result of the soil surveys and of the laboratory investigations, the possibility of producing a finer textured tobacco wrapper leaf in the Connecticut Valley was taken up, and it has been developed to a point where it is assured that a leaf approaching the Sumatra tobacco in texture, but with other local and distinctive characteristics, has been produced in the Connecticut Valley; and largely as a result of the bureau's work in Florida, the American-grown wrapper leaf has taken a foremost rank, is being exported to foreign countries, and is taking its place in real competition with the Sumatra leaf. The interest in this shade-grown product has grown to large proportions and the extension of this industry is contingent to a very large extent upon the soil surveys which shall point out the soils upon which this desirable leaf can be produced.

No suggestion there that the grower has been misled to his injury; on the contrary, it is shown that he has greatly prospered by the information given him by the department.

Hence it will be seen that the Secretary places, and very properly so, too, great store by the soil surveys, and states not extravagantly but conservatively the great benefits which have accrued to those sections of the country, including Florida, where this work has been carried on.

Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest problems now claiming the attention of the legislator in this country is how best to decentralize urban population, how best to check the tendency of the individual to leave the farm and go to the city. A partial solution of this great problem may be found in pointing the industrious and enterprising farmer to the land, no matter where located, out of which he can get the best results for his labor; in giving him information as to the soil where he may produce those special crops which will bring him better returns than ordinary farming. Such may be done in almost any section of the country, and particularly in Florida, where nearly every product of the farm, the orchard, and the garden may be produced. These soil surveys will, by furnishing this much-needed information, accomplish great good along the lines just suggested.

Some one says, however, that we should go slowly, doing a little this year, a little next, and so on, thus spreading the work over a number of years, as if there was merit in long delay. But if it is important to do the work at all, as it certainly is, why not accomplish it as early as possible? That, to my idea, would be the wise course to pursue, and the only way to do it would be to furnish adequate appropriations, which we have not been making heretofore. I therefore hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I do not know much about soil surveys, because there has been so little of it done around my country. There has been, as the map before you shows, some surveys made on the Salt and Colorado rivers. I am informed by various boards of trade in telegrams received yesterday that these soil surveys have been of great value in the selection of soil for appropriate crops. I am very much in favor of this amendment, providing always that a little more

of it comes to Arizona. [Laughter.] We have tracts of land containing a vast number of acres of the finest soil in the world, but it is difficult for sparsely settled populations to ascertain by costly experiment what crops can be most profitably grown upon it. Without detaining the committee, I should like to say that this amendment I hope will pass, if the appropriation will give to the soils of that Territory a little more investigation. It is more needed in the West than elsewhere, for the reasons indicated. I have no doubt that vast tracts of land lying in many fertile valleys in Arizona, the great value of which is yet unknown, may shortly become the most fruitful fields on earth, when the anxious homeseeker is informed, through the publication of scientific experiments, of the crops to which these lands are peculiarly adapted.

But if these soil surveys are to be confined to old and thickly settled agricultural districts, I doubt whether the appropriation should be enlarged. These experiments should be largely confined to government lands, with the purpose of building homes in the waste places rather than on soils that have been cultivated by intelligent farmers for the last fifty or one hundred years.

I have little doubt that certain districts in Arizona could grow the finest tobacco in the world. But who is to ascertain this fact? The poor settler is not able to do it. He can barely make a good living on his little homestead entry in the desert by raising the crops costing the least labor. He can not afford to hire help to experiment on the agricultural possibilities of the soil. I am sure the finest cotton in the world can be grown on thousands of acres of the public domain in Arizona. Soil surveys should reveal to the cotton growers this fact and make the growing of that staple a great western industry. I hope the amendment will be adopted, but whether it is or not, I sincerely hope that a much larger sum than usual under this soil-survey appropriation may be dedicated to its fittest purpose, in pointing out to the homeseeker the lands on which, by industry and intelligent work, he may find shelter and comfort for his family on a farm and under a roof all his own.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I now yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER].

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the soil survey, if properly made and afterwards followed by demonstrations as to what particular plant that soil is adapted, is of the utmost importance to the farmer. It has been demonstrated in the State of Arkansas that rice growing has been made profitable, and that land that was formerly worth but \$2 is now worth \$75 per acre.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that these soil surveys should be made wherever it is possible to do so. In a new country where the land is rich and where it will produce almost any kind of a crop it is not necessary; but in the old countries where farming has been going on for years and years until the land is worn out and no longer produces good crops, it is necessary to know the elements that are in that soil and to know the elements that are not in there in order to supply the proper elements lacking to produce the best crops for which that particular soil is capable. You can not know that unless you know what is in the soil.

The farmer can not know the profitable crops adapted to his land unless he knows the elements that are necessary are in the land. If any of the elements are lacking, it is necessary to place them there to produce the crop that is desired. When this is done, the tilling of the soil is brought down to a scientific basis, and it can only be done in this way.

The State of Illinois is doing a great work in soil survey under the direction of Prof. C. G. Hopkins, of the State University. He has demonstrated to the farmers of that State the importance of knowing all about the soil and how to supply the missing elements. Through the proper survey of the soil and the demonstration of the particular crop to which it is adapted his assistance has been of great benefit to our people. I am sure we appreciate it in that State very much. The benefit of the analysis of the soil enables our farmers to know how to till the soil in a scientific way. Under the work of Professor Hopkins it is intended to make a survey of the whole State, so we may know the different kinds of soils and what crops can be grown to the best advantage. The soil survey without a demonstration of what can be done is of little value. [Applause.]

[Mr. SHACKLEFORD addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think the Bureau of Soils is a humbug. I think the head of the Bureau of Soils knows a good deal more about running a campaign for increased appropriations than he does about soils or their uses. I am not willing to take the judgment of a man who devotes most of his time to having telegrams sent to Members of Congress to vote for increased appropriations instead of devoting all of his time to the duties for which he is paid by the Government. I think if the head of the Bureau of Soils would devote less of his time to campaigns for increased appropriations and more of his time to the study of his job he might some day or other learn something about the thing for which he is being paid, and his judgment might in the end be worth taking on a proposition as important as this.

Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, surely.

Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES. Does the gentleman tell the House that the head of the Bureau of Soils has caused these telegrams to be sent here?

Mr. MADDEN. I believe, without any question, that the telegrams sent by the people from the various States of the Union to Members of this House were sent at the instigation of the man in charge of the Bureau of Soils.

Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES. Does not the gentleman believe that he does that gentleman a grave injustice to assert he did that when he has not any personal knowledge of it?

Mr. MADDEN. I would not want to do anybody an injustice, but I am quite sure this is not the first time that he has done that sort of thing. I have ample evidence to be able to reach a conclusion that he has done it in former cases, and the fair assumption is that he has done it in this instance. So that if the gentleman paid by the Government for discovering the value of soils in the various sections of the country would devote himself to the duties for which he is paid, and about which he is supposed to know something that is of some use to the people of the country, he would be more valuable doing that than he would be doing what I am sure he has done and ought not to do.

Mr. NORRIS. If that be true, would it not be a good idea to increase this appropriation, so as to give him more to do in his particular line of soil culture, and then he would not have time to run the other campaign? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. On the contrary, I believe that, with such a man at the head of such a bureau, all the appropriations now standing to the credit of that bureau ought to be eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will permit me to say this much in justice to Mr. Whitney. I want to say that he stated to me that he had never used any influence of that kind, directly or indirectly, to affect the view of any Member.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire in whose time the gentleman from Kentucky is speaking. I have not yielded him any time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is speaking by unanimous consent.

Mr. SCOTT. I will now ask the gentleman from Alabama to use some of his time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. How much time is left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has eight minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kansas twelve minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Then I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB].

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, there is but one question before this House, and that is whether or not you will adopt this amendment adding \$100,000 to the Bureau of Soils or whether you will stand by your committee, who had a fair opportunity and one of the best opportunities to ascertain what amount should be appropriated for this bureau. All this wide range that this question has taken is not germane to the discussion at all, and I do not propose to discuss the utility of the soil survey or its desirability. But I want to say this, that as a member of that committee and the oldest member in service on it, and this opinion is shared by many another Member of this House, that this Bureau of Soils should never have been created, that it should be a division in the Bureau of Plant Industry, because these soil surveys are of no service to anybody until there is a demonstration, and the Bureau of Plant Industry takes these soil surveys and makes experiments, and analyzes the different soils reported by the survey, and tells the farmers through bulletins what these soils will produce best. That map in front of the Speaker's desk shows whether or not your committee has been niggardly toward this Bureau of Soil



Survey—we have given them an increase every year for ten years.

When I first became a member of the Agricultural Committee the Division of Soils, as it then was, received \$16,000 in round numbers. This year the appropriation amounts to \$237,000. These surveys are made faster than the Bureau of Plant Industry can demonstrate the possibility and practicability of the soils and to what those soils are adapted. Now, it is a wild speculation to attribute the prosperity that has come in this country to the farmers and others to the soil surveys. It is all chimerical; it is useless to talk in that sort of way. We have given the Soils Survey all the money they can use, and I ask this committee to stand by the report of the Committee on Agriculture. Every year we are troubled with this. Last year there was put on a great addition here, and the Senate cut it out, as it will do this time should the amendment prevail. We are wasting time talking about it. The question is whether we shall add the \$100,000 or stand by the report of your committee, which I think knows what it is doing and is one of the most industrious committees in this House, if I do say so. [Applause.]

Mr. COX of Indiana. How much did this bureau demand of your committee in appropriations this year?

Mr. LAMB. They do not demand, but they estimate for \$287,100, and we gave them the same sum as last year.

Mr. COX of Indiana. How much did they recommend the increase to be over what it was last year?

Mr. LAMB. Forty-nine thousand four hundred dollars.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Then I understand the Committee on Agriculture complied with their recommendation?

Mr. LAMB. We did not give them all they asked. Of course we are not going to give them all they asked; if we did, we would not have money for anything else.

Mr. COX of Indiana. How much did your committee increase it?

Mr. LAMB. We did not increase it. We gave them the same as last year. I now yield back the time to the gentleman from Kansas. I simply desired to discuss the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and show to the House that the report of our committee was reasonable and all that the Soils Survey should ask.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the value of the work that has been done by the Bureau of Soils surveys. I went into the committee this year with the express determination of offering an amendment to increase that appropriation in accordance with the estimates of the department. I believe that anything that will conserve the fertility of the soil ought to be encouraged, because we recognize it as the greatest natural resource that the Nation possesses to-day. Any contribution to that end should certainly be welcomed by Congress. But after I had listened to all the evidence on this proposition and ascertained the use that is being made of these soil surveys, the impracticability of the reports which were being made, the utter impossibility of the farmers applying it practically in their operations throughout the country, I concluded to vote with the committee, and believe that the present appropriation is sufficient.

They are engaged in good work. Let them proceed with this experimental work that they are now doing for years with the present appropriation. Then, if it becomes practical and can become of use to the American farmer, we can increase the appropriation. But during the experimental stages let us permit the appropriation to remain where it is. The sum is sufficient for experimental purposes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. COLE. Certainly; I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not a benefit to the farmers to have these soil surveys made, how does the gentleman account for the fact that there is a general clamor to have them made throughout the country?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I have not observed any great clamor for these soil surveys. I think that the evidence on file will not sustain any such conclusion.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLE. My time has expired.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman may be extended—

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I must object. We on this side have only one more speech, and I would like for the gentleman

from Alabama to use that time, and I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, in the midst of so much difference of opinion as to the usefulness of soil surveys, I think it might be timely to cite cases that are certain. Sumter County, in the sixth district of Alabama, was surveyed some years ago. In the last three years we have undertaken to utilize the benefits of that survey, the result of which has opened up a large part of the soil of Sumter County to the culture of alfalfa and has shown the possibilities of other culture that have never been suspected before.

We have completed the survey of Marion County, in the sixth district of Alabama, and have discovered, where it was never dreamed before, that here also there are soils suited to the culture of alfalfa. We are now beginning that culture in this county. We believe that in the county of Tuscaloosa and the county of Pickens and the county of Hale that we have soils similar to the county of Perry, in the ninth district, where tobacco has been successfully grown as the result of a soil survey. We are now waiting for the survey of those counties to begin the introduction of this valuable culture.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOBSON. I am sorry, but the four minutes I have are all needed to make a simple statement of fact.

Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal of confusion on this subject that ought not to exist. Many Members are confusing the soil survey with the utilization work that follows. I found the reports of the survey of Sumpter County piled up in the probate office. Nobody had ever used them. They had been there for some time and had done no good. I can see perfectly well that if no utilization work is undertaken after the survey is made the survey will not be of much use. I believe that utilization work should be pushed and rapidly developed. But, at the same time, you can not take up the best and most complete and most scientific work of utilization until after the soil survey has been made. Therefore the survey work should be pushed the more rapidly, so that utilization can go ahead. Confusion seems to exist as to the relation of the work of the bureaus in the Department of Agriculture, due no doubt to the former overlapping of the work of the Bureau of Soils and Bureau of Plant Industry. This overlapping has now been eliminated by a ruling of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Bureau of Soils has now been confined strictly to the work in which it is expert. There can now be no question of misinformation, no question of doubt, as to the accuracy of the reports sent out by this bureau.

It is a mistake to assume, however, that restricting the duties has reduced the amount of work now falling to this bureau. On the contrary, the field of this work has been enormously extended by adding the whole semiarid zone. The country has been divided during this last year into great zones, one of which is called the "semiarid zone," extending from Texas to the Canadian frontier. This great section of the country is waiting on these surveys to utilize great possibilities known to exist there. In order to meet the demands from this zone it was decided to reduce the surveys in the South and in other parts of the country, which has worked a hardship there. Mr. Chairman, no section of the country ought to be made to wait. The survey is the first step needed, and no time should be lost in making surveys of all the farm lands of the Nation. Nor is it a matter for the States alone or the Nation alone, but for cooperation of both State and Nation. We should lose no time in putting agriculture on the most scientific basis and in finding out, as in my district, the extent of the soils available for all the great crops.

The best-informed and most farsighted men of the country are pointing to a day not far distant when America will be compelled to import foodstuffs. We can make no mistake in supplying ample funds for pushing forward the soil-survey work. As to the Chief of the Bureau of Soils, the chief complaint seems to be his enthusiasm for the cause. As far as my observation has been able to extend, he is one of the most conscientious, hard-working, competent public servants I have ever known; but even if he has been overzealous, that is no just ground for making the agricultural interests of the country suffer for lack of funds. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. I would like one minute more.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have promised the balance of my time, I will say to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBSON. Could the chairman of the committee give me one minute?

Mr. SCOTT. I am very sorry, but my time is all used.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS].

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, a criticism has been made of the experiments in tobacco culture which resulted from the soil surveys. The fact was reported to this House last year, and is uncontradicted so far as I know, that the internal-revenue increase as the result of these tobacco experiments in Alabama and in Texas brings into the Federal Treasury more than the Government has ever appropriated for all these surveys.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. POLLARD] in his criticism, and a harsh criticism, of the Bureau of Soils admits that these surveys do enable the farmers in a large way to determine what fertilizers to use. The Secretary of Agriculture in his report says that the farmers of this country spend a hundred million dollars a year for fertilizers, and that a third of that sum, \$33,000,000 a year, is wasted because of the misapplication of fertilizer elements to soil conditions and needs. If we are to save the farmers in this country \$33,000,000 a year, or any fraction of that sum, it occurs to me to be inexcusable economy to refuse to appropriate \$100,000 for the purpose. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield a minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to state this: Five or six years ago I had these soil surveys made in my district in two of the largest counties. The farmers were greatly benefited and so told me. A commercial board in one county and others urged me last session, I think, and I brought the matter to the attention of the committee last session to ask for reprints of what had been done, so that all the farmers in the district might study what had been said by the scientists who went there and investigated this matter. The latter showed the people where it was best to plant their seed corn, wheat, potatoes, tobacco, berries, and so forth, and they have, to a great extent, done so and been greatly benefited. For instance, they said that out yonder on the side of a barren hill, among the little oak bushes and in similar soil, they could best produce berries and fruit. So the people down there, who were not using these barren hills, are now, as a result of this information, and they turned these hills into vineyards and formed associations for that purpose. I say that it has been a great benefit to those who have studied what these men have taught. [Applause.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. The soils of the United States constitute the greatest natural endowment of the American people, far exceeding in the value of their annual products the returns secured from all mines and fisheries. The Bureau of Soils is charged with the investigation of these soil resources and with determining the best methods for the development of agricultural industry upon all of the various soils which exist in the different portions of the country.

Soil surveys have been made of the tobacco soils of the United States covering the most important tobacco-producing districts in 16 different States. The results of these soil surveys show that among all of the agricultural crops the tobacco crop is probably more directly affected by the character of the soil upon which it is grown than any other. The heavy clay soils of Kentucky and Tennessee produce the thick export tobacco to the best advantage. The light sandy soils of the Connecticut Valley and of Florida produce the cigar-wrapper tobaccos. The sandy loam soils underlain by clay at a moderate depth produce the cigar-filler tobaccos in Florida, Alabama, and Texas, which are excelled only by the very best leaf produced in the most favored tobacco districts of Cuba. Through the work of the Bureau of Soils in outlining and indicating the existence of these different classes of soils, the area devoted to tobacco, particularly in the Gulf States, has been more than quadrupled in the last five years, and sections which ten years ago depended solely upon cotton as their money crop are now producing millions of pounds of tobacco upon soils which have been shown by the soil surveys to be peculiarly suited to the production of this crop and of far greater value for the production of tobacco than of any other crop which can be grown.

The investigations of the Bureau of Soils, through its soil surveys, have also shown the existence along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts of large areas of sandy loam soils peculiarly suited to the production of market-garden and winter truck crops, and as a result of soil surveys throughout the Southeastern and Southern States, land which was formerly held to be worthless for the production of staple crops, is now valued at \$100 to \$200 per acre for the production of winter truck and small fruits.

The Bureau of Soils has investigated the types of soils best suited to the production of a large number of different varieties of apples, not only throughout the Northeastern States, but also throughout the Appalachian region and the Ozark uplift

of Missouri and Arkansas. These soil surveys have shown that different soil types are suited to single and peculiar varieties of apples which can be produced to the greatest perfection only upon a definite class of soil. The horticultural interests of several States have been vitally affected by the results of these soil surveys in New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Alabama, Arkansas, and Missouri.

The soil surveys in south Texas have shown that the soils of a vast region formerly given over to the grazing of cattle, and considered of only moderate value for the production of cultivated crops, are suited to the production of citrus fruits and highly valuable varieties of table grapes. The soil surveys in northern and northeastern Texas have also indicated the existence of hundreds of thousands of square miles of land especially well suited to the production of alfalfa and of other valuable forage crops. These lands constitute vast stretches of prairie which had formerly been given up to the sole production of the cotton crop. With this crop threatened by the advance of the Mexican cotton-boll weevil, it is absolutely essential that the farmers of north Texas should understand the capabilities of the soils for the production of alfalfa, corn, and sorghum. Extensive soil surveys should be made in order to demonstrate the existence of soils suited to these crops.

Along the Gulf coast of Texas, extending westward from the Louisiana rice fields, are extensive areas of prairie soils which a few scattered soil surveys have shown to be peculiarly well suited to the production of rice. Additional soil surveys should be made along the Gulf coast from the Sabine River westward to indicate the remaining areas of this prairie land which may be occupied by the rice crop. Throughout the same region the alluvial lands along the rivers constitute an additional area upon which sugar cane may be produced economically, and the extension of the home production of refined sugar necessitates the extension of soil surveys to show the extent and character of these soils.

One of the most important results of the soil-survey work throughout the cotton-growing States has been to demonstrate beyond question the fact that the annual cotton production of the Gulf States may be more than doubled without the use of a single additional acre of soil for growing the cotton crop. Soil surveys in Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, and a study of the adaptation of these different soils to the different varieties of cotton, have shown that the States of the cotton belt annually suffer millions of dollars of loss from the indiscriminate planting of unknown varieties of cotton upon types of soil to which such varieties are not at all suited. Experimental work at the different state stations have shown that the amount of lint produced by cotton which has been originated and bred upon a distinct type of soil is not infrequently reduced to less than one-half the yield when this variety of cotton is planted upon another soil. If the cotton planters of the Southern States can be shown, by the means of these soil surveys, what the capabilities of their cotton soils are, and can be told what varieties of cotton will produce the largest yields upon each of these soil types, there will be an annual profit to the cotton planters alone which will return to them \$1,000,000 for each \$1,000 expended in the prosecution of these soil surveys.

The agricultural lands of the Southern States are not like those of the great central prairie States densely occupied by an agricultural population. In the majority of the Gulf States less than one-third of the available agricultural land is under cultivation at the present time, and in the State of Texas less than one acre in ten which is available for the production of crops was occupied by the farming population at the time of the last census. Since that time the agricultural population of Texas has been increased by over 1,000,000 people, as nearly as can be estimated in the absence of later census figures, and citizens of other States are crowding into Texas at the rate of 30,000 to 40,000 persons per month, in search of homes and agricultural opportunities on Texas soils.

Requests for the soil survey of over 60 additional Texas counties have been presented to the Bureau of Soils, supported by the petitions of the Texas Farmers' Congress, representing over 300,000 Texas farmers, by local agricultural organizations, and by boards of trade. In order that the agricultural opportunities of Texas and the nature and the character of Texas lands may be made known, not only to the present population of the State but to those who are desiring to make their homes there, the extension of the soil-survey work in Texas is earnestly desired and as earnestly urged.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I want to say this, that the gentleman in charge of this bill and the gentlemen who have reported the bill to the House have uniformly



almost, condemned the Bureau of Soils, condemned the Soil Survey, and yet we find in this bill an appropriation already of \$137,000 to carry out this work.

Now, if it is no good, if it is a fake, as you say it is, if it is a useless proposition, why are you wasting government money for it; why are you bringing in an appropriation of \$137,000 if it is no good? It is good, and by your very action in reporting this appropriation you stand for the Bureau of Soils; you stand for soil surveys, or you condemn yourselves. If it is good, then why should we not carry on the work; why should we not make it \$237,000 instead of \$137,000 to finish the work?

Mr. RUCKER. Why should we limit it to \$237,000?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think we should push it as rapidly as we can, and if we had the men to do the work to-day, and bring it to the people, I would say \$400,000; but we have got the men to work for which we ask this sum.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Five hundred thousand dollars would not meet the expense to supply all the requests made for these surveys.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Undoubtedly. Here are people from one end of the country to the other demanding these soil surveys. Now, they want them, and the Committee on Agriculture approves the Bureau of Soils, because I will not say they condemn themselves. Therefore why should we hesitate to increase this appropriation the pitiful sum of \$100,000, when you are spending millions that go to the benefit of no one, especially not to the benefit of the producing classes in this country? [Applause.]

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas has six minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, while the appropriation bill was pending before the Committee on Agriculture the following gentlemen appeared before that committee to ask for more liberal appropriations for some of the bureaus: Dr. W. H. Jordan, of Geneva, N. Y.; Dr. W. E. Stone, president of Purdue University, Indiana; Dr. H. C. White, of the University of Georgia; and Prof. C. F. Curtis, dean of the College of Agriculture, of Ames, Iowa. They did not volunteer any comment upon the Bureau of Soils, I think I ought to say in fairness to them; but they were asked whether they believed the work of that Bureau of Soils to be of practical value, and they united in the declaration that in their judgment the value of that work had been grossly exaggerated. Doctor Jordan expressed this opinion, in which they all declared they concurred:

We recognize the fact that there is being done in the laboratories of the Bureau of Soils some excellent investigational work which we would not like to see cease, and which should be encouraged. But as to this broad general study by the Bureau of Soils of various sections of the country, I do not feel that in the State of New York we have gotten anything out of it. I am answering you frankly, without the slightest desire to reflect upon anybody.

Then Doctor White, of Georgia, said:

You are asking me now my opinion and that of the gentlemen with whom I am associated, and the general farming people whom I know, as to the utility of the soil surveys in farm practice, and I tell you that in my judgment, and I believe in the judgment of others, the importance which has been given by the Bureau of Soils itself in its reports and elsewhere to the value of that work has been grossly exaggerated.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman will pardon me; I can not yield.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I should like to read some statements that the gentleman has not read.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman will understand, in view of the brief time I have, that I can not yield.

The extracts which I have read show clearly enough the opinion of men who have control of the state agricultural colleges, and certainly the views of trained and scientific agriculturists ought to be entitled to some weight.

The gentleman from Alabama very properly inquires why it is, if the committee believes these soil surveys to have no value, that we make any appropriation for them at all? We do believe they have value, but we believe the value depends on whether or not the surveys are followed up by utilization work; and the position we take is that with the appropriation we carry in this bill they will be able to make all the surveys which can possibly be so followed up. It is because we take this position that we make that appropriation. And to say that because \$137,000 is good, \$237,000 would be better, is just about as logical and worthy of about as much consideration as to say because one battle ship is good a hundred battle ships would be better, basing upon that argument a demand for an appropriation of a sufficient amount to build them.

But I take the position that if the claims of the Bureau of Soils were ten times as great as they are, I should still wish to see this amendment defeated because of the methods used to force it through this House. Of course I do not refer to the gentleman from Alabama or to any other Members of the House who are supporting this amendment. They have done nothing and are doing nothing not absolutely within their rights.

But it is well known that as long ago as last Friday, days before this paragraph in the bill had been reached, long before any public announcement had been made that this amendment would be offered, gentlemen on this floor began to receive telegrams from their constituents asking them to support "the Griggs amendment," the expectation at that time doubtless being that it would be offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Now, those of us who have served even a single session here know perfectly well that such telegrams as these are inspired. They are not spontaneous. In the very nature of things, those who sent them could not have known that such an amendment as this was to be offered unless they had been informed, directly or indirectly, by some one who was on the inside here in Washington. Now, I know the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has not sent out this information, and I do not believe it has been done by any other Member. Then, who did send it out? Who is likely to have sent it except some one who had a personal interest in swelling the appropriations for this bureau? [Applause.]

No one could be more reluctant than I to make a damaging charge against any man without absolute proof to sustain it. But it is so obvious that these telegrams were inspired, and it is so obvious that the men connected with the Bureau of Soils have a greater interest than anyone else has in the passage of this amendment that I can not believe I am wrong in charging that someone connected with that bureau is responsible for this outrage. For is it not an outrage? Can there be conceived a more intolerable situation than would exist if bureau officials generally, whenever they failed to get all the money they asked for from a committee, should go over the head of that committee, over the head of their department chief, and by "building a fire" under Members of the House, by the meanest and most disreputable of the tricks of the lobbyist, should attempt to coerce Congress into swelling their appropriations?

Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SCOTT. I shall be obliged to decline. If this were the first time the Bureau of Soils had offended in this way, I should not feel so strongly about it. But gentlemen may remember that we had a precisely similar experience with this same bureau last year. At that time the officials of that bureau, in utter contempt of your Committee on Agriculture, in insolent disregard of the wishes of the Secretary of the department, demanded from this House a hundred per cent increase in their appropriation and enforced that demand through a species of lobbying, bolder and more unscrupulous than any I have ever known. The House yielded to that demand, and to-day we see the result. Emboldened by their success last year the officials of this bureau are attempting another raid upon the Treasury through the same tactics. Will they win again? I can not believe it. I can not believe that this House will deliberately give notice that all any bureau chief has to do who is disappointed with the appropriation given him by a committee in order to get all the money he wants is merely to build a hot enough fire under the Members at home. I can not believe that this House will vote to discredit its own committee and declare in effect that its recommendations are entitled to no weight as against the demands of a bureau chief. I appeal to the House to vote down this amendment and thus serve notice that the Congress reserves to itself the right to fix the limit of appropriations and that lobbying on the part of bureau officials is insufferable and must cease. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. UNDERWOOD) there were—ayes 60, noes 90.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Bureau of Soils, \$232,660.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOSTER of Vermont, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, re-

ported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 27053, the agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### QUAPAW AGENCY LANDS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 16743) for the removal of the restrictions on alienation of lands of allottees of the Quapaw Agency, Okla., and the sale of all tribal lands, school, agency, or other buildings on any of the reservations within the jurisdiction of such agency, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to nonconcur in the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

Mr. MANN. What is this bill?

Mr. SHERMAN. An Indian bill, for the alienating of certain lands of the Quapaw Nation.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.

#### ESTATE OF SARAH EDWARDS.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. MILLER, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 6852) for the relief of Walter F. Rogers, executor of the estate of Sarah Edwards, late owner of lot No. 116, square No. 628, Washington, D. C., with regard to assessment and payment of damages on account of change of grade due to construction of the Union Station, District of Columbia, and the same was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GARDNER of Michigan, for four days, on account of important business.

To Mr. ESCH, for five days, on account of important business.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 27252. An act for the relief of Francisco Krebs and his heirs and assigns; and

H. R. 13809. An act for the relief of Charles S. Blood.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution and bills of the following titles:

S. R. 115. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to establish harbor lines in the Kansas River at Kansas City, Kans.;

S. 6580. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the widening of Bladensburg road, and for other purposes," approved January 9, 1907;

S. 8540. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River in Marion County, Tenn.," approved May 20, 1902, as amended by an act approved February 1, 1905, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River in Marion County, Tenn.;" and

S. 6359. An act to change the name and jurisdiction of the inferior court of justice of the peace in the District of Columbia.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 13809. An act for the relief of Charles S. Blood; and

H. R. 27252. An act for the relief of Francisco Krebs and his heirs and assigns.

#### LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Henry Walrath, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. BOOHER, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of W. S. Thatcher, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for care and custody of insane persons in the district of Alaska for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909 (H. Doc. No. 1435)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for care and custody of the insane in the district of Alaska for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 1436)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for an accountant for the office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs (H. Doc. No. 1437)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture submitting an estimate of appropriation for the Bureau of Animal Industry (H. Doc. No. 1438)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation for expenses of representation at the Brussels Conference on International Law (H. Doc. No. 1439)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the ship *Hope*, Sylvester Bill, master (H. Doc. No. 1440)—to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. McCALL, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 254) creating a commission to recommend a design and site for a monument or monumental memorial to Abraham Lincoln, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2106), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### ADVERSE REPORT.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. McCALL, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 247) relating to the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln and making the 12th day of February, 1909, a legal holiday, and for other purposes, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 2105), which said amendment and report were laid on the table.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 27594) granting a pension to Anna Kennah, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 28016) to authorize the sale at auction of public land heretofore withdrawn for reser-



voir purposes and islands of less than 10 acres area—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 28017) to amend the postal laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: A bill (H. R. 28018) to amend the act entitled "An act to encourage the establishment of public marine schools," approved June 20, 1874—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PETERS (by request): A bill (H. R. 28019) for the relief of the officers of the Regular Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the civil war, not now on the retired list of the army or navy, who resigned from said service because of wounds received in battle or because of other disabilities incurred in said service—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 28020) to provide for the extension of Newton place NW. from New Hampshire avenue to Georgia avenue and to connect Newton place in Gass subdivision with Newton place in Whitney Close subdivision—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 28021) authorizing the purchase by the United States of the Albemarle and Chesapeake Canal, in the States of Virginia and North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 28022) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a new division in the middle judicial district of the State of Tennessee"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 28023) authorizing the preparation of plans, estimates, and survey for a bridge across the Eastern Branch of the Potomac River on the line of Massachusetts avenue extended, in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 28024) to provide for the sittings of the United States circuit and district courts of the northern district of Ohio at the city of Youngstown, in said district—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 28025) granting a pension to Katie E. Delph—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 28026) for the relief of the Louisiana State Bank—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 28027) for the relief of the heirs of Wesley W. Wallace—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 28028) granting an increase of pension to Horace W. Nungesser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 28029) to correct the military record of Robert F. Hamilton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 28030) granting an increase of pension to George E. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAVENS: A bill (H. R. 28031) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Minor—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 28032) granting an increase of pension to W. J. Ray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 28033) granting an increase of pension to Nora Shepard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 28034) granting an increase of pension to Simon P. Ulch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINLEY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 28035) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Burnett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 28036) granting a pension to Ethel M. Hoffman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 28037) granting an increase of pension to David Rizer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 28038) granting an increase of pension to James Enloe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN (by request): A bill (H. R. 28039) granting an increase of pension to John S. Churchill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 28040) for the relief of John W. Alves—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SWASEY: A bill (H. R. 28041) granting a pension to George I. Leonard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 28042) granting a pension to John Aldrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 28043) granting an increase of pension to Stephen B. Marston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 28044) granting a pension to Peter A. August—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 28045) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set aside the forfeiture of and reinstate a coal lease to the Sans Bois Coal Company and to permit the relinquishment of lands in certain Choctaw and Chickasaw coal leases and the substitution of other lands therefor, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Resolution (H. Res. 554) to pay to Herman Gauss and L. S. Terry certain sums of money—to the Committee on Accounts.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Apollo, Pa., for interstate regulation of commerce in liquors—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Petition of M. M. Heath, of Pana, Ill., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOK of Pennsylvania: Petition of National Board of Trade, favoring parcels-post and savings bank laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of National Board of Trade, for legislation to establish schools for the training of applicants for the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of the Minnesota Live Stock Breeders' Association, favoring the Davis bill, for promotion of technical education—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of W. R. Wood and others, of Castle Rock; John O'Brien, of Kilkenny; and O. A. Olin and others, of Lafayette, all in the State of Minnesota, against duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Trades League of Philadelphia, favoring increase of salaries of United States judges (S. 6973)—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of James Heatley and others, favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 100 mercantile firms of the Second Congressional District of Iowa, against a parcels-post and postal savings bank law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Shenandoah Valley Fruit Growers' Association, for law to compel inspection of imported nursery stock—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition favoring parcels-post and postal savings bank laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the American National Live Stock Association, opposing advancement in freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of board of supervisors of San Francisco, Cal., favoring action in taking water from the Hetch Hetchy Valley, etc.—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petitions of the National Civil Service Reform League and Columbia Typographical Union, No. 101, of Washington, D. C., against the Crumpacker census bill (H. R. 16954)—to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Petition of Salisbury Grange, No. 228, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring a national highways commission and federal aid in construction of public highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARRETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of W. J. Ray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of Theodore Kintzi and 33 others, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Tim Sammons and 5 others, of Triumph, Minn., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASKINS: Petition of Jamaica Grange, No. 378, and Calais Grange, No. 387, favoring a national highways commis-

sion and appropriation for federal aid in construction and improvement of highways (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of Ministers' Association of South Amboy, N. J., favoring temperance legislation of various sorts—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: Petition of Delaware Valley Grange, of Landgston, N. J., favoring legislation to establish parcels-post and postal savings bank laws (S. 5122 and 6844)—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Delaware Valley Grange, No. 143, favoring a national highways commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KAHN: Petitions of Alice M. Lord and 95 other residents of Seattle, Wash.; Byron S. Thornton and 12 other residents of Ellenville, N. Y.; John Scanlan and 96 other residents of San Francisco, Cal.; John A. Warren and 35 other residents of St. Elmo, Tenn.; Gust. Jordan and 97 other residents of Tacoma, Wash.; David C. Foss and 27 other residents of Lititz, Pa.; Fred Noltzen and 48 other residents of Lehigh, Pa.; and A. V. Fortune and 87 other residents of San Francisco, Cal., for an effective exclusion law against all Asiatics save merchants, students, and travelers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., in favor of H. R. 26092, for a national consular school—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, against removal of the United States marine hospital at San Francisco from its present location to Angel Island—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Golden Gate Harbor, No. 40, American Association of Masters, Mates, and Pilots of Steam Vessels, favoring S. 6990—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Golden Gate Harbor, No. 40, American Association of Masters, Mates, and Pilots of Steam Vessels, favoring H. R. 15657—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petitions of San Francisco Labor Council, Bayard River Steamboat Men's Union, and Marine Firemen, Oilers, and Watertenders' Union of San Francisco, Cal., against removal of the United States marine hospital at San Francisco from its present location to Angel Island—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of U. S. Grant Post, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring H. R. 15829, relative to a medal of honor for Charles Rapp—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of S. W. Eccles, favoring H. R. 25553, for the relief of the Alaska Pacific Railway and Terminal Company—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MALBY: Petition of members of the Congregational Church of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., favoring H. R. 24148, for federal bureau for children—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Shenandoah Valley Fruit Growers' Association, for legislation to control manufacture and sale of insecticides and fungicides—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Shenandoah Valley Fruit Growers' Association, favoring a quarantine and inspection of imported nursery stock, etc.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of the Grand Army of the Republic Post of Hastings, Nebr., for a volunteer officers' retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of S. Perkins & Co., of Rochester, N. Y., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of the National Live Stock Association, of California, against advancement of freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John S. Churchill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Gillespie County, Tex., against parcels-post and postal savings bank laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolution of the directors of the Hartford Business Men's Association, of Hartford, Conn., urging the passage of the Appalachian and White Mountains forestry reserve bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STANLEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John W. Alves, of Henderson County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STURGISS: Petition of John N. Tregellas, of Grafton, W. Va., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWASEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George I. Leonard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of Stephen B. Marston and John Aldrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Industry, Me., favoring parcels-post and postal savings bank laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petition of Belfast Grange, No. 1068, Patrons of Husbandry, and Cassadaga Grange, No. 659, Patrons of Husbandry, for the creation of a national highways commission (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of business men of Cuba, Allegany County, N. Y., against a parcels-post and savings bank law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of oil producers of Allentown, N. Y., against putting oil on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Fredonia Preserving Company, of Fredonia, N. Y., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of oil producers of Friendship, Allegany County, N. Y., against any change in tariff relative to crude oil—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEBB: Petition of citizens of Lincoln County, N. C., favoring a parcels-post and postal savings bank bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 11, 1909.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Edward E. Hale.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

### ELECTRIC LIGHTING IN MANATI, P. R.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, certified copies of a franchise granted by the executive council of Porto Rico for the purpose of erecting, maintaining, and operating an electric plant, etc., in the municipality of Manati (H. Doc. No. 1444), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed.

### CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1908 (H. Doc. No. 1442), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 8154) to amend section 19 of the act granting the Lake Erie and Ohio River Ship Canal Company rights to construct, equip, maintain, and operate a canal, or canals, and appurtenant works between the Ohio River, in the State of Pennsylvania, and Lake Erie, in the State of Ohio, approved June 30, 1906.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13851) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a new immigration station thereon at the city of Boston, Mass.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16743) for the removal of the restrictions on alienation of lands of allottees of the Quapaw Agency, Okla., and the sale of all tribal lands, school, agency, or other buildings on any of the reservations within the jurisdiction of such agency, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 23473. An act extending the time for final entry of