

Also, petition of the International Dry-Farming Congress, favoring an appropriation for completing survey of public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Milk Producers' Association of Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin, in favor of the passage of the Haugen bill, relating to the coloring of oleomargarine, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of National Civic Federation, favoring the passage of the Brantley bill, for a Federal commission to investigate subject of employers' liability and workmen's compensation, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Price & Schmidt and other merchants, of Hinckley, Ill., in opposition to the enactment of parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of J. C. Reardon, of Pecatonica, Ill., favoring the establishment of a parcel-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Clarence L. Bartol Camp, No. 16, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring passage of the Crago bill (H. R. 17470); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: Petition of citizens of State Center, Iowa, for passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of the State of Iowa, for enactment of the Haugen agricultural bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of W. R. Benton and 11 others, of Martin County, Minn., favoring an investigation of certain alleged combinations of coal dealers as requested by the city council of Two Harbors, Minn.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Resolution of the quarterly conference of Elizabeth charge, Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Palestine, W. Va., for passage of an effective interstate liquor law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTMAN: Petition of citizens of Juniata, Pa., protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Cambria and Glen White, Pa., for construction of battleships in Government navy yards; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Petition of merchants of Moody, Tex., against the passage of a parcel-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of Clifton Pierce, American Fork, Utah, and Mrs. A. M. Young, Ogden, Utah, favoring amendments to copyright act of 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petition of citizens of Bellingham, Wash., for enactment of Senate bill 4043, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of members of Improved Order of Red Men of Seattle, Wash., for an American Indian memorial and museum building in the city of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KAHN: Memorial of Local No. 510, of Sign and Pictorial Painters of San Francisco, Cal., relative to legislation affecting labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of U. S. Grant Council, No. 19, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of San Francisco, Cal., relative to pending immigration legislation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of San Francisco, Cal., for the Kent bill to restore citizenship to American women who marry foreigners; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of San Francisco Labor Council, for enactment of House bill 20423; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of State of Pennsylvania, favoring the building of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of Seventh-day Adventist Church of Wade, Pa., protesting against enactment of House bill 9433; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Wade, Pa., protesting against enactment of Senate bill 237; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and other citizens of St. James, Md., praying speedy passage of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: Petition of citizens of Lewiston, Me., favoring Senate bill 5474, for postal-express service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Resolution of the Detroit (Mich.) Real Estate Board, favoring the Lincoln memorial road; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of citizens of Lapeer County, Mich., favoring the Watkins-Field bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Cowley, Wyo., protesting against the enactment of any legislation removing the present duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NYE: Petition of citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of Charles E. Bond Camp, No. 9, United Spanish War Veterans, Minneapolis, Minn., indorsing House bill 17470; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERLEY: Petition of citizens of fifth Kentucky district, urging the building of a battleship at the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SPEER: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Jesse M. Manson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Memorial of Sangre De Cristo Lodge, No. 31, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Salida, Colo., favoring House bill 20487, known as the workingman's compensation law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTTER: Petition of the Board of Trade of Pawtucket, R. I., protesting against the elimination of the Rhode Island section by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in its plan for an intercoastal waterway from Boston, Mass., to Beaufort, N. C., together with statistics; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the Central Foundry Co. of New York, favoring passage of House bill 16844; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring Senate bill 2117, to promote the efficiency of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, April 5, 1912.

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXPENDITURES FOR FOREST RESERVATIONS (H. DOC. NO. 681).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the disbursements of the Department of Agriculture for salaries and other compensation of inspectors, forest supervisors, deputy forest rangers, assistant forest rangers, and the number of each class, which will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed. The order to print will include, if there be no objection, certain illustrations.

Mr. HEYBURN. Should there not be an order to print first before the reference?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That was the order, that it be printed and referred.

Mr. HEYBURN. And referred afterwards.

Mr. WARREN. It goes to the printer first.

Mr. HEYBURN. I thought it was stated the other way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair may have stated it in a roundabout way, but that is what the Chair intended to state.

SENATOR FROM MAINE.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I present the credentials of my colleague [Mr. GARDNER], chosen by the Legislature of the State of Maine to fill the unexpired term ending March 4, 1913. I ask that the credentials be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The Secretary read the credentials of OBADIAH GARDNER, chosen by the Legislature of the State of Maine a Senator from that State for the term ending March 4, 1913.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be referred to the Secretary of the Senate for the files of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. The Senator elect is present and ready to take the oath of office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator elect will present himself at the desk to take the constitutional oath of office.

Mr. GARDNER was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. JOHNSON of Maine, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him he took his seat in the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 93) authorizing the Librarian of Congress to furnish a copy of the daily and bound CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the undersecretary of state for external affairs of Canada in exchange for a copy of the Parliamentary Hansard.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2) supplementary to and amendatory of the act entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Nation of Indians in Oklahoma," approved June 28, 1906, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution (No. 46) providing for the printing for the use of the House of Representatives of 5,000 copies, on manila paper, of a wall chart on hookworm and soil pollution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution (No. 47) providing for the printing of 30,000 copies of the message of the President of the United States of February 12, 1912, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture submitting a report on the Mexican cotton-boll weevil, etc., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16661) to relinquish, release, and quitclaim all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to all the lands held under claim or color of title by individuals or private ownership or municipal ownership situated in the State of Alabama which were reserved, retained, or set apart to or for the Creek Tribe or Nation of Indians under and by virtue of the treaty entered into between the United States of America and the Creek Tribe or Nation of Indians on March 24, 1832; asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FERRIS, Mr. DENT, and Mr. MONDELL managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 252. An act to establish in the Department of Commerce and Labor a bureau to be known as the Children's Bureau;

S. 2434. An act providing for an increase of salary of the United States marshal for the district of Connecticut;

S. 3475. An act extending the time of payment to certain homesteaders on the Cheyenne River Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation, in the States of South Dakota and North Dakota;

S. 5748. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to secure for the United States title to patented lands in the Yosemite National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 14918. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 15471. An act making appropriation for repair, preservation, and exhibition of the trophy flags now in store in the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.; and

H. R. 20842. An act to provide a tax upon white phosphorus matches, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Dyer, Tenn., remonstrating against the extension of the parcel-post system beyond its present limitations, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the First Baptist Church of Bessemer, Ala.; the Methodist Episcopal Zion Church of Worcester, Mass.; and of the Methodist Episcopal Church South of Bridgeport, Ala.; of members of the Salvation Army of Worcester, Mass.; and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Bridgeport, Ala., and Bessemer, Ala., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating liquors, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a telegram, in the nature of a petition, from N. B. Thistlewood, of Mounds, Ill., praying that an appropriation be made for the relief of the flood sufferers of lower Illinois, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union, No. 1450, of San Juan; of the joint advisory board of

the Cigar Makers' local unions of Porto Rico; of Typographical Union, No. 478, of San Juan; of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers' Local Union, No. 550; of Bricklayers' Local Union, No. 10982; and of the Porto Rico Federation of Labor, of San Juan; of Cigar Makers' Local Union, No. 449, of Ponce; and of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union, No. 1389, of Santruce, all in the Territory of Porto Rico, praying for the establishment of a department of agriculture and labor in that Territory, which were referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

He also presented a petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union, No. 449, of Ponce, Porto Rico, praying that the citizens of Porto Rico be permitted to become citizens of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

Mr. BRISTOW presented petitions of sundry citizens of Stockton and Salina, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws by outside dealers, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Burlington, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide for the coloring of oleomargarine in imitation of butter, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of Alva H. Morrill, pastor of the Christian Church, of Franklin, N. H., praying for the enactment of an interstate liquor law to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws by outside dealers, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of E. H. Brown, of Dover, N. H., praying that an increased appropriation be made for fighting forest fires, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Columbia Heights Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a new school building in Park View subdivision, District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Columbia Heights Citizens' Association, of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the establishment of parks throughout the city of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented the memorial of Daniel F. Buckley, of Boston, Mass., remonstrating against the removal of the duty on sugar, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ASHURST. I present a memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona protesting against the confirmation of Richard E. Sloan to be Federal judge of the State of Arizona. I ask that it be printed in the Record. This is the first legislature that has convened in the State of Arizona, and is composed of strong, able men from all the walks of life in that State and will compare favorably with the legislatures of any of the older States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorial is one that must be presented to the Senate in executive session, the Chair thinks. It is a matter that relates to the action of the Senate in executive session, and it should be there presented and be disposed of by the Senate in executive session.

Mr. ASHURST. Then I now request that the RECORD show that I offered it here.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly; the RECORD will show that.

Mr. ASHURST. Thank you.

Mr. WATSON presented petitions of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal Church South of Reader, and the Methodist Episcopal Church South of Elizabeth, and of sundry citizens of Farmington, Bridgeport, and Glendale, all in the State of West Virginia, praying for the enactment of an interstate liquor law to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws by outside dealers, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Bluefield, W. Va., praying for the adoption of a 1-cent letter postage, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Follansbee, W. Va., praying for the appointment of a commission on industrial relations, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of the Illinois State Association, Master House Painters and Decorators, remonstrating

against the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Western Branch of the Aetna Insurance Co., of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws by outside dealers, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Milk Producers' Association of Illinois, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide for the coloring of oleomargarine in imitation of butter, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Galesburg and Astoria, in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against the establishment of a parcel-post system, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. CRAWFORD presented a petition of sundry citizens of Brookings, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WILLIAMS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Mississippi, remonstrating against the extension of the parcel-post system beyond its present limitations, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. CURTIS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Buckeye, Allen, Beaumont, Neal, Hallowell, Circleville, Lyndon, Hanston, Manchester, Westphalia, Dover, Junction City, Council Grove, Hope, Dwight, Argonia, Beverly, Wilson, Rydal, Carlton, Papico, Kipp, Leocompton, Larned, Burlington, Shields, Pawnee Rock, Haven, Russell, Wilsey, Vassar, Clyde, Waverly, Horton, Herrington, Mount Hope, Florence, and Glasco, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to permit the coloring of oleomargarine in imitation of butter, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Topeka, Kans., remonstrating against the extension of the parcel-post system beyond its present limitations, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Cornlng, Kans., praying for the enactment of an interstate liquor law to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws by outside dealers, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROOT presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Coneyus, N. Y., remonstrating against the extension of the parcel-post system beyond its present limitations, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. REED presented petitions of the congregations of the Ozark Presbyterian Church, of Mount Vernon, and of the Christian Union Church of Blue Ridge, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lamar, and of sundry citizens of Carthage, all in the State of Missouri, praying for the enactment of an interstate liquor law to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws by outside dealers, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of St. Louis, New Cambria, Elvins, Green Ridge, Crowder, Bismark, Hale, Richmond, Cabool, and Kansas City, all in the State of Missouri, remonstrating against the extension of the parcel-post system beyond its present limitations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Eminence, Bryant, Rockville, Taberville, Weldon Springs, St. Charles, White Water, Richland, Laquey, Bloodland, Republic, Billings, and Plato, all in the State of Missouri, praying for the establishment of a parcel-post system, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. CLAPP presented memorials of sundry citizens of Winona, Minneapolis, New York Mills, St. Paul, Windom, and Rushmore, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the establishment of a parcel-post system, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WATSON, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (S. 5814) to provide for the erection of a public building at Charles Town, W. Va., reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 568) thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

S. 5990. A bill to provide for the extension of the underground system of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. and the City & Suburban Railway of Washington along certain

streets in the city of Washington, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 569); and

S. 6096. A bill to amend subchapter 2, chapter 19, of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, by providing a penalty for willful omission to return library property in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 570).

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 5063) to reorganize the municipal court of the District of Columbia, to increase the jurisdiction of said court, to provide a common-law trial by jury therein, and to regulate the appeal from the judgment of said court, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. BRISTOW, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1330) for the relief of Joseph B. Riley, alias Thomas E. Keesy, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 571) thereon.

Mr. DU PONT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 5681) for the relief of former occupants of the present military reservation at Point San Jose, in the city of San Francisco, and to repeal an act entitled "An act to refer the claim of Jessie Benton Fremont to certain lands and improvements thereon, in San Francisco, Cal., to the Court of Claims," approved February 10, 1893, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims, which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 5547) for the relief of James Butler and others, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims, which was agreed to.

Mr. JONES, from the Committee on Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (S. 4850) to establish on the coast of the Pacific States a station for the investigation of problems connected with the marine fishery interests of that region, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 572) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 239. A bill to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Alabama (Rept. No. 573);

S. 90. A bill to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Colorado (Rept. No. 574);

S. 6011. A bill to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Connecticut (Rept. No. 575);

S. 4645. A bill to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station for the hatching and propagation of shad upon or near the seacoast, in the State of Georgia (Rept. No. 576);

S. 142. A bill to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Idaho (Rept. No. 577);

S. 263. A bill to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Minnesota (Rept. No. 578);

S. 4757. A bill to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Nevada (Rept. No. 579);

S. 268. A bill to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Rhode Island (Rept. No. 581); and

S. 365. A bill to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station at a point in the eastern portion of the State of South Dakota to be selected by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor (Rept. No. 582).

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

S. 231. A bill to establish a fish-culture station at the city of Fargo, in the State of North Dakota (Rept. No. 580);

S. 4550. A bill to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Washington (Rept. No. 583);

S. 423. A bill to establish a fish-culture station in the State of Utah (Rept. No. 584); and

S. 457. A bill to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Oklahoma (Rept. No. 585).

Mr. JONES, from the Committee on Fisheries, to which was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. NELSON January 8, 1912, proposing to appropriate \$25,000 for the establishment of a fish-cultural station, in the State of Minnesota, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported it with an amendment, submitted a report (No. 592) thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed, which was agreed to.

Mr. CLAPP, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 5682) for the relief of claimants who have paid money into the United States Treasury under compulsion of an unconstitutional statute, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Finance, which was agreed to.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21170) granting to El Paso & Southwestern Railroad Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Territory and State of Arizona, a right of way through the Fort Huachuca Military Reservation, in the State of Arizona, and authorizing said corporation and its successors or assigns to construct and operate a railway through said Fort Huachuca Military Reservation, and for other purposes, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, which was agreed to.

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

S. 5883. A bill to extend the time for the completion of a bridge across the Missouri River at Yankton, S. Dak., by the Yankton, Norfolk & Southern Railway Co. (Rept. No. 586); and S. 5882. A bill to extend the time for the completion of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Yankton, S. Dak., by the Winnipeg, Yankton & Gulf Railroad Co. (Rept. No. 587).

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

H. R. 20486. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Willamette River at or near Newberg, Oreg. (Rept. No. 588); and

H. R. 20286. An act authorizing the fiscal court of Pike County, Ky., to construct a bridge across Russell Fork of Big Sandy River (Rept. No. 589).

Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 5991) to authorize the War Department to use the unexpended balance of appropriations heretofore made by Congress for the construction of a Navy memorial in the Vicksburg National Military Park, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 590) thereon.

LANDS OF CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS.

Mr. OWEN. From the Committee on Indian Affairs I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 6078) amending the act entitled "An act to provide for the sale of the surface of the segregated coal and asphalt lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, and for other purposes," approved February 19, 1912. It is a short bill, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of "An act to provide for the sale of the surface of the segregated coal and asphalt lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, and for other purposes," approved February 19, 1912, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto: "And provided further, That where any cemetery now exists, land adjoining same, not exceeding 20 acres, may be sold at its appraised value to some suitable person as trustee as an addition to such cemetery."

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

A bill (S. 6190) granting a pension to Isaac N. Gerhart (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 6191) to provide for the disposal of certain lands in the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 6192) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building in the city of Prescott, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 6193) granting an increase of pension to George W. James (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 6194) to amend section 2322 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to mineral locations; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 6195) for the relief of Granville Perry; and A bill (S. 6196) for the relief of the heirs of Russell White; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 6197) granting a pension to Sarah Hunter;

A bill (S. 6198) granting a pension to M. C. Jenkins;

A bill (S. 6199) granting a pension to Lucinda Patterson;

A bill (S. 6200) granting a pension to John B. Bromley;

A bill (S. 6201) granting a pension to Mary M. Pollard; and A bill (S. 6202) granting an increase of pension to James A. Mahaffy; to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO RIVER AND HARBOR BILL (H. R. 21477).

Mr. OLIVER submitted an amendment relative to the survey of the Schuylkill River, Pa., from the Delaware River to Gibsons Point, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$3,500 for improving South Bristol Harbor, Me., intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURTON submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of War to report as to the advisability of the west breakwater in Kahului Harbor, Hawaii, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PERKINS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$200,000 for improving the harbor at Nawiliwili, Hawaii, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted an amendment proposing to lease to the Birmingham Water, Light & Power Co. the Government right in and to the water power created by Dams Nos. 16 and 17 on the Black Warrior River, Ala., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$15,000 for completing construction of low reservoir dam at Gull Lake, Minn., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

VANCOUVER BARRACKS, WASH.

Mr. DU PONT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 4663) to authorize and empower the Secretary of War to locate a right of way for and to grant the same and the right to operate and maintain a line of railroad, telephone, telegraph, and electric-transmission lines through Vancouver Barracks and Military Reservation, in the State of Washington, to Washington-Oregon Corporation, its successors and assigns, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

Mr. BURTON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$2,500 for the contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the Promotion of International Arbitration at Brussels, Belgium, intended to be proposed by him to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill (H. R. 19212), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—PRESTON SHARP.

On motion of Mr. GAMBLE, it was

Ordered, That the papers accompanying Senate bill 5928, Sixty-second Congress, granting an increase of pension to Preston Sharp, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—WILLIAM C. REEVES.

On motion of Mr. GAMBLE, it was

Ordered, That the papers accompanying Senate bill 5928, Sixty-second Congress, granting an increase of pension to William C. Reeves, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

CONSERVATION OF HUMAN LIFE (S. DOC. NO. 493).

Mr. OWEN. I present a memorial relating to the conservation of human life as contemplated by the bill (S. 1) providing for a department of health. I move that the memorial be printed as a Senate document.

The motion was agreed to.

SERVICE PENSIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of

the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1) granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War and the War with Mexico, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate insist on its amendment to the bill, consent to the conference asked by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. BURNHAM, and Mr. GORE conferees on the part of the Senate.

HOOKWORM AND SOIL POLLUTION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution (No. 46) of the House of Representatives, which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed for the use of the House of Representatives 5,000 copies on manila paper of a wall chart on hookworm and soil pollution, and that the same be distributed through the folding room of the House of Representatives.

MEXICAN COTTON-BOLL WEEVIL.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution (No. 47) of the House of Representatives, which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed 30,000 copies of the message of the President of the United States of date February 12, 1912, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture submitting a report on the Mexican cotton-boll weevil, together with said report (S. Doc. No. 305), of which 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, to be distributed through the Senate document room, and 20,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, to be distributed through the House document room.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there other morning business?

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Committee on Privileges and Elections about when we may expect a report on the Lorimer case? I do not see the chairman of the committee present, and I ask the question of some member of the committee or of the subcommittee who may be present.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I did not understand the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. My inquiry was about when we may expect a report on the Lorimer case. I understood that the committee had reached a conclusion in the matter a week ago, and I was inquiring when the report would be submitted to the Senate.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to say that the chairman of the committee is not now on the floor, but I can assure the Senator from Kansas that the report will be prepared and submitted to the Senate just as soon as it is possible to do so. The chairman is putting in practically all of his time in getting the report ready, and there will be no unnecessary delay. There are about 9,000 pages of testimony in the record, and the Senator from Kansas can realize that it is quite a task to prepare and submit a report in such a case. We are, however, going to do it just as soon as possible.

Mr. BRISTOW. The reason I make the inquiry is that time is passing; the first week of April is almost gone, and I do not think the Senate desires to spend another summer in Washington; but there is the Lorimer case, and then we have not had from the Committee on Finance a report on any of the tariff bills. It seems to me that unless we expedite business somewhat we shall soon have a congestion which will keep us here until August.

Mr. JONES. I will say that, so far as the time of the Committee on Privileges and Elections is concerned, I have spent almost a year on that committee and on this case; I have attended every meeting of the committee every day; and I am just as anxious to get through with it as is the Senator from Kansas. The chairman of the committee is now present, and I think he will bear me out in stating that this report will be prepared and submitted as soon as it can justly be prepared and submitted.

Mr. BRISTOW. I might add, for one, that I should regret to be compelled to spend another summer in Washington. I am now serving my fourth year in the Senate, and every summer since I have been a Member has been spent in session. We have now the Lorimer case, the tariff bills, and other important legislation to consider, and unless we get at that business soon we shall have hot weather with us, and then we will find ourselves struggling through another summer to conclude our work. So far as I am concerned, I shall oppose any adjournment until we dispose of the Lorimer case and other important legislation.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to say that the Senator from Kansas does not want to avoid hot weather any more than I do.

THE METAL SCHEDULE.

Mr. PENROSE. I am directed by the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18642) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909, to submit an adverse report (No. 591) thereon. I ask that the bill be placed on the calendar.

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

Mr. SIMMONS. In the absence of the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Finance, I desire to say that the majority report of the committee was not submitted to the minority members until yesterday and that the minority will, just as soon as the Senator from Texas can prepare the report, present a minority report in favor of the House bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, at the proper time I intend to offer amendments to the bill just reported by the chairman of the Committee on Finance [Mr. PENROSE], proposing to revise the metal schedule, and I should like to ask the chairman of the committee about what time he expects to bring the bill before the Senate for consideration? I think we ought to have all the information we can on that subject in order that we may prepare for the discussion.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I do not know that I am the individual to whom such an inquiry should be addressed, as the majority of the Committee on Finance has reported adversely on the bill. Just what the friends of the measure propose to do with it, I am not in a position to explain. I take it that the bill, being on the calendar, will, from time to time, be the subject of speeches by different Senators interested in the subject as may suit their convenience and the convenience of the Senate.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I supposed, notwithstanding the fact that the report was an adverse one, that the measure was still in charge of the chairman of the Committee on Finance. I am sure that his wishes with regard to the time for bringing it on for discussion would be heeded by the Members of the Senate. Of course we can fix no definite day now, but if he could suggest about when the bill would be brought up for either amendment, passage, or for indefinite postponement, I think it would be helpful to those of us who are expecting to have something to do with its ultimate disposition.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, so far as I have any information on the subject, several Senators have advised me that they expect to speak upon this measure in opposition to it. Just when they will be ready to do so I am not at this time advised. I will, however, be glad to confer with the Senator from Iowa and try to suit his convenience in arranging about the disposition of the measure so far as I have any jurisdiction over it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Very well. Any time will suit me; but I think, in view of the other business before the Senate, that it would be very desirable if we could know a little while in advance when the bill is expected to be taken up for disposal.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I think I can say to the Senator from Iowa that the minority report will be in some time about the middle of next week; certainly toward the latter part of next week. I think it is the desire of the minority members of the committee that the matter shall be taken up by the Senate for discussion just as soon after the minority report is filed as is possible. There does not now seem to be very much business of importance before the Senate, and it seems to me that it is a very good time for us to take up a measure of this kind; yet, not knowing exactly when the minority report will come in, I suppose Senators are not now prepared to go on with the argument. I repeat, I believe we shall have the report in next week, and I do not see any reason why we should not be able to take up the bill the week after next.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I shall cheerfully cooperate with the Senator from North Carolina to expedite action on the bill and have it taken up at the very earliest possible date.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I assume, then, that nothing will be done with respect to the bill, unless some Senator desires to speak generally upon it, until the week after next.

Mr. SIMMONS. I should assume not; yet I do not see any reason why, if any Senator wishes to address the Senate upon the bill he should not do so next week, although we may not then have the minority report in.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not so much interested in speeches on the subject as I am in action upon it, though I do not think I

shall care to offer the amendments I desire to offer until near the time when action is expected.

Mr. SIMMONS. I trust the Senator from Pennsylvania, having the bill in charge, will find himself in a position to call it up week after next and have it made the unfinished business, so that we may get through with it as quickly as possible.

Mr. PENROSE. I shall be very glad to do so, Mr. President, so that this and all other pending tariff bills may receive prompt action in order to facilitate the adjournment of Congress.

EMPLOYEES OF COMMON CARRIERS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to give notice that on Monday next, immediately following the routine morning business, I wish to address the Senate on the bill (S. 5382) to provide an exclusive remedy and compensation for accidental injuries, resulting in disability or death, to employees of common carriers by railroad engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, or in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

POST ROADS AND RURAL DELIVERY ROUTES.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I should like to give notice that on Monday next, following the remarks of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], I will address the Senate on the bill (S. 2935) to provide for the construction, maintenance, and improvement of post roads and rural delivery routes through the cooperation and joint action of the National Government and the several States in which such post roads or rural delivery routes may be established.

AMENDMENT OF PRINTING LAWS.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 4239) to amend, revise, and codify the laws relating to the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is that offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN], which the Secretary will again state.

The SECRETARY. On page 75, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "eight" and insert "two"; in line 16, on the same page, to strike out "four" and insert "one"—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire the propositions treated as one amendment?

Mr. HEYBURN. I think the amendment might be read through.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And considered as one amendment?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the entire amendment, and it will be treated as one amendment unless there be objection.

The SECRETARY. It is also proposed in line 17, page 75, to strike out "one dollar and a half" and insert "fifty cents," so as to make the paragraph read:

The superintendent of documents is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at \$2 for the long session and \$1 for the short session, or 50 cents per month, payable in advance.

It is also proposed, on page 75, line 18, after the word "advance," to insert:

The Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to make, on or before the 1st of July, 1912, such rules and regulations as will enable all postmasters in the United States to receive popular subscription for the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the aforesaid terms per year, and report all such subscriptions and account for and pay the amount received therefor to the Public Printer.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, no measure more important to the Members of the Senate and the people of the United States will be presented at this session of Congress. If this bill should pass and the Members of Congress should wake up some morning and read it they would be astonished, but they would be helpless. It is intended through this measure to turn over to a syndicate of newspapers the function of telling the people what their representatives in Congress are doing, and to tell the people what the executive departments of the Government are doing. It is in the nature of a proposition for silence unless you pay for the knowledge.

I would not have addressed the Senate upon this question to-day except that I feel that it is important almost beyond estimation. It proposes to reduce to the very minimum the opportunity for the people to know what their representatives, not only in Congress but in the executive departments, are doing. It proposes to place in the hands of the committee a power greater than Congress itself should possess, and at the expense of Members of Congress.

To-day is the last occasion I shall be with you for some time to come, and I came here only to place the responsibility for

the action in connection with this bill upon those of you who will remain here. I hope to be able to set a fire under this bill that will burn it up this morning. It is without excuse for its existence or for the form in which it is presented.

Mr. President, ordinarily I am not particular whether or not all Senators are present or only myself, but inasmuch as I intend the responsibility to be one that can not be avoided by the statement "I was not present," I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Cummins	Lippitt	Pomerene
Borah	Curtis	Lodge	Rayner
Bourne	Dillingham	McCumber	Reed
Bristow	du Pont	McLean	Root
Bryan	Fall	Martine, N. J.	Shively
Burnham	Foster	Myers	Smith, Ariz.
Burton	Gallinger	Newlands	Smith, Mich.
Catron	Gamble	Oliver	Smoot
Chamberlain	Gardner	Owen	Swanson
Chilton	Gronna	Page	Thornton
Clapp	Heyburn	Penrose	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	Johnson, Me.	Perkins	Williams
Cullom	Jones	Poindexter	Works

Mr. SWANSON. My colleague [Mr. MARTIN of Virginia] is detained from the Senate on account of serious illness in his family.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] is necessarily absent from the Chamber.

Mr. SHIVELY. I am requested to announce that the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] is necessarily absent from the city. He is paired on all votes with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN].

I also desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. KERN] is unavoidably absent.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I was asked to state, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], that he is necessarily absent, having been unavoidably called home.

Mr. JONES. I am requested to announce that the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY] is unavoidably absent from the city.

Mr. BRYAN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. FLETCHER] is necessarily absent from the city on business of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I am inclined to believe that the interest manifested in this measure is not going to be very intense, and I shall not expend an undue amount of energy in impressing or seeking to impress upon Senators the importance of this question. I shall probably let them find it out. They may some day be asking the attention of the Senate for relief.

An attempt is to be made to inaugurate an entirely new system of law as a substitute for the existing law. I am not going to characterize that attempt as surreptitious, but I am going to characterize it as silent. When the bill first came in I asked that it be reprinted so that the changes from existing law might be in italics or distinguishing figures or letters. I thought an order was entered to that effect, but it seems that it was not so stated; so that there is nothing in this print of the bill by which anyone can know existing law as compared with the proposed changes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the Senator—

Mr. HEYBURN. Do not hesitate about that, please. I should like to be interrupted.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no particular desire to do it, but I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the morning after his request was made we had placed upon the desk of every Senator a printed bill showing the comparisons of the proposed bill with the present law, and I thought every Senator had a copy of that print. I know the request was complied with. Here is a copy of it.

Mr. HEYBURN. I saw that document, and it was the sight of it that made me suggest the ordinary manner of procedure, so that in the body of the bill we would know, without referring from one page to another and reading down for comparison, that which we are entitled to know.

I have undertaken this morning to direct attention to an amendment which I offered, which I thought was broad enough to bring up, perhaps, all of the questions involved in this measure.

Under existing law every Senator is entitled to send out 88 copies per day of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Vice President is included in that order. There is, I take it, no Senator

in this body who has not requests from his constituents for many times that number. They are requests of right. Those who are interested in the making of laws are those that we left at home.

Some people think, or seem to think, that the only people who are interested in the making of laws are those who make them. That would be true in a monarchy, or a kingdom, or the old-fashioned sort of arbitrary government. But every man of responsibility in point of citizenship is entitled to know promptly and fully what we are doing, what we are proposing to do, and how we are proposing to do it; and he is entitled to know the expressed views of every Member of this body upon those questions. It is his right as much as it is the right of the Senator to draw his pay for services.

We are not sent here in blind confidence that we will do the will of our constituency. They are entitled to know why we are acting and to what purpose. A lot of ridicule is heaped upon the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by gentlemen who would like to assume the responsibility of informing the public from their own standpoint and in their own way what Congress is doing. Had experience proven that they were of the high measure of responsibility that we might expect them to be, we could rest with that. There was a time when the newspapers in this country reported the proceedings in Congress, and the people of the country, who support the newspapers and who own Congress, could be advised every day of what we did, and we would have the opportunity of suggestions as to their views. But the time has come when the only purpose which Congress seems to serve to the people who call themselves reporters is that of sensation and jest.

If the generations that are to assume the responsible duties of citizenship were to be educated only through the newspapers, the Government would not last long, and the newspapers would be out of a vocation.

I have some very refreshing comments by newspapers, which I have clipped from time to time, as to their views on the right of the people to the truth—to accurate information. One newspaper man said openly that the newspapers of the country intended to mold public opinion, and that in molding public opinion they proposed to state the facts that would justify their purpose. That is the spirit that is behind the attempt to suppress through legislation a legitimate system of advising the people of the truth.

A newspaper man with a conscience must squirm when he reads his account of the proceedings of this body in the presence of some one who tells him that he has read the official statement. He must squirm, as all men squirm, when they are convicted of making garbled statements, or misstatements of fact, or when they are convicted of suppressing all or any part of the truth, or when they are convicted by a simple inspection of a responsible official record of having suppressed or distorted or misstated the action of a Member of Congress in either House, because they liked him or did not like him, or because it was the policy of this paper or that to boost one man and not another.

I would not charge any Member of this body with being affected or influenced by what the newspapers might say, or what they might fail to say, as to his manner of performing his responsible duty, because it would be a slander upon a Member of this body.

The only safeguard to the people, so far as it is a safeguard, is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It speaks the truth, and nothing but the truth. In this body there is no such thing as "leave to print." What men say is recorded at the desk, is printed and is sent out at the expense of the people for whom it was printed, because they want it. If you could suppress the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Munchausen's Travels would be mild compared with the newspaper statements of what transpired in Congress. And I can take up the papers of this morning in this city, and in the city of New York, and others, and convict any man who dares to deny it.

I read the newspapers. There are many facts of interest and value stated in them. After you have gotten over the first page and the large type of scandals and crimes you will find in fairly sizeable type further on some statements that are worthy of consideration.

Now, Mr. President, I did not rise for the purpose of attacking the newspapers, but with the intent, among other things, of making a few statements which I defy them or any other person to disprove. The man who comes here caring what they say about him ought not to be here and the man who being here cares ought to leave. I do not say that out of disrespect for journalism in its true sense; I say it as a correct rebuke to those who, enjoying the courtesy of this body, abuse it. They treat the Members of this body, without regard to their per-

sonnel, as though they were merely here for the purpose of their amusement and that Congress was a great joke. We give them special rates in the mail. We passed an insane bill giving them special rates under the tariff laws. They will sit snugly here, guests without courtesy, and may I not this morning express the truth about it when it is wrapped up in this provision of the bill so snugly? The whole effort is to reduce the power of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a medium of true statement to the people as to what Congress does.

I am going to look into the facts. The amendment which I have proposed to make is on page 75 of the bill. At present the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is furnished only on a solvent basis, the price being fixed at a figure that meets the cost of its production. The daily edition is about 28,000. Just think of it. It is sent to only 28,000 of the American people out of more than 40,000,000 who are capable of reading it and understanding it. Only 28,000 copies are printed. The cost of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the first session of the Sixty-first Congress was \$6.30; that is, per issue. I mean to say for each CONGRESSIONAL RECORD through the term. For the second session of the Sixty-first Congress it was \$13.63; for the third session it was \$5.98; making the total cost \$25.91 for printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that Congress—the Sixty-first.

Now, \$25.91 is a pretty big price for an American citizen to pay for knowing what his representatives are doing and how they are doing it. It was subscribed for—and only a few people know where it can be obtained or how it may be obtained—by 205 subscribers for the first session, which brought a revenue of \$582.50. There were 282 subscribers for the second session, which brought a revenue of \$1,157.50. There were 719 subscribers for the third session, which brought a revenue of \$1,478.50, making a total for the Sixty-first Congress of \$3,219.50 for those who subscribed at that very high price.

Of course, that can not be termed a popular subscription. There are a very comparatively small number of the people who can pay \$25 a year for subscription to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The amendment which I have offered and which is under consideration provides as follows:

On page 75, line 15, strike out the word "eight" and insert the word "two."

That is, the bill provides that the subscription shall be \$8 per long session of Congress. I propose to reduce it to \$2.

Then the next amendment is in line 16. I propose to strike out \$4 for the short session and insert \$1 for the short session, and in line 17 I propose to strike out \$1.50 per month and insert 50 cents per month.

Now, those are popular prices. They would make it entirely available to all the people.

Then I propose to insert the following, on line 18, after the word "advance," and this is a part to which I desire especially to direct the attention of Senators:

The Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to make, on or before the 1st of July, 1912, such rules and regulations as will enable all postmasters in the United States to receive popular subscriptions for the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the aforesaid terms per year, and report all such subscriptions and account for and pay the amount received therefor to the Public Printer.

I have taken some pains to inquire as to public sentiment and the probable results of this amendment. I have no hesitation in saying—and I speak from the consensus of a large scope of opinion—that there would be 2,000,000 subscribers to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at those prices, \$1 for the short session and \$1.50 or even \$2 for the long session.

The post offices of the United States will announce in bold form in their waiting hall, where the people congregate, that subscriptions are received there and the price. They would announce something that a lot of people do not know, that the Congress of the United States would meet at Washington on a certain day, and that a record, a correct record, of its daily proceedings would be published each day. It would become the subject of controversy among the people in the neighborhood until it would soon be known that a popular subscription was open for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It would promote controversy as to what was reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It would set young and old, especially the younger portion of the citizens, to discussing and considering and weighing the opinions of men and the responsible acts of their representatives.

I have been sending for years into a mining camp in Idaho the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with other documents. I was there last year, and I asked an old-timer, who had been there all the time and in whose name I sent the paper, "George, what becomes of these CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS?" He said, "I will tell you. They come to me first, and I read them aloud to all the boys in the cabin, and when they know that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is there I have quite an au-

dience. Then," he said, "we discuss it in all parts of this mining camp. Then the boys will come to me and they will say, 'George, I wish you would let me see that page in the Record where So-and-so said so-and-so.' And those people are pretty live people. He said that goes on and that copy of the Record passes from hand to hand, is loaned from cabin to cabin, and you will see the last of it in fragments of some man's speech or the record of some vote; and by that time they will have another one. He said the result is that that mining camp is as well informed on the proceedings of Congress as any equivalent number of people in the United States, and I know it by the letters they write me.

I have said before, and I repeat it, because it is proper in this connection, during the Easter holidays not many years ago a nephew of mine, then in Yale College, came down to visit us. He had known Congress only through the newspapers, and it was more or less of a joke or a farce, or the coming together of grafters, according to the newspapers that he read. He stayed here as my guest and sat in that gallery for a week. He came to me, and he said, "Uncle, I want you to send me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD," and he recited to me about his change of opinion. I, of course, arranged to send it to him. He wrote me that he had enlisted the sympathy of his class in it, and he formed right there in that great institution of learning a political club, and during the period that he was there that club was a live political institution, each proud of the knowledge he had of what Congress meant, each glorifying that which he had viewed with some measure of contempt before. With another college I had the same experience. I sent them the Record. They organized a political club for information and individual improvement with the same general result. When those boys left the college those clubs did not die, because they were recruited from the ranks.

Now, I have given you the two extremes—the mining camp away up in the mines of Idaho; and I have given you the experience in the foremost educational institution of the world. I assure you that at every point between those along the line like conditions exist, and my appeal to you this morning is to take interest enough in this question to advise yourselves about it.

We have some other duties besides proposing and arguing legislation. We are the great educators of the American people in the political science of government. It is not enough that we understand these questions. It is not enough that 88 of the constituents of each of us should have the opportunity to know. It is our duty to make available to them that which belongs to them. Our services are their property. They are the Government, we are their representatives in the Government. Yet we act sometimes, it seems to me, as though we were the Government. Those people select their representatives with the idea that the representative is going to be of some substantial use, not only in enacting laws for their present government, but in laying the foundation in the intelligence of the people for the enactment and enforcement of laws in the years to come.

Mr. President, what do they propose to do in this bill? They propose not to increase the opportunity of the people to know what we do through the RECORD, but to reduce it to nothing. This amendment proposes a solvent proposition. Whether or not it is solvent, it is a worthy and justifiable expenditure of the money of those people and these people. It is proposed that hereafter, instead of Senators having the right to send 88 copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to a selected few of their constituents, they shall have the opportunity of sending—I will state it accurately so that there will be no question about it—

Provided, That the superintendent of documents may supply, on the request of the Vice President, Senators, Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, not to exceed five copies each of any publication of the Government not authorized by this section.

I am glad I ran across that. That I will deal with later. Here it is. There shall be furnished—

to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner there shall be furnished three copies of the daily RECORD, one to be delivered at his residence, one at the Capitol, and one to be reserved by the Public Printer in unstitched form to be promptly bound in paper when each semimonthly index shall be issued.

Instead of getting 88 copies for your constituents, you get none. You get three copies for yourself, one of which will be retained by your trustee, to be bound later. Why, I suppose we shall hardly be able to know within the Chamber what we are doing or what was said or what we did. We get two copies only for our use, one for our committee room and one for the house. No provision is made for the one under the desk; I suppose that is to be cut off; but it is immaterial. The thing is reduced to such an unjust and absurd proposition that I shall not spend time in discussing whether the one under the desk is in lieu of the one for the committee room or the one at the house.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I know that the Senator from Idaho wants to be absolutely just and correct in the matter, but the bill provides that—

Mr. HEYBURN. Now, do not anticipate what I am just going to take up. I know what the bill provides. If the Senator wants to correct something, well and good; but I prefer to take up the questions as to what the bill provides as my own original statement.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator made a statement that—

Mr. HEYBURN. I think I will forestall the Senator and not yield longer at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho declines to yield.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is the old, old way of doing some things. I am just about to state, and I have it in hand, what they do. In section 68, paragraph 1, the bill provides:

SEC. 68. PAR. 1. The Vice President and each Senator shall be entitled to not to exceed \$2,500 annually, and each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner not to exceed \$1,800 annually, in value of documents and publications authorized by this section, an account of which with the Vice President, each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner shall be kept by the superintendent of documents.

That goes to the question of charges against what you might call the right to buy CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS. We have that right now—the right to buy them; we need no act of Congress to give us the right. This money provision of \$2,500 would allow us for last year \$1,800 for CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS. That much of it would have been expended in sending out 88 copies. I have the figures before me. The amount allowed, \$2,500, and the cost of the last two years' CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS for 88 copies, our past and present allotment, would take \$1,800 out of that for CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS alone, and we would have \$640 left to buy for our constituents the public documents which we now send them.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. The average for every Senator for the last 10 years for 88 CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS is \$600. There is no question about that and it has been stated here on the floor over and over again. Under the law, as the Senator will observe if he will read it, the price is \$8 for a long session and \$4 for a short session. That has on an average of 10 years amounted to \$600.

Mr. HEYBURN. I have here from the officer—if he is an officer—charged with the management of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, whose place of business is in Statuary Hall, a written statement in regard to this matter, which I procured yesterday. He is the man who knows what these things cost. In the short session of the Sixty-first Congress the cost per set ran down to \$5.98. Beyond the passage of the appropriation bills there was little done in that session that would have interested many people, although there were a large number of questions involved in their consideration. In the long session of that Congress, however, the cost per set was \$13.63. I took that Congress as a criterion because it is of recent date—in fact, it is the last Congress—and I added the three sessions together and it resulted in an aggregate of \$25.91 for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD per set for that Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say, Mr. President, that the average cost of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the Sixty-first Congress, first session—the short session—was \$5.937 per copy, and for the Sixty-first Congress, second session, which was the long one, of which the Senator speaks, the average cost was \$13.621 per copy.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OLIVER in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. REED. I should like to say that if it costs \$13 a copy per session to print the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we had better get a different Public Printer, because that is certainly about six times as much as it ought to cost to print it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. That statement was made offhand, I know; but if the Senator knew exactly what the length of the session

was and the amount of paper that it took to print the debates he never would have made such a statement, because, Mr. President, the Sixty-first Congress, second session, was a long session, the one during which there was the tariff discussion, and in the Record for that session there were 11,723 pages; the paper cost on an average 3.42 cents per pound, and the actual cost of the Record during that session was \$13.621 per copy.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. REED. If the Senator from Idaho will pardon me—

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; I yield to the controversy.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator from Utah undertake to say that this cost of \$13 per session for the Record, assuming there was the same amount of printed matter, would continue to be \$13 per copy if we printed a vast number of copies? Is not that cost made up very largely of composition, of the original work of setting the matter?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have a statement here from the Public Printer to the effect that there would be about 10 per cent saved in that amount, provided a million copies of the Record had been published.

Mr. REED. That only 10 per cent would be saved?

Mr. SMOOT. That only 10 per cent would be saved.

Mr. REED. I may have made a reckless statement a while ago, and it must have been if the Senator from Utah so characterized it; but I undertake to say that any printer on earth who says that you can not save more than that in printing vast quantities is making a statement that can not anywhere be borne out by the facts.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say that after the Public Printer, in reporting upon what 1,000,000 copies would cost according to the figures in the amendment of the Senator from Idaho, stated that the difference between the cost of 1,000,000 copies and 2,000,000 copies—that is, 1,000,000 extra—would be 10 per cent. As to the difference in cost of printing the 27,000 copies that are now issued and 1,000,000 copies, I have no figures. I am simply giving the information I have from the Public Printer as to the difference in cost between printing an issue of 1,000,000 copies and an issue of 2,000,000 copies.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, the statement as to the vast expense that would be incurred by doing that which ought to be done is of secondary importance. Of course it costs something to perform every act of government, and the people expect it to cost something. The item of cost involved in this matter, under the most exaggerated estimate that has been made, is one of insignificance compared with the importance of this question.

I do not accept the figures made by an officer who does not want to carry out the proposition, but wants to find some way not to do it. I say that without intending to animadvert upon the officer personally; but they are comfortably and snugly fixed in the Government Printing Office now and they do not want to be disturbed. That, however, is a consideration of no importance whatever. The question here is, Shall we make the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the subject of popular subscription, so that all the people may know truthfully what happens? It would be better for them to remain in ignorance and not know at all than to be compelled to depend upon newspaper accounts of what is done in this body.

Mr. President, I shall put into the RECORD in connection with my remarks, with the consent of the Senate, a statement showing the average cost of the RECORD for the long and short sessions, and I shall ask leave to print in connection with it the statement in the handwriting of the officer specifically charged with accounting for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). In the absence of objection, permission is granted for printing in the Record the papers referred to by the Senator.

The papers referred to are as follows:

Statement showing the average cost per long and short session of printing the daily Congressional Record.

Sessions.	Copies.	Pages.	Total cost.	Average cost per copy per session.
Sixtieth Congress, first session (long).....	27,172	10,371	\$271,966.14	\$10.009
Sixtieth Congress, second session (short)...	27,172	5,438	176,084.83	6.4803
Sixty-first Congress, first session (special)...	27,000	6,522	219,294.20	8.122
Sixty-first Congress, second session (long)...	27,754	11,723	378,347.82	13.632
Sixty-first Congress, third session (short)...	27,571	5,411	163,705.50	5.937
Sixty-second Congress, first session (special)...	27,571	5,636	173,702.57	6.302

First. The printed edition daily is about.....	28,000
Second. The cost of printing per set for the first session	
Sixty-first Congress (short session) was.....	\$6.30
Second session Sixty-first Congress (long session) was.....	13.63
Third session Sixty-first Congress (short session) was.....	5.98
	25.91

Third. There were 205 subscribers, first session Sixty-first Congress, at a revenue of.....	582.50
There were 282 subscribers, second session Sixty-first Congress, at a revenue of.....	1,157.50
There were 719 subscribers, third session Sixty-first Congress, at a revenue of.....	1,478.50
	3,219.50

Mr. HEYBURN. The Senator from Utah has some large figures as to the cost of this proposed change. I have a copy of them here. The Public Printer, in voluntary response to the Senator's suggestion, addressed a letter to the Senator from Utah, under date of January 11, 1912, in which he says:

DEAR SENATOR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your communication of January 9 requesting a statement relative to the cost of certain proposed changes in the printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In reply thereto the following statement is submitted—

Now, mark you, he says:

One million copies of the Record printed in its present form could not be produced in the buildings now occupied by the Government Printing Office.

I have serious doubt as to the accuracy of that statement, because I think it was based upon an assumption that is not to be recognized.

An edition of 1,000,000 copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD daily can be printed and produced in an economical manner by—

1. Printing the daily RECORD in newspaper form; size of pages 19 by 23, five column;
2. The installation of three octuple perfecting newspaper presses, with stereotyping and mailing equipment;
3. The construction of a building having an approximate floor space of 50,000 square feet, and not exceeding three stories in height, adjacent to the railroad yards in the northern or southern sections of the city.

Not one of those suggestions is necessary to be taken into consideration. He immediately proposes to print a newspaper of standard size containing this matter, when he has already set up and plated in the office the standard CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He proposes, in reply to this suggestion, in order to discourage its consideration, to erect a new building, equip it with new presses, and start a newspaper. Well, we all know, or at least, unfortunately, too many of us know, what it costs to start a newspaper. This reminds me somewhat of the statement of a man who wants to induce you to start a newspaper so that he can have a job as editor. His estimates on the cost of starting the newspaper are very enticing, as a rule, but the experience of those who accept his suggestion and put up the money are just about in line with this suggestion by the Public Printer.

Let us cut out all of that, because none of it is necessary. Not a particle of that expenditure is necessary. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is set up, and it is only a question of the number of presses that you use in printing it; that is all. You can multiply them; and presses are not very expensive as compared with a few years ago. You can set up those extra presses and attach them to the machinery and you can print these additional copies.

It is not at all necessary that these copies should be printed on the same day with the present edition or go out in the same mail. There is no such haste in the printing and mailing of the copies proposed under this amendment as in the case of the copies required here for immediate reference. If they go out the next day or the next it is quite sufficient. What the people want is to know what is done here, and the question of a few hours as to when they know it is not so material.

You can dismiss all of that first antagonistic argument. Now we come to this:

Ten carloads of paper—

That is something substantial—

would be consumed daily, and storage space for a 10 days' supply, or 100 carloads, would be necessary.

That is a great item—storage for the paper upon which the RECORD is to be printed. I wonder what the great papers, that print very nearly this number of copies, do to store their paper. That is a trifling objection. It is not substantial.

We come now to another item:

The daily mail shipment would amount to approximately 12 carloads.

Why, when we are dealing with our general appropriation bill for the Post Office, the question of buying or hiring or subsidizing 12 carloads does not cause a blink of the eye on the part of any Senator in this body. They do not even stop to read it. It goes right along in the general swing of legislation. This is much less than I expected. I had no idea that a million copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD could be carried on 12 cars.

The cost of production in newspaper form, based upon the issues and average number of pages during the three sessions of the Sixty-first Congress, and the gain or loss, would be approximately as follows.

It is all on a false basis, because I do not think anyone would want it printed in newspaper form. Here are his figures where he gets up into the upper register. They are based on the last Congress:

Number of issues: First session, 123; second session, 163; third session, 82.

Average number of pages per issue: First session, 56; second session, 60; third session, 64.

Cost of 1,000,000 copies of each issue, page 19 by 23—

He is still sticking to something that nobody has suggested—five columns, on paper at 3 cents per pound—

That would have been an interesting item if we were discussing Canadian reciprocity—

First session, \$8,348; second session, \$8,858; third session, \$9,466.

That makes the cost of paper for a Congress approximately between \$27,000 and \$28,000.

So he makes it add up as follows:

Cost of 1,000,000 copies each of all issues, first session, \$1,026,804; second session, \$1,612,156; third session, \$776,212.

That is the cost for 1,000,000 copies. Now, listen to this:

Cost of one copy of all issues, first session, \$1.02; second session, \$1.61; third session, 78 cents.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I merely want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that that is the cost of the actual printing, and does not include the cost of paper.

Mr. HEYBURN. It is the cost resulting from the addition of the items I have just read, and is so stated.

No increase in the composing-room equipment of the Government Printing Office would be necessary. The matrices would be made in the present Government Printing Office and taken from there to the Record printing and plate-making plant.

There would be no extra cost there.

The cost of new equipment would be approximately \$140,000.

That equipment is already mentioned, and it would not be necessary at all. Of course, there would be a necessity for increasing the printing presses and some of the things belonging to that class of work.

There is the statement, and the worst that statement can produce is an increased cost of about \$852,000. Well, what are we going to get for it? That is the material question. That is the question that arises with every intelligent man having money to pay for something: "What am I going to get for it—for this less than a million dollars?"

You are going to get a popular education of the people in that which, were they educated in it to-day, would obliterate much of the vice and ignorance and mistaken impression that exists to-day. It is worth more than that many millions, if you can accomplish this obliteration, to do so.

Mr. President, I regret that I can not remain to listen and participate in the debate, if debate shall follow, upon this question. I have endeavored to state—and I believe I have succeeded, at least to some extent—the basic facts upon which this change rests. In what interest is it proposed?

This country has never voluntarily taken a backward step in anything that would advance the intelligence of the people, or their opportunity to gain intelligence. Is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to be made a joke? Is there any Senator here, speaking for himself, who would confess that his utterances were a joke? I know there is no Senator here so ungracious as to charge that the utterances of another Senator were a joke.

That being the case, are we to degrade ourselves in the rank of intelligent consideration, or in the ability to perform our high duties, by legislating our utterances into oblivion? Are we to confess to the American people that we either do not care or do not dare to let them know or give them the opportunity to know what we say and what we do? To suppress or diminish the opportunity of the people in this respect is to confess that our work will not bear inspection—is to confess that the duties we perform are unimportant or ill performed.

No man will charge any Senator upon this floor with urging a measure such as this from selfish motives, or motives of self-exploitation. A Senator who would entertain such a thought would be unworthy of the position. When we go out, as we do every two years, and meet not only our own immediate constituents in our States, but the people elsewhere, are we not sometimes impressed with the thought that they not only need but that they desire an opportunity to know how the Government is conducted?

This is the Government. The Congress of the United States is the Government. Those who carry out our mandate and merely the agencies of government. Sometimes you would think they stood in splendid rank above us. But that is a thought that will not last beyond the first criticism. I repeat, because the idea seems to be lost sight of so often at the cost of intelligent participation in government, that the Government is in the legislative bodies. The Constitution puts it there. It created it first, and it stands in the first rank of our Government. There are three departments or branches of the Government—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. That is the order of rank. No man can change it by donning a uniform, or by adding an inch of tape to his regalia. Can it be said that that which we do in our responsible capacity is of no interest to the people, or none of their business?

If the execution of a law is not in entire harmony with and obedience to the mandate of Congress, then the executive officer violates his duty. If it is in exact accordance with the mandate of Congress, then to Congress belongs the credit—if credit is due—for the law, with its virtues, its efficiency, or its defects.

Mr. President, I should like to feel in this hour that Congress, recognizing the dignity and importance of their functions due to the people, will show a willingness that the people shall know what they are doing, and, rather than circumscribe it, that they will make it more easy to accomplish.

The post offices are the best medium through which to take these subscriptions, because the people go to the post offices, and will continue to go there, I suppose, more than to any other center. They will say to each other, "Have you subscribed for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?" "No; it is too expensive. I can not pay six, eight, or ten dollars a year for it." "Oh, well, but you do not have to now. You can get it for a dollar a year for the short session and for a dollar and a half, or, at the outside, two dollars, for the long session." "How do I get it?" "Why, go right there to the postmaster's window and subscribe for it"; and his subscription goes to the Public Printer, and the Public Printer puts him on the mailing list.

That is all there is of this amendment. What I have said in general criticism of the bill, outside of this amendment, has been only to prompt other Senators to a closer investigation of the bill.

This is no emergency legislation, except, if there be an emergency clause in it, it is this amendment. Outside of this amendment there is not a rule or regulation in it that could not be dealt with next year as well as this.

Mr. President, I have not had time to examine all of this bill, nor have I felt equal to that duty. But I do know that it is one of those pieces of fallacy that we sometimes encounter, based upon a desire to change something, to put the head where the feet ought to be, without regard to the effect, or to destroy something because, forsooth, some three or four or half a dozen men do not appreciate its value.

I repeat that this legislation either ought to go back to the committee or that which is contained in this amendment should be taken up for affirmative action as a separate measure, without waiting for the bill; and I shall feel no jealousy if any other Senator shall see fit to do that in my absence, for it is a worthy measure.

Now, Mr. President, I have said all that I am able to say at this time. I sincerely hope that the pending measure will not be put through with accelerated speed at the expense of careful and proper legislation.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, so that there will be no misunderstanding as to what the bill provides, and in part answer to the criticism made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN], I want to call the attention of the Senate to the figures, and they are the accurate cost of printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the first place, Mr. President, under the present law the rate charged for the RECORD for a long session is \$8 per copy, and for a short session it is \$4 per copy. The proposed bill does not intend to change those figures, but we have provided a valuation system. Each Senator will be credited at the beginning of the session with \$2,500, which he can use in the selection for distribution of any public documents. If a Senator wants to spend it all in copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he can do so.

The Senator from Idaho said that taking the 88 RECORDS that a Senator is entitled to under the present law it would amount to about \$1,800 of the \$2,500 allotment. Under the present and proposed law the charges are and will be \$8 for the RECORD for the long session and \$4 for the short session, so you can see it would be impossible for the 88 RECORDS to amount to \$1,800. It is not so under the present law, and the proposed law does not change the rate one penny. In the short

session 88 copies at \$4 would be \$352, instead of \$1,800, and in the long session it would be \$704, instead of \$1,800, as stated by the Senator. Taking an average of the two, it would be \$528, instead of \$1,800. Taking a number of years, say, the last 10 years, the average value of 88 RECORDS has been \$660. The average value of the Yearbook, and every Senator has had to his credit 1,152 volumes, at a cost for each of 95 cents, amounts to \$1,094.40. In the past Senators have had issued of those two items alone to the amount of \$1,754.40, and the other publications, on the \$2,500 basis, would be \$745.60.

So, under the proposed bill, Mr. President, even at the prices charged, if every Senator wanted to send the full amount of his allotment of \$2,500 in RECORDS, he could send to his constituents 625 copies.

I listened to what the Senator said in relation to the RECORD and how it has been appreciated by his constituents. I have no doubt but many of the parties receiving the RECORD appreciate it, but I do know there are others who do not. I have gone into law offices and I have seen stacked up in the corner of the office the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the wrappers just as they were when they left Washington. Only to-day a Senator said to me that he had been sending the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for years to a lady friend of his in his State. When asked if she was receiving it, she answered saying, "Yes; I am receiving it, and it makes the best kind of iron holder."

Mr. President, I am aware it is not altogether a question of what the RECORD costs, but that is worthy of consideration. When the Senator from Idaho introduced his amendment I started an investigation to see exactly what it would cost the Government. I addressed a letter to the Public Printer and also one to the Postmaster General, asking what the actual cost of an additional million copies would be. The answer that I received from the Postmaster General is dated January 18, 1912, in which he says:

Your letter of the 9th instant requesting that an estimate be prepared and submitted for the information of the Printing Investigation Commission of the cost of carrying in the mails 1,000,000 copies of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD per day and per session, as provided for in Senate bill 145, and also an estimate of any additional expense which, in my opinion, this bill would place on the Post Office Department, has been received, and in reply I have the honor to advise you as follows:

In order to estimate the annual cost of transporting and handling 1,000,000 copies per day of the RECORD it was necessary, first, to ascertain the probable weight to be transported and handled annually. It was learned that the average number of issues each year for the past four years was 181. Based on an average number of pages per issue of 56 and the weight of the paper in use at present, the average weight per copy is found to be 4 ounces. From these figures an annual weight of 45,250,000 pounds to be transported and handled is ascertained.

Multiplying this weight by 3.61 cents, the latest estimated cost per pound for transporting second-class matter paid at the pound rate averaged for all hauls, as shown in the department's supplemental statement submitted to the Postal Commission on Second-class Mail Matter on October 20, 1911, gives a product of \$1,633,525, the estimated cost per annum for transporting 1,000,000 copies per day for 181 days.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. Has the Senator figured just how much that is per copy—that is, I mean per set or per issue?

Mr. SMOOT. I can soon figure that. It would be \$1.63 $\frac{3}{4}$ cents per year.

Mr. BRISTOW. How much per year would that be for a copy of the RECORD?

Mr. SMOOT. One dollar and sixty-three cents per year.

Mr. BRISTOW. It seems to me that is a very extravagant cost. It is very much more, it appears to me, than it ought to cost. That is more than the paper it is printed upon would cost.

Mr. SMOOT. There are about 4 ounces of paper. The average cost of paper to-day is 3 $\frac{3}{8}$ cents per pound. That was the contract price for the coming fiscal year. The average price of paper has been 3 $\frac{43}{100}$ cents per pound for the last 10 years.

Mr. BRISTOW. Now—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has yielded to the Senator from Kansas. Does the Senator from Utah yield further, and to whom?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to either Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I wish to ask one brief question.

Mr. BRISTOW. Certainly; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Can the Senator inform us on what system the Government buys the paper?

Mr. SMOOT. Every year we advertise in papers in the different cities of the United States for bids. Those bids are generally opened in the month of February. The quantities required and specifications of every kind of paper used by the Government are sent to all the leading manufacturers of paper, giving the exact analysis of the paper, size, and so forth.

Every manufacturer in bidding bids upon the specifications as furnished, knowing exactly what the paper contains, strength required, and size of sheets.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am afraid my question will indicate no very great familiarity with the subject on my part. I want to understand it, and I think this is the best time to get a little knowledge upon it.

The bill proposes to put to the credit of each Senator \$2,500 for each session of Congress, and permits him to take out public documents to that value, according to his own selection?

Mr. SMOOT. At actual cost, with 10 per cent added.

Mr. CUMMINS. So I have stated up to this time the fact?

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

Mr. CUMMINS. These documents are charged to him at their cost.

Mr. SMOOT. With 10 per cent added.

Mr. CUMMINS. With 10 per cent added. Does that cost include the free disposition or circulation of the same document by other officers of the Government?

Mr. SMOOT. Outside of Senators and Representatives?

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. The law specifically provides what each department is entitled to receive.

Mr. CUMMINS. What I was coming to is this: Suppose there were 10,000 copies of a particular document printed. Suppose the department which issued that document or had a right to circulate it sent out 5,000 copies free. The Senate and House would get the other 5,000 copies. Would the cost charged up to a Senator include the cost of the free documents sent out by the department?

Mr. SMOOT. It would not, Mr. President.

Mr. CUMMINS. Why is it that the departments are not compelled to have an allowance and to take out their documents in the same way and have them charged up to the departments, just as it is proposed to charge up the documents to Senators?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will glance over the bill he will find that it provides the number that can be printed of all documents issued by the departments. We limit those issues and they can not print more than the number provided by law. I think the number usually runs at about 3,000, in some cases more.

Mr. CUMMINS. Those are exclusive of the copies circulated by Senators.

Mr. SMOOT. Entirely so; and if they desire more printed than the law allows it can not be done unless Congress acts upon it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Now, I come again to my question. Suppose a department has 3,000 copies, but the whole issue is 10,000 copies. In ascertaining the cost of a particular copy, have you adopted as the basis the entire cost of the 10,000 copies?

Mr. SMOOT. It very seldom happens that a department prints a congressional document and very seldom that Congress prints a department publication. A congressional document is given a number and called a Senate or House document. Departments have their publications printed as department publications. The latter are distributed as department publications, by the department issuing the publication, and has nothing to do with documents that may be ordered by Congress. Therefore it is charged to their printing allotment, not to that of Congress.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not understand that. Take the Agricultural Yearbook as an illustration. That is published and circulated by the Members of Congress. The cost of each one of those books will be charged up to us—

Mr. SMOOT. To Members of Congress.

Mr. CUMMINS. And against the \$2,500 allowed.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true, but—

Mr. CUMMINS. Will that cost be ascertained by taking the whole number of copies printed and dividing the whole cost by the whole number, or will it be ascertained in some other way?

Mr. SMOOT. The Yearbook is ordered to be printed by Congress; it is not charged to the Agricultural Department; and if there are 100,000 copies printed the cost is based on the issue of 100,000 copies. I will say to the Senator that the issues since I have been here have been as high as 150,000, but generally there are about 100,000 copies.

Mr. CUMMINS. Will the seeds that are furnished by the Agricultural Department also be charged up to Senators?

Mr. SMOOT. We have nothing to do with that, Mr. President; that is provided for in the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. Where do we get our right to distribute seeds? I am asking purely for information.

Mr. SMOOT. Through the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. And they will not be included in the \$2,500?

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all.

Mr. CUMMINS. Then we are to buy, at the public expense, of course, \$2,500 worth of documents at the actual cost of those documents with 10 per cent added?

Mr. SMOOT. That is true, Mr. President; and under that system you can buy whatever public document is of interest to your constituents.

Mr. CUMMINS. Has there been any limit upon Senators heretofore?

Mr. SMOOT. There has always been a limit.

Mr. CUMMINS. What is the limit now?

Mr. SMOOT. If the up number is printed, each Senator is entitled to two or three copies. What I mean is that when any document is printed as a public document, say, 1,274 copies, they are divided between the House and the Senate and the different departments, and it amounts to about two or three copies to each Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. And we are now to be limited to \$2,500?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. What is the limit now for which \$2,500 is substituted?

Mr. SMOOT. It is about \$2,300, I will say to the Senator; and the \$2,500 is a little above what Senators have to send out under the present system.

Mr. CUMMINS. Why not cut it down a little?

Mr. SMOOT. Because I think under this system the public documents will be used to better advantage and more freely. Besides, the Members of the House feel that they ought to have an increase, so I am told. We thought, taking the whole average for a number of years back, that it would be a proper basis to make it \$2,500 for the Senate and \$1,800 for the House.

Mr. CUMMINS. Suppose an edition of a document is exhausted and I come in and have a credit to my account. I ask for 100 copies of that document. Will they be printed, then?

Mr. SMOOT. They will be printed just the same as they are to-day.

Mr. CUMMINS. They will not be printed to-day, because they will say the edition is exhausted. I doubt whether, if the selections were made and we asked for more than are printed, the Printing Office would then go and print them.

Mr. SMOOT. Whenever there is a sufficient number of orders to print the Public Printer will certainly print them.

Mr. CUMMINS. How many? This bill does not fix the number.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senators fix the number.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the bill provide for any catalogue of documents so that a Senator can go and make from that catalogue a selection if he desires?

Mr. SMOOT. The same catalogue under the bill will be published as is published to-day by the superintendent of documents.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is pretty large.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the weekly catalogue is not large.

Mr. CUMMINS. Oh, the weekly catalogue.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator was no doubt referring to the yearly catalogue.

Mr. CUMMINS. This substitute must in some way furnish Senators an opportunity to make the selection they require.

Mr. SMOOT. We have provided for that, Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. So far as one Senator is concerned I would require more knowledge on the subject in order to make the selection. I have not the least idea.

Mr. SMOOT. The bill provides that the superintendent of documents shall issue a catalogue. It compels him to issue it just the same as he is compelled to issue it to-day, and the Senator will get one of those catalogues just the same as he gets it to-day.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am very much obliged for the information, and it is purely for information that I made the inquiries. One more, and I will not make another—at least, not immediately. Do we get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at cost now?

Mr. SMOOT. We get it at less than cost under the bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. If other documents are charged at cost, why not the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. SMOOT. Because of the fact that we do not change the rate from what it is under the present law. In the present law it has been \$8 for a long session and \$4 for a short session.

Mr. CUMMINS. It would not, then, disturb the precedent or custom if we were to reduce that price somewhat in accordance with the views of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN]. It would simply be a further reduction?

Mr. SMOOT. It would be a further reduction and a greater cost to the Government.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. BRISTOW. I suppose every Senator has the experience of having requests for valuable documents, and requests that he has to decline because the quota which is assigned to him is exhausted. A great majority of the Senators, those representing the larger States, have greater calls for the valuable documents and for the Record than the quota assigned to them. So the documents that are actually sent out do not represent the demand that is made. I think the Senator's estimate as to the amount that would be required to supply the demand may be very much too low. The expensive documents are those most sought after. So the bill would put the burden upon every Senator of assigning so much of the available appropriation to this purpose or that purpose and deciding as to which of his constituents he would favor and those whose requests he would decline, and it might be a very serious embarrassment.

Mr. SMOOT. That is arbitrarily fixed now.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. Under the bill it would not be arbitrarily fixed. If a Senator had assigned to him under the present law, and if he wanted to get 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 10 or 20—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota; he was on his feet first.

Mr. NELSON. What I want to suggest to the Senator from Kansas is that it has been my experience that of the valuable documents, so called, the most important documents, we always get a very limited number. I have never been able to get from my quota enough to supply the demand. So this would not cut us off. I would like to get as much as we have ever received.

Mr. SMOOT. And a Senator gets documents he does not want under the present arrangement.

Mr. NELSON. We could get a great deal more under the proposed law of those valuable documents than we get to-day.

Mr. BRISTOW. But I want to suggest to the Senator from Minnesota, if the Senator from Utah will permit me, when he does that he does it at the expense of other documents. Now, take the agricultural bulletins. The Senator from Minnesota, I know, has need for every one of them he gets, and he could use a great many more than those assigned to him.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will allow me, my experience with the agricultural bulletins is that they are not distributed to me at all. I get hundreds of requests for them, and I present them to the Agricultural Department, and they are filled from there.

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to say to the Senator—

Mr. NELSON. They do not come under this head at all.

Mr. SMOOT. They are not provided for in this bill; they are printed by the Agricultural Department.

Mr. BRISTOW. But each Senator, as I understand it, is given a credit of \$2,500.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. BRISTOW. Now he has a credit of 12,000 agricultural bulletins.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. BRISTOW. That does not come out of this appropriation at all?

Mr. SMOOT. The agricultural bulletins are published by the Agricultural Department. The appropriation is made directly to that department for the publication of them, and it is not charged to Senators and never has been. They are not congressional documents. The charge against the \$2,500 only includes the documents that are either a Senate document or a House document.

Mr. NELSON. I want to say, if Senators will allow me, that within the last six months I have had probably several thousand calls for those agricultural bulletins. All I have done is to send the calls to the Department of Agriculture and they would fill them, and continue to fill them unless the edition is exhausted. They have not been a part of the quota. They are not in the list sent to us of documents in the folding room to our credit.

Mr. SMOOT. They never go to the folding room. The Senator has a certain number to his credit, and if he sends out that number then his credit is exhausted. That is provided for in the appropriation bill, and has nothing whatever to do with the printing bill.

Mr. BRISTOW. Well, if it has not, I am glad.

Mr. SMOOT. It has nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. BRISTOW. I am glad to know that.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. SHIVELY. The Senator stated a few moments ago that in case a document was a favorite document and there was a large demand for it, under the proposed system a Senator could avail himself of it and supply the demand, so far as he was concerned.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

Mr. SHIVELY. Of course, there is a difference in the value of these documents, as admitted by Senators. Does this bill give such flexibility in the number of publications as to accommodate the supply to the demand?

Mr. SMOOT. The bill provides that if the Senator from Indiana should desire to take his allowance of \$2,500 in one document he could do so.

Mr. SHIVELY. Yes; but where would the document be? Suppose we all concluded that we wanted to take it all in one document, where would you have that supply?

Mr. SMOOT. At the Government Printing Office.

Mr. SHIVELY. Do you mean to say that, under the pending bill, of every document there will be a sufficiency so that each Senator could make a demand upon it to the value of \$2,500 and not exhaust the supply?

Mr. SMOOT. Of course that would be true if such a thing ever happened; but it never would happen.

Mr. SHIVELY. I know that particular case would never happen, but it involves the same principle. There are some documents which are favorites whilst others are not, and they are therefore neglected. Do you say that under your proposition we can make a choice, make a selection, make a requisition for the amount we like? Suppose it is a favorite document, is there any provision in this bill by which in any way the supply of documents could be adjusted to the demand?

Mr. SMOOT. I see what the Senator desires to know. We have what is called "the edition system." We issue the documents in editions only as they are called for, so that whenever there was a sufficient demand a new edition would be issued.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ROOT. I wish to ask the Senator from Utah whether any attempt has been made to determine the quantity of the different kinds of documents which ought to be printed. By an examination of the great mass of unused publications referred to in the report on page 40, I see this quotation from the report of the Select Committee on Useless Papers and Documents:

The entire number of old pamphlets and publications which are now in the folding room, and for which there is practically no demand, exceeds 1,000,000 copies. There is in the vaults perhaps 1,000 tons of useless paper which cumber the earth and is of no value to anyone.

I suppose a publishing house would regulate the size of the editions of a particular kind of book which it ventured to put out by its past experience as to the demand for that kind of a book. My inquiry is, What attempt has there been to furnish a standard for fixing the size of the editions to be published of the different kinds of documents which we authorize to be printed?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the superintendent of documents has gone into that question very thoroughly. He has examined the question of the number usually required of each class of publications. From the experience he has had and that which the Public Printer has had, they seem to think that at least they will be able to work in the future upon the same system as do the publishing houses in the United States. The number necessary to be issued of the different documents can almost be determined now from the number issued in the past, and it is believed that in the future there will be no more documents printed than will be actually called for.

Mr. ROOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah whether he does not think that it might be a useful thing, as a guide to our action, to provide that there shall be each year a report made to the Senate, or to each House of Congress, of the number of documents authorized the preceding year which have not been distributed?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that is provided for by requiring an annual report of the Public Printer, showing the amount of work that has been done, the receipts of the Government Printing Office, and a detailed statement of everything pertaining to that office.

Mr. ROOT. Does the provision to which the Senator from Utah refers specifically require the officer to state what number

of copies of each document has been distributed and what number remains in stock?

Mr. SMOOT. Section 58, paragraph 5, of the pending bill reads:

SEC. 58. PAR. 5. The superintendent of documents shall submit to the Public Printer monthly a report showing, by title, the number of copies of Government publications received by him from all sources, specifying each; the number of copies sold; the total sum received for the same; the number of copies distributed to depository libraries, congressional valuation distribution, and otherwise; and the number on hand.

That paragraph provides for a monthly report from the superintendent of documents to the Public Printer. Then the Public Printer is required at the end of the year to make a complete statement to Congress showing the result of the different reports made by the superintendent of documents.

Mr. ROOT. That is, he is required to make a report which may include that, but he is not specifically required to do so?

Mr. SMOOT. It does include that.

Mr. ROOT. There is another subject that I should like to inquire about. Has the committee considered the question as to whether this rigid rule, without reference to the population to be served in the way of distribution, accomplishes the real object of the printing of public documents? I assume that we print these documents in order that they may be read. We want the people of the country to get the information. Take the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We all of us agree, I am sure, with the view taken by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN], though we may not agree with the measures which he proposes to give effect to it. We desire that the people of the country shall be correctly informed about what we are doing here and the reasons that are stated here for our action. The committee fixes a limit of \$2,500 for all documents which may be distributed on the requisition of a Senator, cutting off the supply of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, which, I think, is now \$8.

Mr. SMOOT. Not cutting off the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. ROOT. Well, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has to be paid for or accounted for out of the \$2,500.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true. It is included in the estimate that Senators receive to-day.

Mr. ROOT. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] has some four million and odd people in his State; the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] has six million and odd; and my colleague [Mr. O'GORMAN] and I have between nine and ten million. How many people are there in Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. About 450,000.

Mr. ROOT. About 450,000. Then there are somewhere between 20 and 30 times as many people in my State as there are in Utah. You are going to cut the people in New York off from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless they are people who can afford to pay \$8 a session for it.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator has forgotten that there is a House of Representatives.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. They have forgotten us.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from New York must remember that his State has 36 more Members of the House of Representatives than has Utah.

Mr. ROOT. Well, that is no reason why we should—

Mr. SMOOT. Every Member of the House of Representatives is allowed \$1,800; and we have arranged the question of the distribution as to population by allowing every Representative to have \$1,800 credit.

Mr. ROOT. Does the Senator, then, abandon the idea that the allotment to Senators of these documents is for the purpose of distributing the documents to the constituents of Senators and treat the allotment as being merely a personal perquisite of the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think that is the case, and I am sure it was not the intention. I think that the western Senators, perhaps, have as great a demand for public documents, or a greater demand, I will say, in many cases than have the Senators from New York. This particularly applies to horse books, yearbooks, cattle books, irrigation reports, and so forth. If the Senator from New York does not require such books for his constituents, then he can send them more CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS.

Mr. ROOT. I do not doubt that the constituents of the Senator from Utah want the horse books, but my constituents want to read the solid and substantial material supplied by us here.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Statistical Abstract, for instance.

Mr. ROOT. They want intellectual food.

Mr. SMOOT. Under this proposed system the Senator from New York can send a portion of his quota in horse books and he can send as a portion of it the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or any other public document he thinks his constituents desire.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. BORAH. Could we not get a public document on automobiles for New York? [Laughter.]

Mr. SMOOT. That would rest entirely with the Senate; but I do not think the Senator from New York would make such a request.

Mr. ROOT. Well, as I have at least 10 times as many constituents as has the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], who are owning and operating farms, I hardly think it would be necessary to follow his suggestion.

Mr. BORAH. As I understand, then, the Senator is in a position to utilize his number of horse books?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly; and I have probably 10 times as many demands for the horse books as I can fill from the 4,000,000 people who live in the country districts in New York.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course that is true.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator from New York will allow me, I want to call his attention to the fact that under the present system he only gets a limited supply of those books.

Mr. ROOT. I know; and I think it is entirely inadequate.

Mr. NELSON. And the same is true of the RECORD. You get no more for the State of New York than we do for the State of Minnesota. Each Senator has the same allotment; but under the proposed new system he can pick out the documents he desires and can get more of them than he now does.

Mr. ROOT. I think that, apart from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the new system is an improvement on the old allotment arrangement; but I do not think it goes further than that.

Mr. SMOOT. The only way that that could be obviated would be to lower the price of the RECORD or leave the price as it now is and increase the allotment to each Senator. If a greater distribution of the RECORD is desired, one of the two systems must be adopted; but I think when every Senator has had the experience of distributing \$2,500 worth of public documents there will be hardly a Senator who will not say that that is ample to cover all the documents he desires to distribute.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield further to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ROOT. Does not the Senator from Utah think that there is a difference between the distribution of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and other documents?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; Mr. President.

Mr. ROOT. It seems to me that we ought to try to promote the distribution of the RECORD to all the people who want to read it; I think that is rather fundamental, and that we ought not to put barriers in the way. I would rather have the Senator cut down the allowance for documents generally and make a special arrangement so that everybody in the United States who was really willing to read the RECORD should be able to get it.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me call the attention of the Senator to the fact that we have not distributed the entire number of RECORDS that have actually been published in the past.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I will answer the Senator. I know just exactly what he is going to say, but let me get through with my statement, and then I will tell the Senator what he was going to say. In the second session of the Fifty-seventh Congress there were four parts of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and about 27,000 copies were printed, of which 5,594 were not distributed.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I ask the Senator to wait until I get through. In the first session of the Fifty-eighth Congress there were 3,680 sets of the RECORD not distributed; in the second session of the Fifty-eighth Congress there were seven parts of the RECORD, and 3,780 sets were not distributed; in the third session of the Fifty-eighth Congress there were five large volumes of the RECORD, of which 4,201 sets were not distributed; and in the second session of the Fifty-ninth Congress there were six parts and 1,410 sets were not distributed. I am perfectly aware that there are a number of Senators who would have been glad to have those RECORDS for distribution in their States, but that number was not distributed.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. As a matter of fact, those RECORDS that were undistributed were the bound volumes, were they not?

Mr. SMOOT. They were the bound volumes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The bound volumes come late, after the subject matter has ceased to be of any practical interest, and you might as well attempt to circulate a last year's bird's nest.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, let me tell the Senator that there would not be any bound volumes if Senators wanted to distribute the daily RECORD as issued from day to day. No one is compelled to keep any part of his allotment of 88 volumes to be bound.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I think that I have never had during all the time that I have been in either House a dozen requests for bound volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would much prefer to send the RECORD out from day to day, when the subject matter is being discussed. I undertake to say that there are not many Senators or Representatives who know that they have the bound volumes to their credit now.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, every Representative and every Senator is notified. He makes up the list of those to receive the daily RECORD at the beginning of every session of Congress. He can reserve as many as he desires of the number allotted to him to be bound or he can make up a list the very first day of the session of Congress and send out every one of the 88 sets of the RECORD in daily form if he so desires.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from Utah is failing to consider facts growing out of human nature. Each Senator is asked at the beginning of a session how many copies of the RECORD he wants distributed in the daily RECORD form and how many he wants to reserve for the bound volumes. Suppose I make a calculation and conclude that I had better keep back five sets for bound volumes. I do that because the year before, perhaps, I have sent on request, or generally without request, to educational institutions or college libraries that number of bound volumes. As the Senator from Michigan has said, nobody makes requests for bound volumes of the RECORD except school or other libraries. So I keep back a certain number of RECORDS, thinking that there will be that many requests; but the requests are not made and that number of bound RECORDS is left on my hands. I dare say that that is just exactly how this accumulation of undistributed bound volumes grew up.

Each man of prudence will keep back as many as he thinks will be called for, and in order to be on the safe side may keep back a copy or two more than will be called for; but my experience is, although the demand is not so pressing here as it was at the other end of the Capitol, that every copy of the daily RECORD is called for. What makes it worse is the fact that the weekly newspapers in each district seem to think that they are entitled to the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and in a certain sense they are, because they boil it down, sift it, and get out of it what goes to the public; and by the time you get through supplying the weekly newspapers you have very few copies left for precisely the kind of people who ought to get them—men here and there who are students of public affairs, whose opinions are well worth cultivating, because they are going to influence other people. So that it seems to me that the fact which the Senator from Utah has stated—which is undeniably a fact—has no application at all to the question as to whether there shall or shall not be more copies of the daily RECORD distributed.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. In a moment. I first want to say to the Senator from Mississippi that what he says I believe is absolutely the fact, but under the system proposed a Senator can send in a list of names, whether 60, 80, 100, 120, or more, and that number of RECORDS will be charged to him. Then, at the end of the session, if there are calls for bound volumes of the RECORD, all he has to do is to order one, two, three, or whatever number of sets he may desire, and there will not be a copy left.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator who has charge of this bill what objection would he or the committee have to a suggestion either to increase or to retain the present quota of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, and then

change the system for the distribution of other publications as suggested in the report and recommendation of the committee?

My objection to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD being charged to the quota of documents to which a Senator is entitled, is this: In States near Washington the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is somewhat like a daily paper, and there is a great desire for it; but when a week elapses before it is received, oftentimes matters discussed in the RECORD are forgotten, and, of course, in such case the bound volumes are worth about as much as the daily RECORD. I know, however, that the demand upon me for the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from the State of Virginia far exceeds the number I can furnish. At the beginning of each session of Congress I try to comply with all the requests that come to me for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The requests are so many, however, that under the system proposed my entire quota of documents would be charged up at the beginning of the session, and if subsequent requests should come in I would be entitled to no further documents. Then all I could do would be to make arrangements to buy the documents for my constituents, which would about take all my salary. Now, having only 88 copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD furnished me, after I have supplied that number, I can very properly write that my quota has been exhausted, and that is a satisfying reply to my constituents.

It seems to me that we should reach a conclusion as to the distribution to be made of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think it should be distributed more freely and more largely than it is at present. I was a subcommittee of the Post Office Committee to whom was referred the proposed amendment, which was then a separate bill, offered by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN].

After examining the cost of the proposed change and bringing the matter before the full Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, the conclusion was reached, after discussion, though no resolution was passed, that rather than go to the expense of millions of dollars in printing the RECORD for cheap, popular distribution, in accordance with the idea suggested by the Senator from Idaho, we would recommend an increase in the quota of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS allotted to Senators and Members of the House of Representatives. I think the time has arrived to do this. I think simply to provide an edition of 28,000 copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is certainly a very small dissemination of the information contained in that RECORD.

There are occasions when it is sent to people who do not read it. They read it when there is an exciting debate or when there is an important matter under consideration or when there is something in which they are interested, but no one has the time to read the RECORD continuously. I do not do that myself, and I presume the Senator from Utah does not read one-fifth of the RECORD. Frequently, as the Senator suggested from his own observation, it is not even opened; but that does not mean that all RECORDS are not opened. I guarantee there are very few people who receive the RECORD who do not read the discussions and debates in Congress on matters in which they are interested.

I should like for the Senator to consent, on behalf of the committee, to increase the quota of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS allowed Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, and then let his suggestion as to other public documents, making an allowance to each Senator of documents to a value of \$2,500, be adopted. I think that is a better system of distribution of the general run of documents than we have at present. I know I have to my credit a great many documents which to me are useless and an incumbrance, but which other Senators may desire, and which I very gladly give them when they make the request. The proposed change makes the distribution useful and beneficial; and if it is beneficial, if it provides for the sending of documents to the people who desire them and need them for information, I can not see why we can not increase the quota of the RECORD to two or three hundred for each Senator and Representative and make the allowance \$2,500 for other useful documents it is proposed to send out, and let Senators and Representatives select what they desire.

I should like for the Senator to consent to an amendment providing for an increase, say, of 100 or even 10 or 12 RECORDS to each Senator and Member of the House, and then provide for the distribution of other documents by charging them up to the amount of \$2,500. I think under such a method Senators will obtain documents which are useful to them and their constituents and that they will have ample to supply the demand for documents and for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I feel satisfied that very few documents will then be left on the hands of the Government.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will wait until I answer the Senator, then I will yield.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I also want to make an observation to the Senator from Virginia. I want to tell him—and I will do it very briefly if the Senator from Utah is willing—that this plea of his for CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS and public documents is about the last stand that Senators and Representatives are making to get anything in their own right. They have been refined out of about every other thing, and if they refine us out of this we shall finally fall back on the right to ask the Secretary of State for letters of introduction to the consular and diplomatic officers of the United States. That will be about all that we can do.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Virginia that the easiest way to bring that about would be to lower the price of the RECORD, as suggested by the Senator from Idaho, but perhaps not to the point suggested in his amendment. But before doing that, I want to tell the Senator just what it is going to cost. I have had an idea that we were trying to practice economy. I know I have had a jolt once or twice of late when the question of economy has been attempted. Still, for all that, I shall insist, as far as I am concerned, in being economical with the Government's money as far as possible.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me—

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

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator does not want to exercise economy in education and information?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, not at all.

Mr. SWANSON. I understand—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend for a moment. Senators desiring to interrupt will please address the Chair. The reporters have complained two or three times this afternoon that they could not hear the interruptions. The Chair hopes that hereafter Senators will address the Chair before interrupting the Senator who has the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will now continue with the letter of the Postmaster General.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Before the Senator continues on that branch of the matter, I want to call the attention of the Senate to what I regard as a very serious thing in this bill. It is found in section 37. I want to let the Senate know that there is something here besides a disposition to curtail the distribution of the RECORD and public documents.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator is going to make a speech, I would rather put in this letter now, and then I will yield to the Senator. The Senator's reference to section 37 brings up an entirely different question than this.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I know it, and I am afraid it will be lost sight of.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, Mr. President, I refuse to yield until I get through with this subject. Then I will take up the other matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not care to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well. I will continue with the letter of the Postmaster General:

The cost a pound for the other services rendered by the Post Office Department in connection with the handling of this volume of matter is estimated at 4.86 cents, or \$2,199,150 for the year. The total estimated cost to the department of transporting and handling the matter, therefore, is \$3,832,675. This estimate might be reduced to some extent should the publication be separated to routes, States, and districts, in conformity with the schemes of distribution recently issued in connection with such separations by publishers, but the amount of such reduction can not be stated.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. If it is on this subject.

Mr. BRISTOW. It is. Will the Senator please read again the total amount that the Postmaster General estimates as the cost?

Mr. SMOOT. Three million eight hundred and thirty-two thousand six hundred and seventy-five dollars.

Mr. BRISTOW. That is more than a twentieth, if I remember correctly, of the entire estimated cost of handling all the second-class matter that is handled in the United States mail. I do not believe any such expense or cost would be incurred. It seems to me, without investigating it in detail, that it is ridiculous to say that the distribution of the RECORD would cost one-

twentieth as much as the entire second-class mail matter of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this statement is based upon the hearing before the Commission on Second-Class Matter in New York City.

Mr. BRISTOW. I do not care what it is based upon, if the Senator will excuse the remark. The Postmaster General estimates, if I remember the figures correctly—and if I do not I shall be glad to be corrected—that the cost of handling second-class mail matter in the United States is something over \$60,000,000 per annum. Is that right?

Mr. SMOOT. Then, if that is the case, this is not 20 per cent of the total.

Mr. BRISTOW. I said it was one-twentieth. I did not say 20 per cent.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. GRONNA. I believe the statement the Postmaster General made in that regard was that the loss was some \$58,000,000.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRISTOW. Does the Senator from Utah remember what was the department's estimate of the cost of handling second-class matter?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not remember it; but I got this report, which says that the total expense per pound for second-class mail matter is 0.0847 cent. The estimate of the Postmaster General for the extra 1,000,000 copies is based upon each issue of the Record weighing on an average of 4 ounces, and upon an average issue of 181 days. On that basis the total cost would be \$3,832,675.

Mr. ROOT. For how many copies?

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

Mr. SMOOT. For 1,000,000 copies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the Secretary to read the rule.

The SECRETARY. Rule XIX, on page 19 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, provides:

1. When a Senator desires to speak he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer, and shall not proceed until he is recognized, and the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator who shall first address him. No Senator shall interrupt another Senator in debate without his consent, and to obtain such consent he shall first address the Presiding Officer; and no Senator shall speak more than twice upon any one question in debate on the same day without leave of the Senate, which shall be determined without debate.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. The Secretary is reading the rules of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rules of the Senate.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRISTOW. Has the Senator now the figures in regard to the estimated cost of handling second-class mail matter?

Mr. SMOOT. In the same report, Mr. President, I find that the expense of handling second-class mail matter to-day is \$59,692,439.64. The revenue is \$7,042,161.08. In other words, there is a loss of \$52,650,278.56.

Mr. BRISTOW. According to those figures, then, the cost of handling second-class matter is approximately \$59,000,000. The estimated cost of handling the Record would be \$3,800,000, or approximately one-sixteenth of the entire expense of handling second-class matter, which includes all the papers, the magazines, and everything else that has the second-class rate. It seems to me, without analyzing the statement in detail, that those figures can not be accurate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the report also shows that the total weight of second-class mail matter is 692,624,512 pounds, and the weight of a million copies of the daily Record is 45,250,000 pounds. So, if the Senator will multiply 45,250,000 pounds by 16 he will be not very far from or even a little beyond the amount of the actual weight of second-class matter.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. ROOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas if he appreciates how heavy the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD really is? [Laughter.]

Mr. BRISTOW. I will suggest that if the Record is as heavy as indicated by the figures which the Senator from Utah is presenting, it should be made lighter in avoirdupois at least, which could be done by using a much lighter paper.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, since I have been chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing we have changed the weight of the paper twice, and the last time we did it I remember that a number of Senators complained that it was altogether too light.

In this connection I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that if a million copies of the Record are printed daily it will require 10 carloads of paper. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD comes in 4, 5, 6, and 7 parts a year, according to the length of the session, sometimes with as many as 11,723 pages during the session. Before putting a price upon it, and before we go headlong into this proposition of a cheap edition, I think the Senate ought to know just where we will land and what it is going to cost. Then, if we desire to incur the cost, I will have no objection; and I think the easiest way to reach that result is to reduce the price. But in so doing the Government would not be reimbursed by the money that the subscriber pays.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will merely suggest in that connection that the weight of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is partly due to the fact that we are getting into the habit of printing in it pretty much everything that can be conceived of. Every time we discover a paper that we think of interest to the individual a request is made to put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We used to object to it, but we do not do so any more.

Now, Mr. President, inasmuch as there is no possibility of the bill being passed to-night, I want to ask the Senator if he will not let the matter go over, as there is a little business that some Senators would like to transact and an executive session is desired?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before that suggestion is considered I should like to make a suggestion to the Senator from Utah for him to respond to, not now, but later, in connection with his bill and in connection with the matter being discussed at this moment.

I am not sufficient of a local historian to know how the habit or custom grew up of Representatives and Senators in Congress distributing every sort of public document, but it has grown up. The truth is that there is no common sense in the idea of Senators and Congressmen distributing any documents of any description except the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD itself, House documents, Senate documents, House bills, Senate bills, House reports, and Senate reports.

There is no reason at all, founded on common sense, why a Senator or a Representative should be selected for the purpose of distributing a Horse Book or an Agricultural Yearbook. There are a thousand reasons why the Agricultural Department ought to do it. There is no reason under the sun why a Senator or a Member of the House should be selected to distribute garden seed. There are a hundred reasons why an experimental farm of the Agricultural Department should do it. There is no reason why you or I should distribute Coast and Geodetic Survey Reports. There are reasons why, upon request of citizens, the experts in that business should send out those reports for the information of the people. There is no reason why you or I should distribute the reports of the Smithsonian Institution. There are reasons why they should be distributed, but not by us.

In other words, we Senators and Members of the House have seized as a political asset upon the distribution of public documents, and it has cost the Government of the United States a great deal of money, and it will cost the Government of the United States a great deal more money if it is persisted in, if it gradually increases from session to session and from year to year, as it inevitably must, because we are human beings and are possessed of human nature.

The Senator can not equalize all this by saying that at the beginning of the session somebody must say what sort of document he wants, because he does not know. He is distributing these things on request. I think there are a good many people in the United States who believe that a Senator or a Repre-

representative has a right to send out as many copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as he chooses.

One word more, if the Senator will pardon me for the length of the interruption, because I am asking no answer now. I see very many reasons why the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should be distributed to the people of the United States as cheaply as possible and in as great numbers as possible, and why it should be distributed by Senators and Members of the House, because it is a defense of themselves from any false or unjust or untrue attack; and it is not only that, which is a small matter, but it is the actual diary of the United States Government; and the people, who are the masters of their public servants, ought to have as nearly as possible a daily report from their public servants.

But I want the Senator to direct his attention to getting Senators and Representatives rid—if they will permit themselves to be rid of it, which I doubt—of this business of distributing, as a political asset, for the purpose of strengthening themselves in their districts and States against possible opposition, all sorts of public documents that ought to be distributed, but ought to be distributed by other people and not by them; by other departments of the Government which are in closer touch with the interests, with the special individuals, that these things ought to go to. There are a great many of these reports that are matters of information to scientists, matters of information to doctors, matters of information to sailors, matters of information to soldiers. They are sent to us to distribute instead of being distributed by the medical department, by the War Department, by the Agriculture Department, and by the various other branches of the Government who by the very nature of their business are kept in touch with the class of people who want to read that sort of literature.

I shall not ask any response to that suggestion at this time, and I beg the pardon of the Senator from New Hampshire; but I wanted to get that off my mind while I had it on my mind.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a very good point.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. I, too, desire to suggest a matter with no expectation of an answer now. The cost of distributing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been based upon an alleged cost per pound of distributing second-class mail matter. I should like to know, at some future time, whether the Senator concurs in the view of the Postmaster General that it costs 8½ cents a pound to distribute second-class mail matter in this country.

The Senator knows that that statement has been very sharply and, as I think, successfully challenged in several investigations that have been made by Congress. I myself am led to believe, from all the testimony that has been laid before us, that it does not cost half that much. But I should like the Senator to become familiar, if, indeed, he is not already familiar, with what has been developed in Congress upon that subject, and be able to give us his own judgment as to what it will cost to circulate the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. As suggested, I will not attempt at present to answer either the Senator from Mississippi or the Senator from Iowa. But I have all the information that I could gather from the department as to the cost of transportation of second-class matter. I will say frankly to the Senator that I really do not know what it actually costs. I know, however, as he says, that it is a disputed question.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the Senator will not know when we meet again, because nobody knows. But we do know this: Anybody who examines or analyzes the statements of the Post Office Department knows that many of the items which have been included in order to ascertain this cost are erroneously included. I think it is the judgment of anyone who has examined the subject that, whatever it may cost, it does not cost anything approximating 8½ cents a pound.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, of course, when the bill is up for consideration again I should like to finish the statements showing what the Postmaster General and the Public Printer say this will cost the Government. Then, of course, every Senator can judge for himself as to whether it is correct or not. Then, too, they can judge as to whether there should be a decrease in the price that shall be charged for the RECORD. I will say now that whatever decrease may be made in the price of the RECORD will be an increased allowance to each Senator under the valuation system.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. OLIVER was, on his own motion, excused from further service upon the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BURNHAM was, on his own motion, excused from further service upon the Committee on Cuban Relations and the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

Mr. GALLINGER, on behalf of Mr. BRIGGS, asked that he be excused from further service upon the Committee on Conservation of National Resources and the Committee on the Geological Survey, and Mr. BRIGGS was excused.

Mr. GALLINGER, on behalf of Mr. WORKS, asked that he be excused from further service upon the Committee on Coast Defenses and the Committee on Patents, and Mr. WORKS was excused.

Mr. GALLINGER, on behalf of Mr. BROWN, asked that he be excused from further service upon the Committee on Pacific Railroads, and Mr. BROWN was excused.

Mr. GALLINGER, on behalf of Mr. BORAH, asked that he be excused from further service upon the Committee on Revolutionary Claims, and Mr. BORAH was excused.

Mr. GALLINGER, on behalf of Mr. JONES, asked that he be excused from further service upon the Committee on Industrial Expositions, and Mr. JONES was excused.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution, which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That Mr. CATRON be assigned to the following committees: Expenditures in the Department of the Interior, chairman; Coast Defenses; Conservation of National Resources; Cuban Relations; Industrial Expositions; and Pacific Railroads; and

Resolved, That Mr. FALL be assigned to the following committees: Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor, chairman; District of Columbia; Geological Survey; Pacific Islands and Porto Rico; Patents; and Revolutionary Claims.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 276), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor be, and it hereby is, authorized to employ a clerk at a salary of \$2,220 per annum and a messenger at \$1,440 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, at the request of many Senators on both sides of the Chamber who have important committee work to do, I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

LEVEE PROTECTION AT MOUND CITY, ILL.

Mr. CULLOM. I introduce a joint resolution, and I want to have a dispatch read showing the justification of it.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 96) appropriating \$10,000 for the purpose of maintaining and protecting against impending floods on levee at Mound City, Ill., was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc. That the sum of \$10,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War in maintaining and protecting against impending floods the levee at Mound City, Ill.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask leave to have read the dispatch I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

MOUND CITY, ILL., April 4, 1912.

Senator SHELBY M. CULLOM, Washington, D. C.:

At a citizens' meeting held to-night it was decided to ask you to secure for the city of Mound City, Ill., the sum of \$10,000 from appropriation recently made to aid us in our flood-stricken condition. Water at top of 4 miles of levee all around city; no money in treasury. Financial aid necessary at once to save us from inundation. Can you not have same wired to city treasurer here?

M. F. BROWNER, Major.
DANIEL HOGAN,
W. A. WALL, County Judge.
F. J. KUNY,

President Mound City Commercial Club.

Mr. CULLOM. This morning I received the telegram which has just been read, and I applied to the Mississippi River Commission, asking them to send to Mound City some of the money we have already appropriated. They telegraphed me that they can not use it, because the appropriation was made for the Mississippi River alone. So I have introduced the joint resolution. I hope it may pass at once, because there is great distress there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 8, 1912, at 2 o'clock p. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 5, 1912.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Henry C. M. Burgess, of Nebraska, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Lincoln, in the State of Nebraska. (Re-appointment.)

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Luke B. Colbert, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts. (Reappointment.)

ENGINEER IN CHIEF, REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Charles Albert McAllister to be engineer in chief of the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed himself.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Wistar Morris Chubb, of Ohio, to be probational second lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers for a period of one year.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Lieut. Col. Ira A. Haynes, Coast Artillery Corps, to be colonel from April 1, 1912, vice Col. John C. W. Brooks, retired from active service March 31, 1912.

Maj. Archibald Campbell, Coast Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from April 1, 1912, vice Lieut. Col. George F. Landers, detailed as adjutant general on that date.

Capt. Marcellus G. Spinks, Coast Artillery Corps, to be major from April 1, 1912, vice Maj. George T. Patterson, detailed as adjutant general on that date.

First Lieut. Chauncey L. Fenton, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from April 1, 1912, vice Capt. Marcellus G. Spinks, promoted.

Second Lieut. Isaac E. Titus, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from April 1, 1912, vice First Lieut. Chauncey L. Fenton, promoted.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 5, 1912.

CONSUL.

Wesley Frost to be consul at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Canada.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

John W. Howell to be collector of customs for the district of Fernandina, in the State of Florida.

Edward R. Stackable to be collector of customs for the district of Hawaii, in the Territory of Hawaii.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Ernest I. Edgcomb to be surveyor of customs for the port of Syracuse, in the State of New York.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF PORTO RICO.

Wolcott H. Pitkin, jr., to be attorney general of Porto Rico.

ASSISTANT AGENT ALASKA SALMON FISHERIES.

Ward T. Bower to be assistant agent Alaska salmon fisheries, Division of Alaska Fisheries.

ENGINEER IN CHIEF REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Charles Albert McAllister, engineer in chief Revenue-Cutter Service.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Joseph Charles Beard, Burlingame.
Mrs. J. C. Miller, Bishop.

CONNECTICUT.

Harry W. Crane, Wethersfield.
George P. Edwards, Collinsville.
George W. Randall, Rockville.
Charles T. Welch, Windsor.

DELAWARE.

Harry B. Johnson, Wyoming.

FLORIDA.

David B. Raulerson, Lake City.

GEORGIA.

Annie C. McCord, Harlem.

IOWA.

Isaac W. Abbott, New Market.
William A. Grummon, Rockwell.
Richard Hudgel, Anthon.

MAINE.

Fred H. Atwood, Rumford.
Horace K. Purinton, Fairfield.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Harry E. Clough, South Acton.
Martin E. Stockbridge, Dalton.

MICHIGAN.

Will S. Carpenter, Gaylord.
George L. Curtis, Birch Run.
Edmund O. Dewey, Owosso.
Orlo S. Pattison, Caro.

MISSOURI.

Samuel B. Craver, Madison.
Benjamin C. Klusmeier, La Grange.
Andrew J. Ryker, East Prairie.
Charles L. Zenge, Canton.

NEBRASKA.

Robert E. Chittick, Stuart.
James H. Overman, Stella.

OKLAHOMA.

Charles O. Frye, Sallisaw.

OREGON.

Harry H. Martin, Carlton.
Elizabeth Thompson, Nyssa.
C. H. Van Denburg, Cottage Grove.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Daniel W. Bedea, Shenandoah.
Joseph A. Buchanan, Ambler.
Thomas D. Davis, Girardville.
Charles S. Madeira, Fleetwood.
Nathaniel B. Miller, Clarendon.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Arthur A. Blomquist, Milbank.
Harry L. Stearns, Bryant.

WASHINGTON.

Fred E. Kirby, Friday Harbor.
John O. Wilson, Cosmopolis.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, April 5, 1912.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

We bless Thee Almighty God that we may look up to Thee and call Thee Father and be assured of Thy care and solicitude; in our sorrows we may come to Thee and be comforted, in our weakness we may approach Thee and be strengthened, and in all the perplexities and vicissitudes of life we may call upon Thee and receive light. So let Thy blessing, we beseech Thee, come to all that we may be comforted, strengthened, and guided through the busy whirl and turmoil of life's activities, and Thine be the praise through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR TO-MORROW.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker will be absent to-morrow, and the Chair appoints the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to preside as Speaker pro tempore.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE LOUDENSLAGER.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That Sunday, May 5, 1912, at 12 o'clock noon, be set apart for addresses on the life, character, and public services of Hon. HENRY C. LOUDENSLAGER, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey.

The resolution was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20728, the Indian appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. POU rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. POU. I rise for the purpose of making a motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar. I would like to say, pending the motion of the gentleman from Texas, that several Fridays have passed and the Committee on Claims has given the right of way to other committees. We have considerable work ready for this House, and if the House wishes to consider other matters it is a matter of no more concern to me than to any other Member of the House.

The SPEAKER. The motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] is a preferential motion. If the House desires to go into the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill, it will vote for the motion of the gentleman from Texas. If it prefers to consider private claims, it will vote down the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POU. If the gentleman will yield a moment—

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I do not yield the floor, but I will yield for a question.

Mr. POU. I think the bill that the Committee on Claims has for consideration can be disposed of in an hour's time.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I can not yield to the suggestion of the gentleman from North Carolina to dispense with our bill. We have spent months in its preparation and have proceeded to considerable length in its consideration, and I do not feel disposed to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask both the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from North Carolina to yield to me while I present a privileged resolution that will not take two minutes to dispose of.

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS NO. 2.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana has a matter of pressing nature that will take but a moment.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will yield.

Mr. KORBLY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Elections No. 2, which has under consideration the contested election case of Gill against Catlin, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may sit during the session this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Elections that has in charge the election case of Gill against Catlin have the privilege of sitting during the session to-day. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Now, will the gentleman yield to me to present a privileged resolution?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will yield to the gentleman to present his resolution.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to present the resolution, without prejudice to the gentleman from Texas or the gentleman from North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that he present a privileged resolution, without prejudice to the parliamentary status as between the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from North Carolina. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 481 (H. Rept. 501).

Resolved, That in order to obtain full and complete information, for the purpose of determining what legislation is needed, the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized and directed to make a full investigation of all matters touched upon in House resolution No. 405 within the jurisdiction of said committee; and said committee is authorized, as a whole or by subcommittee, to sit during sessions of the House and the recess of Congress, to compel the attendance of witnesses, send for persons and papers, to administer oaths to witnesses, and to employ experts, counsel, accountants, and clerical and other assistants.

The Speaker shall have authority to sign and the Clerk to attest subpoenas during the sessions or recess of Congress.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I will.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman have any idea as to what this investigation will cost?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I have not a very definite idea. Probably the chairman of the Judiciary Committee would be better advised as to that.

Mr. MANN. There is no limitation to the amount?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. There is no limitation. The custom at this session has been to allow the Committee on Accounts to bring in a resolution limiting the amount.

Mr. STERLING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. STERLING. What is resolution 405?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. In regard to the investigation of the Money Trust. The gentleman will remember that the caucus resolution divided the resolution and referred various parts of it to the several committees having jurisdiction. A part went to the Committee on Banking and Currency, part to the Judiciary Committee, part to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and part of it to the Committee on Election of President and Vice President, and so forth.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will yield for a moment, I have no intention of opposing the resolution. But I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that these committees of investigation have already spent over \$70,000. How much this will cost I do not know. How much additional cost of the investigations already going on I suppose no one knows. Up to date I have not seen any valuable product resulting from the investigation.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to suggest to the gentleman from Texas that while it may be an error on the part of the Clerk, as this resolution was read it said "to require the attention of witnesses."

Mr. HENRY of Texas. "Attendance of witnesses."

Mr. NORRIS. I presume it was a mistake in reading.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The rule provides that after the previous question is ordered one motion to adjourn is in order and no other dilatory motion is allowed.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

CREEK INDIANS, ALABAMA.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 16661) to relinquish, release, remise, and quitclaim all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to all the lands held under claim or color of title by individuals or private ownership or municipal ownership situated in the State of Alabama which were reserved, retained, or set apart to or for the Creek Tribe or Nation of Indians under or by virtue of the treaty entered into between the United States of America and the Creek Tribe or Nation of Indians on March 24, 1832, and move to disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Where is this bill at the present time?

The SPEAKER. It is on the Speaker's table.

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman from Alabama will have to get it before the House.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to take it from the Speaker's table and bring it before the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 16661, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire what the bill is about?

Mr. CLAYTON. It is the Creek Indian land bill, with which the gentleman is undoubtedly familiar. The Senate has struck out the House bill and substituted another bill, which, in the opinion of the Representatives from the State of Alabama, does not afford any relief.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk reported the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The question is on disagreeing to the Senate amendments and asking for a conference.

The question was taken, and the Senate amendments were disagreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the following conferees on the bill H. R. 16661.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FERRIS, Mr. DENT, and Mr. MONDELL.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I now renew my motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEPHENS of Texas) there were—ayes 63, noes 21.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20728, the Indian appropriation bill, with Mr. BARNHART in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction, lease, purchase, repairs, and improvements of school and agency buildings, and for sewerage, water supply, and lighting plants, and for purchase of school sites, \$425,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to this paragraph. I desire to know what school sites are to be purchased. There is a provision in this paragraph for the purchase of school sites, and I desire to know of the chairman of this committee what school sites are contemplated to be purchased, and if the school sites have previously been located?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the bill is subject to this point of order. This item is for the purchase of necessary school sites and for the upkeep of these school plants, and this is the justification for the amount, reading from the hearing at page 26:

Thus the amount available for upkeep of the plants was 3.8 per cent of their total value, which percentage has been found inadequate to keep the buildings and property in good condition and to prevent deterioration of the school and agency plants. Experience teaches that from 5 to 10 per cent is necessary to keep up plants of this character. For the fiscal year 1913 the superintendents of the several schools entitled to the benefits of this appropriation have estimated, as absolute necessities for permanent construction work, buildings, water, lighting, sewer systems, etc., \$583,980. Their total estimates for absolute necessities, however, including repairs as well as constructive work, amount to \$752,276. Deducting their estimates for construction only, this leaves a balance for repairs of \$168,296.

This includes all of the Indian school buildings in the United States in which Indian children are now being taught. The children are there now in everyday and Indian schools in the United States, and this item is not subject for that reason to a point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. What schools are to have these new sites on the reservations?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. There is only one instance in which there is any new plant, and that is building a barn for one of the schools in a cold climate where there is an industrial school now being taught. They have an old shed where horses and cattle are kept, and we thought it was necessary, on the recommendation of the superintendent of that school and on the recommendation also of some of the supervisors who have been out there and who have examined into the matter, to recommend that this barn should be rebuilt. That is the only instance of a new building.

I do not think that adding to this shed a better building would be a new building in the sense of a new appropriation, and I think that the barn could have a shed attached to it without subjecting the item to a point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; but the language is:

And for purchase of school sites.

What school sites are contemplated by this appropriation?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. In many places in the United States where the schools are being taught the lands have been allotted to the Indians on the reservations, but it may be necessary for school buildings to be erected on Indian allotments, and there ought to be some provision for paying for the acre or 2 acres or whatever is necessary of these Indian lands to be transferred to the Indian Bureau for school purposes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, clearly I grant that there ought to be all of the provisions for educating the Indians that are necessary, and for one I shall not be an obstructionist in that direction.

There is not a man in America who is more grateful or more generous or more in favor of giving to the wards of this Government all that is absolutely necessary for their care, for their education, and for their civilization for the purpose of making them real citizens of this country, but, Mr. Chairman, to appropriate money for the purpose of purchasing new school sites without first having decided in advance that they are necessary is, in my opinion, a very dangerous precedent to set in this Congress. While I do not desire, Mr. Chairman, if I can learn that these school sites are necessary, to press this point of order, but, Mr. Chairman, I think that it is—

Mr. CARTER. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill a question. This item here provides for what is known as reservation schools, does it not?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think so; that is my understanding.

Mr. CARTER. As I remember, there is a general law authorizing the construction of buildings on reservations for Indian schools, and in that event the gentleman's point of order would not be good against this item. I do not understand these to be the large, elaborate boarding schools, but the small day schools, as a rule, attended largely by children from the reservation who return home at night. If it is true that these are reservation schools, then the gentleman's point of order must fall, because the general law gives authority to build such schools.

Mr. FOWLER. Then should not the bill specify that it is for the purpose of purchasing sites on these small reservations?

Mr. CARTER. That might improve the verbiage, but it has been carried in this language for a good many years—I think ever since I have been in Congress, anyway, and, I expect, long before.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It has been the law a good many years.

Mr. FERRIS. I presume that when the gentleman from Illinois becomes aware of the fact that the appropriation of last year was \$425,000—

Mr. FOWLER. I know that fact.

Mr. FERRIS. Just a moment—precisely the same amount we are appropriating this year, and that makes the annual upkeep of less than 4 per cent for keeping up the repairs of all the Indian schools throughout the United States, I am sure he will conclude that the department has not been extravagant, but, on the contrary, they have been saving, painstaking, and careful. Again, I want to call his attention to the fact that in the estimates the department asked for \$650,000, and they thought it was imperatively needed, but the committee thought inasmuch as they had gotten along last year with \$425,000 they would hold them down to the old estimate. Now, with regard to the point of order of the gentleman. This committee has jurisdiction to legislate and appropriate for the upkeep and repair and maintenance and welfare of the Indian Department. And if the gentleman from Illinois, or any other gentleman, is going to attack the committee in its authority to appropriate for the welfare of the Indians and for their best interests and for their best welfare, why the Indian appropriation bill would be riddled without either warrant of law or without consideration or a knowledge of the facts.

Mr. FOWLER. How much of the appropriation will be used for this purpose?

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman wants to know how much will be appropriated. Probably none, but in some instances where allotment work is being carried on they have come up so close to the Indian school that in order to acquire a little corner or to square it off, or in order to get a road, or something of that kind from the school to connect with the depot or to connect with the town in which they do their trading—the gentleman can know how imperative that is and how necessary it is. Probably no site will ever be purchased under this. Probably no parcel of land will be bought, but it was thought advisable to give them authority so that they can make a road or a walk, and I think the gentleman would do ill to press his point of order if it were good, and I am sure it is not good, because the Indian Committee has full jurisdiction to appropriate and keep up the schools of the Government.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, that is just the reason I have reserved this point of order. It is because of the indefiniteness of this paragraph with reference to all of the items which are enumerated therein. I take it, Mr. Chairman, that in an appropriation where there are several items to be covered by a specific sum that each one of those items ought to be designated specifically, with the full amount that is to be expended in carrying into effect the different purposes of the appropriation. The precedent, Mr. Chairman, of making appropriations indiscriminately, without naming the amount so that the amount should cover the whole cost of the item, is so great that I do not think this House can afford to sanction this paragraph. Each item sought to be covered by the appropriation should be set out definitely, and the sum therefor should be specified, so that the people of the country could tell just where their money is expended and for what purpose.

I am aware, Mr. Chairman, of the need of these Indian schools, and I would not divert one single, necessary penny from their relief, but I do say, Mr. Chairman, that this committee can, by appropriate amendment, give the necessary relief after the point of order is sustained.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Is the gentleman aware that we have 2,331 schools and 79 boarding schools to keep in repair all the year, and does the gentleman think that out of an appropriation of \$425,000, where the total per capita is 4.8, the sum is sufficient to maintain the sites and to keep up the buildings?

Mr. FOWLER. That is not the question. The question is, What need is there for the purchase of school sites, how many are needed, and in what reservations; also what are they to cost, and how much is necessary to be appropriated therefor? This paragraph is silent upon all of these propositions, and yet you ask us to support this bill.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. FOWLER. I will.

Mr. JACKSON. Can the gentleman suggest some better way in which the Government could acquire school sites for these Indian schools than to place it in the hands of department to condemn or acquire them and pay out the sum to be authorized? The gentleman certainly does not want a site to be selected and then placed before Congress and have it voted upon. Some officer must have the discretion to select sites and approve them, as has been suggested, in the case of the condemnation of the public roads or other things that the department needs for this service. Now, can the gentleman suggest some better way to accomplish that than that which is sought to be accomplished by this provision?

Mr. FOWLER. I would accomplish this matter just the same as any other matter ought to be accomplished.

Mr. JACKSON. That is a very indefinite answer.

Mr. FOWLER. It is necessary to locate the sites necessary for the building of the schools. If there is no necessity for building a school, there is no necessity for the site. First determine whether the school is necessary, and, if it is determined necessary, then locate the site.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. FOWLER. I think it is subject to a point of order, but, in view of what has been said, I withdraw the point of order. The Clerk read as follows:

To conduct experiments on Indian school or agency farms designed to test the possibilities of soil and climate in the cultivation of trees, grains, vegetables, and fruits, for the purposes of preserving living and growing timber on Indian reservations and allotments, and to advise the Indians as to the proper care of forests: *Provided*, That this shall not, as to timber, apply to the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin; for the employment of suitable persons as matrons to teach Indian women housekeeping and other household duties, and for furnishing necessary equipments and renting quarters for them where necessary; for the employment of practical farmers and stockmen in addition to the agency and school farmers now employed; and to superintend and direct farming and stock raising among Indians, \$400,000: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$5,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be used to conduct experiments on Indian school or agency farms to test the possibilities of soil and climate in the cultivation of trees, grains, vegetables, and fruits: *Provided also*, That the amounts paid to matrons, farmers, and stockmen herein provided for shall not be included within the limitation on salaries and compensation of employees contained in the act of June 7, 1897.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I would like to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] as to how this money has been expended.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, the amount appropriated was \$400,000; for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1911, the amount appropriated was \$350,000, and the amount unexpended was \$55,067.15, leaving amount expended \$294,932.85, as shown by the analysis of the expenditures, which is as follows:

Analysis of expenditures:

Employees.....	\$270,548.44
Construction and repair of buildings.....	3,590.69
Subsistence.....	1,448.89
Equipment, furniture, etc.....	3,254.38
Purchase of live stock.....	1,310.00
Forage.....	654.57
Travelling expenses.....	11,265.14
Stationery and office supplies.....	629.29
Rent.....	1,626.50
Miscellaneous.....	964.95
Total.....	294,932.85

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I presume very likely that may be as definite information as the gentleman has, although if it is, I regret, of course, that the information is not of much value. Where was the money spent?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I find in the estimates for last year's appropriation the following statement relating to the expenditure of this money. It says:

The reports from the field indicate that progress is being made in farming and that the Indians, through the constant urging of these farmers and stockmen, are making greater efforts to develop their land and improve their stock.

Eliminating the area under the Union superintendency, there are approximately 34,614,137 acres of unallotted land and 12,408,926 acres of allotted land under the jurisdictions at which these men (excepting 15 of the expert farmers who are estimated for Union Agency) are or will be employed. The population of these reservations is approximately 189,845 Indians, which, if divided by the total number of farmers and stockmen to be employed, would give each man approximately 912 Indians to look after. During the fiscal year 1910 there was an acreage of approximately 55,389 allotted and approximately 18,691 acres of unallotted land under cultivation by the Indians. These figures are not accurate, for the reason that reports before the office are incomplete. They are probably much too low.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, last year we inserted in the bill a provision requiring an annual report in reference to this appropriation, because I had objected several years to the appropriation being made with no information before the House. The gentleman has not given any information of any value to the House. That may be the fault of the Indian Office.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think it is the fault of the Indian Office. The figures for the fiscal year 1911 are not all in the report, because the reports from the field have not reached the office, and therefore the data for that year have not yet reached it. The gentleman can well understand why they have not reached the office.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I can not understand why reports up to the last day of June have not yet reached the office, when the law requires that the report should have been made to Congress on the 1st day of last December.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will yield, I will say that the information was furnished strictly in accordance with the requirements of the law and is printed in House Document 211 of this session of Congress.

Mr. MANN. What is the information? It is the duty of the Indian Committee to have examined the House document and to have given us the information.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I simply call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the document can be had.

Mr. MANN. Very likely. I am asking for information with reference to the item in the bill.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will present to the gentleman the full report.

Mr. MANN. It is the duty of the gentleman in charge of the bill to know what is in the report; and if that is all the information that is contained in the report, then the report does not comply with the law. We have a right to know how much of this money has been expended in advising the Indians in reference to the proper care of forests, and how much has been expended in advising the Indian women in regard to housekeeping and other household duties, and how much has been expended in advising the Indians in regard to stock raising, and how much of it has been expended in testing the possibilities of soil and climate in the cultivation of trees, grains, and so forth.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. If the chairman of the committee will refer to page 38 of the hearings, and following pages, he can give the gentleman the information he asked for.

Mr. MANN. Why can not the gentleman from South Dakota do it?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Texas has charge of the bill, and I defer to him.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. In the hearings, on page 38, I find this discussion:

Mr. MERITT. Where we have no large timber interests the farmers on the reservations and other employees, under the direction of the superintendent, take care of the forest work without having expert foresters or forest assistants.

Mr. BURKE. Is any part of the money appropriated for protecting the forests reimbursable?

Mr. MERITT. No, sir; none of the money appropriated for this work is reimbursable.

Mr. BURKE. The proceeds from the timber that is sold on the reservations go to the Indians?

Mr. MERITT. The proceeds are deposited under a heading known as "Indian money, proceeds of labor," and under a decision of the Comptroller of the Treasury that money is available for administrative purposes, and we are now using some of the proceeds from the sale of timber to help protect the forests, and for administrative purposes for the benefit of the Indians.

Mr. BURKE. Do I understand that you have a fund from the sale of timber, dead, or down, or otherwise, from reservations that you can expend for administrative purposes, and that in addition to the appropriation that is made by the appropriation bill here?

Mr. MERITT. We have not been selling very much timber during the last year or two on account of the low price being paid for timber, but we can, under the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior and in accordance with the decision of the Comptroller of the Treasury, use the proceeds from the sale of timber for administrative purposes.

Mr. BURKE. How much is being used, if you know?

Mr. MERITT. We are not using very much, because we are not getting very much money from the sale of the timber at this time on account of the low price.

Then follows a statement showing by reservations the estimated amount of timber, its value, and the salaries of persons employed in forestry work in the Indian Service during the fiscal

year ended June 30, 1911. That is two pages long, itemizing everything as succinctly as it can be done. Here it is:

Statement showing by reservations the estimated amount of timber, its value, and the salaries of persons employed in forestry work in the Indian service during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1911.

	Acreage, tribal and allotted.	Estimated stumpage value of timber.	Employees.			
			Special.		Forest guards.	
			Num-ber.	Sala-ries.	Num-ber.	Total salaries.
ARIZONA.						
Camp McDowell.....	300	\$6,000				
Colorado River.....	15,000	75,000			2	\$900
Fort Apache.....	640,000	3,000,600			1	600
Navajo.....	430,000	7,500,600			3	900
Pima.....	30,000	65,000				
San Carlos.....	386,000	600,600			2	1,200
San Xavier.....	6,440	8,600				
Truxton Canyon.....	32,000	51,200			1	1,000
Western Navajo.....					1	900
CALIFORNIA.						
Campo.....	40	140				
Digger.....	287					
Fort Yuma.....	10,000	80,000				
Hoopa Valley.....	129,000	4,490,900			2	900
Pechanga.....		2,300				
Round Valley.....	36,662				1	900
Soboba.....	800	1,200				
Tule River.....	45,000	65,000			1	900
COLORADO.						
Navajo Springs.....					1	900
Southern Ute.....		2,000				
IDAHO.						
Coeur d'Alene.....	32,000	140,000			1	750
Fort Hall.....	43,340					
Fort Lapwai.....	28,000	220,000			3	3,020
IOWA.						
Sac and Fox.....	500	2,000				
MICHIGAN.						
Chippewas, Lake Superior..	15,517	68,730				
MINNESOTA.						
Fond du Lac.....	68,500	650,000	1	\$1,800	3	900
Leech Lake.....	39,304	68,800			5	1,050
Nett Lake.....	55,212	119,000			2	450
Red Lake.....	110,237	1,200,481			2	720
Vermillion Lake.....	300	10,000				
White Earth.....	343,878	1,662,352			5	1,050
MONTANA.						
Blackfeet.....	10,000	120,000			2	1,050
Crow.....	12,800	75,800			2	400
Flathead.....	218,000	5,394,000	1	2,250	9	2,925
Fort Belknap.....	32,000	884,000				
Fort Peck.....	10,000	60,000				
Tongue River.....	70,000	900,000			3	2,800
NEBRASKA.						
Omaha.....	1,640	26,240				
NEW MEXICO.						
Albuquerque Pueblo.....	10,000	55,000				
Jicarilla.....	120,000	1,110,000			8	3,600
Mescalero.....	350,000	4,500,000				
San Juan.....	5,000	50,000				
Santa Fe Pueblo.....	10,000	57,000			1	600
Zuni.....	1,500	22,500				
NORTH CAROLINA.						
Cherokee.....	50,000	100,000				
NORTH DAKOTA.						
Fort Berthold.....					1	840
Standing Rock.....	10,000	250,000				
Turtle Mountain.....	9,600	87,500				
OKLAHOMA.						
Osage.....						
Otoe.....	3,000	63,000				
Pawnee.....	400	12,000				
Ponca.....	5,000					
Sac and Fox.....	15,508	75,000				
OREGON.						
Klamath.....	789,942	23,683,260			9	4,840
Roseburg.....	80,000	800,000				700
Siletz.....	4,000	217,000			2	450
Umatilla.....	3,020	18,373			1	900
Warm Springs.....	233,000	2,305,000			7	2,100

Statement showing by reservations the estimated amount of timber, its value, etc.—Continued.

	Acreage, tribal and allotted.	Estimated stumpage value of timber.	Employees.			
			Special.		Forest guards.	
			Num-ber.	Sala-ries.	Num-ber.	Total salaries.
SOUTH DAKOTA.						
Crow Creek.....	4,000	\$1,500				
Lower Brule.....	1,900	40,000				
Pine Ridge.....	50,000	150,000			3	\$2,340
Rosebud.....	65,000	50,000			1	960
UTAH.						
Uintah and Ouray.....	10,000	41,250			3	1,180
WASHINGTON.						
Colville.....	707,000	3,279,600	1	\$1,800	7	3,400
Spokane.....	120,000	1,777,545			3	1,200
Cushman.....	226,000	5,108,126			3	960
Neah Bay.....	21,960	275,000				
Tulalip.....		400,000				
Yakima.....	550,000	2,500,000			8	3,740
WISCONSIN.						
Hayward.....	21,278	102,084			3	1,800
Keshena.....	161,280	8,250,600			4	2,880
Lac du Flambeau.....	30,000	245,000			1	420
La Pointe.....		1,355,550	1	1,800	3	1,800
WYOMING.						
Shoshone.....	300	11,250			3	1,125
Grand total.....		84,040,781	4	7,650	123	60,430

Statement showing the estimated amount of timber upon tribal lands of certain Indian reservations and its estimated value.

	Amount.	Value.
Fort Apache.....	1,000,000.00	\$3,000,000
Navajo.....	3,000,000.00	7,500,000
San Carlos.....	221,000.00	600,000
Hoopa Valley.....	740,000.00	740,000
Nez Perce.....	100,000.00	200,000
Red Lake.....	100,000.00	1,200,000
Blackfeet.....	80,000.00	120,000
Crow.....	64,800.00	64,800
Flathead.....	1,493,000.00	4,479,000
Tongue River.....	300,000.00	600,000
Mescalero.....	1,500,000.00	4,500,000
Eastern Cherokee.....	40,000.00	100,000
Klamath.....	5,000,000.00	11,000,000
Warm Springs.....	2,280,000.00	2,280,000
Colville.....	3,279,000.00	3,279,000
Cushman.....	4,274,000.00	4,274,000
Neah Bay.....	271,000.00	271,000
Yakima.....	2,000,000.00	2,500,000

Mr. MANN. Very well. How much was applied to the teaching of Indians how to properly care for forests? How much of this was expended for that purpose?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection. Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The gentleman can get that on page 40 of the hearings.

Mr. MANN. Why do you leave out this year the exemption of the Red Lake Indian Reservation in Minnesota from this appropriation?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. This is the information covering that point as contained in the hearings:

Industrial work and care of timber.	
Fiscal year ending June 30, 1912:	
Amount appropriated.....	\$400,000.00
Fiscal year ended June 30, 1911:	
Amount appropriated.....	350,000.00
Amount expended.....	294,932.85
Unexpended balance.....	55,067.15

Analysis of expenditures:	
Employees.....	270,548.44
Construction and repair of buildings.....	3,590.69
Subsistence.....	1,448.89
Equipment, furniture, etc.....	3,254.38
Purchase of live stock.....	1,310.00
Forage.....	654.57

Analysis of expenditures—Continued.

Traveling expenses.....	\$11,265.14
Stationery and office supplies.....	629.29
Rent.....	1,626.50
Miscellaneous.....	964.95
	294,932.85

Industrial work and care of timber, 1913, \$400,000.

Appropriation for the fiscal year 1912, \$400,000.

Of the \$400,000 appropriated for the fiscal year 1912 to conduct experiments on Indian school and agency farms, for purposes of preserving living and growing timber on reservations and allotments and to advise the Indians as to the proper care of forests, for the employment of practical farmers and stockmen in addition to the agency and school farmers now employed, and to superintend and direct farming and stock raising among the Indians, \$225,000 was set aside for agriculture and stock purposes and \$5,000 for experimentation.

Mr. MANN. That is what the gentleman read before.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That covers all the timber work, and shows what has been done with it last year.

Now, with reference to the expert farmers, I have this information:

Salaries:	
40 expert farmers.....	\$54,190.00
154 additional farmers.....	124,000.00
9 stockmen.....	8,300.00
1 stock detective.....	850.00
1 horticulturist.....	1,200.00
3 supervisors of farming.....	6,350.00
1 supervising stockman.....	2,500.00
1 chief supervisor.....	1,486.64
1 clerk to chief supervisor.....	400.00
	\$199,276.64
Per diem of supervisors.....	3,600.00
Traveling expenses of supervisors.....	3,320.00
Traveling expenses of expert farmers.....	6,200.00
Traveling expenses of acting chief industries section.....	400.00
	9,920.00
Annual estimate, supplies for stock.....	1,013.00
Typewriting machine for supervisor.....	69.75
	1,082.75
	213,879.39
Reserve.....	11,120.61
	225,000.00
For experimentation.....	5,000.00

Now, here is the forestry work report, from page 32 of the hearings:

FORESTRY WORK IN INDIAN SERVICE, 1912.

The total amount allowed for forestry work in the Indian Service during the fiscal year 1912 is \$120,000.

This amount has been apportioned as follows:

1 forester, salary, per diem, and expenses.....	\$5,660
1 assistant forester, salary, per diem, and expenses.....	3,800
1 district forester, salary, per diem, and expenses.....	3,850
4 lumbermen, salaries, per diem, and expenses.....	15,250
15 forest assistants and all expenses.....	25,000
1 draftsman and expenses.....	1,650
1 clerk.....	1,200
1 stenographer.....	1,000
91 forest guards.....	42,180
Office supplies and equipment.....	1,500
Field supplies and equipment.....	3,000
Contingencies, fire fighting, trespass, and other special examinations, building of telephone lines, trails, roads, etc.....	15,910
	120,000

I can not imagine how we could furnish a better statement unless we stated what amount of timber each fire burned, its value, on what reservation, on what range of mountains, and in what county and State the fire took place. The gentleman from Illinois certainly would not expect that.

Mr. MANN. I would not. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I have not before seen House Document No. 221. It escaped me in some way. It seems to contain the information desired.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. It seems to contain information which the gentleman has not been able to give.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws his point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment of Indian police, including chiefs of police at not to exceed \$50 per month each, and privates at not to exceed \$30 per month each, to be employed in maintaining order, and for the purchase of equipments and rations for policemen at nonration agencies, \$200,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What service do these Indian police now render except to draw their salaries?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say in reply to the gentleman—in answer to the gentleman's question—that the amount appropriated was \$8,000. The amount expended was \$6,618.

Mr. MANN. I am talking about the amount of \$200,000.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. There are two items carried here. On what line is that?

Mr. MANN. At the bottom of page 7, for the payment of Indian police. This item has been in the bill for years. Originally it went into the bill when there was occasion for Indian police. What occasion is there now for Indian police? Do the States assume no responsibilities when these Indians are made citizens?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. In answer to the gentleman's question I will make this statement: The next item is the one I thought had just been read. I thought he was referring to the one for the payment of the Indian police, including chiefs of police at not exceeding \$50 per month and privates at not exceeding \$30 per month, the whole item amounting to \$200,000—that is the amount the gentleman asked in regard to, is it not? This is the same amount that was asked for and granted last year.

Mr. MANN. I understand it has been granted for several years; but what is it used for? How many Indian police are there, where are they located, and what do they do now?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I am very glad to answer the gentleman's question. There are over 600 police officers employed to maintain order on the various reservations throughout the United States. By the means of this body of men much has been accomplished toward bettering conditions on the various reservations. With the opening of the reservations throughout the country many questionable characters are drawn toward the Indian country, and the necessity for the continuance of this force is more apparent. Out of this fund also is paid the equipment for the police and rations at nonration agencies.

Mr. MANN. Where are these Indian reservations now, which have been thrown open to settlement, on which we still maintain Indian police?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. They are in Oklahoma, where we have over 100,000 Indians; in South Dakota, where we have about 20,000; in North Dakota, where there are possibly 10,000; in New Mexico and Arizona, where there are about 61,000 Indians, and there are various reservations in other States and possibly a hundred different tribes of Indians scattered all over the United States.

Mr. MANN. We have all told in the United States less than 350,000 Indians, according to the census. Here you propose to maintain a police force of 600 Indians. Most of the Indians have been made citizens, most of the reservations have been abolished, and the land is now in private ownership. When is this to cease? Is the appropriation used for this purpose, or some other?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It will not cease until the Indians become civilized and become citizens of the States in which they reside, so that the local authorities, the constables and State officers, whose duty it is to keep the peace, can take charge of the Indians. Then, and not until then, will it cease. Then, and not until then, can we discontinue these appropriations. As long as we have the Indians under our charge we must have policemen. The Indian, like the white man, needs policing, needs protecting, as well as punishing, and I know of no other way to do it except by making an appropriation for a police force.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask that I may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. The fact is that as we bring these Indians into citizenship we increase their power in this House, and gentlemen here, reflecting the natural sentiments of their Indian constituents, now desire, as mankind always has desired, to protect those men who are holding office.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If the gentleman will yield at that point, we have not an Indian in the State of Texas who is under the care of the Government. We have Indians there, but we take care of them ourselves.

Mr. MANN. Then probably there are no Indian police in the State of Texas. Perhaps Texas does her own policing.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. We certainly do.

Mr. MANN. Oklahoma ought to do the same thing. The Dakotas ought to do the same thing. Arizona ought to do the same thing. So ought the other States where the Indians have been made citizens and have received their allotments in severalty. Why is it that as we go ahead, civilizing the Indians under our method, making allotments in severalty, we still have to support them, police them, and attend to them in every direction?

Mr. FERRIS. If the gentleman will yield, I think the question of the amount and the number has been gone over thoroughly enough, and I think what the gentleman wants to get at is what these Indian police do.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. I move to strike out the last word. I think I can give the gentleman from Illinois a little information on that point.

In a great many reservations where, as the gentleman knows, allotments have been taken up, most of the land has been allotted. In many reservations there are, however, unallotted areas, large sections which have not as yet been allotted. These are usually leased to cattlemen for different sums and for different terms of years or months as the case may be. The Indian police are very helpful to the agents, so the Indian agents tell me, in running around and determining the brands of the cattle, and whether any outside cattle are run in to be pastured for which no pay is collected. They tell me that the Indian police are also helpful, from the fact that they camp and live up and down the streams, and they see that no timber is cut or removed from the Indian lands. Again, they tell me, and I believe it is a fact, that they are helpful to the agency in this way: In many cases they no longer employ a regular force of interpreters to help them with their lawsuits, their payments, and the leasing of their lands, and the different things that are necessary to be done for the Indians. These Indian policemen are paid small salaries, from \$25 to \$50. They keep horses of their own and use them to ride around, and these Indian policemen can be used as interpreters and to run errands and to communicate to the Indians things which they ought to know. Very often the Indians are not within reach of mail facilities, can neither read nor write, and do not go to a post office once in five years. So the Indian service needs some one who can talk the language, who can be sent on errands, and communicate information which the Indians need to know. Of course, this only applies to full-bloods. I think it would be a serious mistake to dispense with the Indian police, for the reasons I have given. Whether or not there are too many in any certain reservation and too few in some other reservation, I am not clearly advised; but the commissioner advises us that as equitably as he can he has distributed the Indian police on the different reservations, where they protect the timber, assist in the leasing of the land, assist in transacting Indian business, and, probably most important of all they do, act as interpreters for the agents.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Let me suggest that they also do much toward preserving order, removing trespassers, and also in suppressing the introduction of liquor upon the reservation.

Mr. FERRIS. That is true. They help keep the peace among the Indians. Another thing which I omitted to state, there are usually old, trusted, tried Indians around every reservation, who are known to the white people and to the agent, and the agent usually designates some such Indian, who serves as a go-between in all these matters, between the Indians, the agency, and also between the white people and the Indians having business relations. I do not think the appropriation ought to be stricken out.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, upon the question of Indian police I am not prepared to speak for all the reservations. There are some reservations in Oklahoma that would probably need Indian police. But I can say that in the Five Civilized Tribes, where we have assumed full jurisdiction as citizens of the State, that we do not have any use for Indian police. Every precinct has its constable, every county has its sheriff and deputy sheriff, and there is no necessity for Indian police in that section. But, as I say, there are sections that would need Indian police in order to carry out certain regulations of the department.

Mr. FERRIS. I take it that if the Indian Commissioner distributes them equitably he would not put any Indian police in that part of the community where the Indians are competent, for I am opposed to supervising people who need no supervision. He has full power to put them where they are needed in the blanket reservations.

Mr. DAVENPORT. If the Indian Commissioner would equitably distribute them, I would raise no objection. But I want to say here that they have not been equitably distributed in my part of the State of Oklahoma. They have been distributed in sections where they are not needed, and I am opposed to the continuation of any number of officers not needed. I am opposed to their being sent to communities where they do as much harm as they do good. I personally know that in the full-blood district of the Cherokee Nation they have done as much harm as good. They are not needed because there are plenty of officers competent to enforce the law and police regulations in the administration of affairs of the State. There are other sections where Indian police are probably needed. They are the reservations that have not been open to full citizenship and lands allotted as they have been in my section.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I want to add a word to what has been said by my colleague [Mr. DAVENPORT]. The Committee on Indian Affairs acted on the evidence presented to it by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, or that department, and this is the usual appropriation, as I understand it. Since the matter has arisen I want to further call the attention of the committee to conditions in my district and other places in Oklahoma. It is a fact, as was stated by my colleague [Mr. FERRIS], that in the large reservations where there are few settlements—in the grazing countries—these police are needed. I now have in mind two counties, or two reservations, where these police are used for nothing more or less than messengers for the local superintendent. I am a little surprised that this appropriation is not cut. I believe that notice should be served on the Indian Department that the amount will be reduced after this year because, as has been said by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT], I know where Indian police are being used who are not needed; but, as stated by other members of the committee, they are an indispensable necessity on the big reservations in such places as South Dakota.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I will say that in the last Congress the matter was considered carefully, and it was decided that we could get along with less police, but that they were not receiving what was an adequate consideration for their services. So we left the amount as it was and increased the amount that is being paid to each policeman. So we have less policemen in number, but they get more pay.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Is there any statement as to whether there are fewer of them?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. There are fewer of them because they have increased the salaries all along the line. The highest salary that can be paid is \$50 a month, and my recollection is that the previous salaries were \$20 and \$30 a month.

Mr. FERRIS. That is true. After the reservation is opened up the Indian does not have free grass and free hay and pasture, and he has to buy it, and the Indian would no longer serve as a policeman for the amount that he was then receiving.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. That is true, and this condition prevailed in the organized counties all through the State. They have local officers, and I know instances where these Indian police are pure ornaments, and nothing more or less.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Are any of these Indian police connected with the Osage Tribe?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I think not.

Mr. MANN. I am speaking of the Osage Tribe.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I do not know of any.

Mr. MANN. Do we have any judges?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Not now. We used to have, but they have dispensed with them.

Mr. MANN. We maintain Indian police in the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. The gentleman who represents that district knows more about that than I do. There are two reservations in my district where they are not needed and ought to be dispensed with. They are simply messenger boys. But I want it understood that that condition does not prevail in the big reservations where there are few settlers.

Mr. MANN. That is what I am speaking of. Here we divide the lands, make the Indian a citizen, have the State assume jurisdiction, and we pay out of the Federal Treasury for the policing and in some places for the judges, when the Indians have plenty of property and the State has plenty of authority.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. That is quite true, and I think that after this year the appropriation ought to be cut.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is aware, of course, that an office with money to spend like this finds it very convenient to give this or some other man a job, and a demand for an officer here and an officer there is easier to yield to than it is to refuse.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. That is quite true.

Mr. MANN. This appropriation ought to be cut in two, as a matter of fact. Mr. Chairman, I move, on page 8, line 1, to strike out the words "two hundred" and insert the words "one hundred and fifty," so that it will read "one hundred and fifty thousand dollars." That is a modest cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 8, line 1, strike out the words "two hundred" and insert the words "one hundred and fifty."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not prevail, for the reason that we do not know but that these policemen are needed, and until we have further

information in regard to the matter I think it would be very unsafe to cut out this appropriation.

Mr. JACKSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] a question. Is it true that these men are simply selected or appointed by the Indian agent?

Mr. FERRIS. On his recommendation.

Mr. JACKSON. And some of them are voters?

Mr. FERRIS. None of the Indians on the west side, in my district, exercise the right, although every one of them has the right.

Mr. JACKSON. There are men who do have political influence in the territory inhabited by the Five Civilized Tribes?

Mr. FERRIS. That is true in that side of the State where they are a little further advanced.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true that these local police could be made a very effective political machine?

Mr. FERRIS. That could be done if it was in an intelligent, far-advanced community, but I do not think the police ought to be used in communities where the Indians are civilized and intermarried.

Mr. JACKSON. It is true that this sort of an arrangement, where these men are simply selected locally, could be made much more effective as a political machine without any intervention or civil-service examination, or anything of that sort, than some of the officers who have been taken out of the appropriation by this present bill.

Mr. FERRIS. In a community where the State is organized and the country is thickly settled, I think, perhaps, that is true, but let me say to the gentleman that I am in this situation: Six counties of my district are in the Five Tribes' part of the State. The balance of my district is on the west side of the State. In counties that are in the Five Tribes' part of the State the Indians there are practically all white men. They serve on reception committees in matters of importance, are the leading lawyers and doctors and business men of the community. On the west side of the State, where I live, we have Indians who are real Indians, who do not really transact business with the white people at all, except through their agents. In districts of that character I feel and the agents in charge feel that a few trustworthy, reliable Indian police around the agency are of help. I have recently talked with some of them. Personally I think that where the Indians are backward, not well along with civilization, and where they are not sufficiently advanced to come in contact with business propositions and transact business in everyday affairs, I think a few Indian police would be really helpful to the Indians and to the administration without any consequence one way or the other.

Mr. JACKSON. It is true they exist all over the territory.

Mr. FERRIS. I never have come in contact with any Indian police in my Five Tribes' district.

Mr. JACKSON. There is one other question that I wanted to ask before I conclude. In the matter of this increase of salaries the gentleman states that he had some explanation to make. Will he tell why the salaries were increased?

Mr. FERRIS. I have the version of the commissioner and the version of the local agents. Prior to the time the Indian lands were opened up these Indian horses they used as mounts could graze on the common. They could get hay on the common and stack it up, but as soon as every acre of land was fenced up, with some white men residing on it, they did not have any public domain for the horses to forage on.

Mr. JACKSON. Does not the gentleman think that this would be a good place to cut this appropriation to \$150,000?

Mr. FERRIS. It certainly would not interfere with anybody unless it be the Indian administration, and I think you will find if you did cut it that the Indian administration will be crippled in places, and it is not my intention or desire to have that done.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask permission to further answer the question the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. JACKSON] asked of my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS]. I think the gentleman from Kansas is correct in regard to the organization of the Indian police in a number of these places. So far in the Cherokee Nation and a portion of the Creek Nation it has been nothing more or less than a political organization in the last four years. Great complaint has gone up among the people there because of that one fact. It now has a tendency to bring about discord and dissatisfaction, and it brings about conflict between the local officers and these police, that goes on and will continue to go on, and if the bill was in such shape that I could make the motion to amend I would provide an amendment by which there should be no Indian police appointed by the department in any organized county or municipality within any organized State.

Mr. JACKSON. I would like to ask the gentleman, since he seems to be familiar with it, about what per cent of the Indian police on the east side of the territory are white men?

Mr. DAVENPORT. Well, they are considerably mixed. As a matter of fact, they are usually taken, as some other tribal officers are, from the influential men of the localities. There are about, I think, now 14 or 16 Indian police in that section of the State. My recollection is only 15 or 16.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman allow me to make this statement in answer to the question he asked. The Five Civilized Tribes are somewhat different from the Indians in the west end of our State and Indians generally throughout the United States. The gentleman should realize that the Five Tribes have had 50 or 75 years of influence of civilizing tendencies over the other fellows. Now, as to over in my end of the State, there is absolutely nothing in it anywhere. I do not know much about political organizations or political machines—

Mr. JACKSON. You do not have the policemen—

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma (continuing). In my section of the State a full blood who works for \$25 a month seldom goes to the polls and you never hear about politics from them.

Mr. JACKSON. You have very few.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. We never thought of it in that connection there, and in fact I do not think there are any machine politics in that part of the State.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a further amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 8, after the word "dollars," in line 2, by inserting the following: "Provided, That none of this sum shall be used in the Five Civilized Tribes."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. I withdraw it.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire that the amendment should read "Five Civilized Tribes."

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent the amendment will be amended as desired by the gentleman. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection, and the Clerk will report the amendment as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 8, after the word "dollars," in line 2, by inserting the following: "Provided, That none of this sum shall be used in any of the Five Civilized Tribes."

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, from the discussion here it has developed that the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians are as intelligent as the ordinary people of this country. I understand that they are citizens of the country. I understand that they are as well behaved as people ordinarily are. If it be true, as was developed in the conversation between the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. JACKSON] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT], that this police force has been used largely for political purposes in the past, certainly this appropriation can serve no useful purpose. Inasmuch as they are able to take care of themselves, and inasmuch as they live, as I understand, in organized counties in organized States, where there is no use for this police force, I think this amendment ought to prevail. If there is a locality or reservation wherein there is need for this police force, I have no objection to it if it is really and substantially demanded by the people of that reservation or that territory; but, Mr. Chairman, in the light of the discussion which has gone on here I think that none of this money ought to be used among these tribes for the purpose of having police to dominate over them with clubs and play politics with them.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say I am in agreement with some of the sentiments advanced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER]. He has uttered not one truth but several, but the conditions, I think, hardly warrant this House in excluding practically one-third of the Indians of the United States from this service. Now, I am one of those who think there is very little of this service necessary in the Five Civilized Tribes' part of the State, but I call his attention to the fact that it would not do with the full-blooded Indians in the eastern half of the State, even though for more than 50 years they have had their own legislatures and governed themselves, and that they have one of themselves in this House and one in the Senate of the United States, at the other end of this Capitol. I do not want to strip the department of the right to send agents there, or Indian police there, if they think it is necessary. Now, you understand it is not incumbent upon the department to send a great horde of Indian police into a community where the people are intelligent; and if they do that, the department

is subject to criticism rather than the whole system of Indian police. I think the objection of the gentleman from Illinois strikes at one specific condition which is but an incident, to wit, the inequality of distributing the Indian police, rather than striking at the entire system in its entirety; and I think that if anybody should suggest to the Indian Commissioner that he has been sending too many Indian police there, and that he should not send them there, he would stop it. But we ought not to take away the right of sending a few there in the event they are needed, and if the amendment of the gentleman prevails it would preclude the sending of them at all.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I do.

Mr. FOWLER. Do not you elect these Indians to offices in counties in which they live, such as sheriffs, constables, etc., for the purpose of maintaining order not only for the Indians, but for the whites also?

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman from Illinois is entirely correct. The governor of our State at this time is an Indian citizen. We have a United States Senator who is an Indian citizen, as well as a Member of this House who is an Indian citizen. The speaker of the Oklahoma Legislature is an Indian citizen. They hold many of our best and most responsible positions and they are entitled to do so. I rejoice perhaps more over that one thing than any other thing—there is no feeling between the Indians and the whites. We elect them to the best offices in the State and support them, and I desire to call the attention of the House to this fact. In our State one class of people, the whites, are over 1,500,000 in population; the Indian population is only a little over 100,000. Where the ratio of strength is so unequal it shows consideration, good feeling, good dealing, and wholesome results. It is worthy of mention. It is a beautiful scene to see two races moving side by side in the progressive new State.

Mr. FOWLER. Do not these Indian officers make just as good policemen as white officers?

Mr. FERRIS. Precisely; but the gentleman should discriminate, and the House should understand that an Indian who has a sixth or an eighth or sixteenth or thirty-second or sixty-fourth Indian blood is an Indian citizen, so far as statutes are concerned, but is not an Indian so far as reality is concerned. Even though we are getting along so amicably, I am not one to withdraw every species of protection from those full-blood Indians in the backward parts of the State in the full-blood settlements.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there any more use of Indian police for those Indians in Oklahoma than there is for police in Ohio, Illinois, and Indiana?

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, yes; there are no Indians in the States mentioned. We must keep within range of the mark. I am sharing largely the views of the gentleman. It has been my purpose to accurately describe to some extent the conditions of the Five Civilized Tribes. Most of these Indians need nothing, and the committee has made marked reductions.

Mr. FOWLER. Is not the appointment of police over these Indian tribes an insult to their intelligence and to their efforts for education and civilization?

Mr. FERRIS. If police were appointed that attempted to meddle with the affairs of a man who only had a slight strain of Indian blood and who was a lawyer or a doctor, or some other leading citizen, of the community, I would say yes. Over in the eastern part of the State we have some Indians who need supervision. The word "Indian" has no meaning as applied to a citizen of 64 per cent Indian blood.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I will.

Mr. CANNON. Do those people whom you call Indians make a part of the 100,000 as against the 1,600,000 of the whites?

Mr. FERRIS. They do.

Mr. CANNON. How many of those Indians whom you call Indians are not Indians?

Mr. FERRIS. There are probably about 18,000 or 20,000 full bloods, as shown by the rolls, but there are not that many in reality. Some are on as full bloods who are not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] may be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOWLER. One other question, and then I am done. Are not these Indians who are full bloods as easily controlled as the ordinary citizen of your State?

Mr. FERRIS. From a standpoint of obedience to law and order I say yes, unhesitatingly, but from the standpoint of

capability to do business you must of yourself agree with me that it could not be true. A full-blooded Indian, from the nature of things, is not as keen of intellect and not as keen of mind to transact business, and has not the business sagacity the white man has. The intermingling of blood makes a keen mind, but there is something about the full blood that will not, as a rule, adapt himself to the white man's ways. He is not as keen and as able to cope with his white brother on business deals.

Mr. WICKLIFFE. Some are Indians by adoption, are they not?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Some are Indians by adoption.

Mr. GRAHAM. Is it not a part of the Indian policeman's duty to assist the Indian in the transaction of business, and his business to prevent the sale of liquor, and so forth?

Mr. FERRIS. I stated partially a while ago what I intend to say now. This is based on observation. They use the Indian police in my home county and in seven or eight counties in which I am intimately acquainted, to help the Indian farmers in agreements as to leases. They send them as a special envoy to perform errands. They travel up and down the creeks and see that no timber is cut from the Indian lands. They do service and are a great deal of help. It encourages the Indians to give them employment and responsibility. It has a good effect and I have never heard of ill effects from it in full-blood communities.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending.

Mr. CANNON. I will oppose the amendment pro forma, although I want to be square and say that, after listening to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], I am for the amendment.

I want to congratulate the State of Oklahoma on its marvelous progress. It is unexampled, so far as I know or believe, by the history of any other State. [Applause.] The State is fully organized. Full citizenship is given to the full bloods and to the mixed bloods. They have intelligence. Why, the gentlemen that I have met representing that country are quite six while anybody else is half a dozen. [Laughter.]

Now, what have we? A powerful State, a rich State, fully organized into counties, with all the official machinery; 600,000 pure white people and 100,000 of Indian blood, but not a great many of them full bloods.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me, I will correct the gentleman in his figures. I think the number of white people in Oklahoma is about 1,500,000.

Mr. DAVENPORT. One million four hundred thousand.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, I thought it was 600,000. As the Dutchman said, "Vurse and vurse." I will not tell it all. [Laughter.]

Now, you propose to appropriate \$200,000, to do what? For the payment of Indian police, including chiefs of police, at not exceeding so much a day, employed in maintaining order, and for the purchase of equipment and rations for policemen on duty at non-ration agencies, \$200,000. There is no more reason for this appropriation than there is to make such an appropriation for any other State in the Union for that purpose. It is an undue interference—

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CANNON (continuing). And a reflection, as well as an interference, with the State of Oklahoma, a State full born, with a million and a half of white people and 100,000 Indians, so-called Indian citizens. God helps those who help themselves, and in justice to the citizenship of Oklahoma, in justice to the Indians, full bloods, if you choose, I think the time has arrived when they should stand, each man, upon his own feet. [Applause.]

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Of course, the gentleman is aware that it is within the discretion of the commissioner as to whether he will send one policeman there or not?

Mr. CANNON. O my friend. With high respect to the Indian Commissioner, with high respect to the humanitarian that sometimes is taking care of people who would be better off if they were not taken care of [laughter and applause], in view of the fact that from the time the white men landed at Jamestown, Va., and from the time they arrived on the eastern coast of Massachusetts the aborigines have been driven back and back with a strong hand; there are some good people—all good people, but mistaken as these people are—at a distance, having nothing else to do, many of them, who, if

they can get an Indian child and fasten him to a girdle will go moving around and say, "Lo, see what we are doing for righteousness." [Laughter and applause.]

I speak with high respect, and have no individual in mind, but if this population in Oklahoma, if these Indians in Oklahoma, are competent for self-government, as I believe they are, and if a few of them are not competent, by the aid of the common school and without being fed panada—a mixture of boiled bread and molasses and vinegar that obtained out on the Wabash [laughter]—they become responsible, each man for himself; and if once in a while perchance somebody does not observe the law, there is enough force there to restrain, to punish. I think it is time to withdraw the arm of the Government and withdraw the Treasury from these people who have made this remarkable progress, so great, in their citizenship. [Applause.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I have gathered from the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that he opposes this appropriation because some of these Indian policemen may be utilized in Oklahoma, or rather that he opposes this appropriation because all of these Indian policemen are to be used in Oklahoma. If I misunderstood the gentleman, I stand ready to be corrected.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will permit, I—

Mr. MILLER. I am surprised that the gentleman did not read the provisions of the bill carefully and become informed about this. If he had stopped to think for a moment he would see that this provision provides for Indian policemen throughout the whole United States, and that conditions existing in Oklahoma are quite different from those in other parts of the country.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me, I will say I was addressing myself to the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. FOWLER], and advocating the adoption of that amendment.

Mr. MILLER. I understood the gentleman was opposed to the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. No. On the contrary, I said I was for the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Then, I made a mistake. However, the remarks of the gentleman were applied generally to the Indian question, and I think some words may be fittingly said in response thereto.

We have had a doctrine in the human race, I suppose since time began, which is fittingly expressed in the words, "each man for himself, and the devil take the hindmost." I have never heard that doctrine advocated as a rule to be followed by the Government in the administration of Indian affairs until to-day. It may be that the strong hand of the white man, in his effort to protect and aid the Indian, has not at all times been successful; but, Mr. Chairman, if we should to-day remove the protecting care of the Government from the Indians, we would turn the Indians over to those portions of the white race that are rapacious, that are full of greed, and who have no consideration for any human being save themselves. We would place the Indian in a condition so infinitely worse than the condition he is in now—a condition so frightful that the imagination palls before the picture.

I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois, that it is only because the Government has held its protecting arm about many of the Indian tribes in the Nation during the past few years that those Indians have a bit of ground to live on; that those Indians have some clothing to their backs, shelter in which to dwell, and some food to live upon; and I deprecate exceedingly that anyone should advance a doctrine to this House that it is the duty of the Government now, after we have, if you please, acquired their land, and we have driven them from the fertile valleys and put them upon the arid and semiarid regions, to withdraw aid and protection, saying that we can and should extend these benefits to them no longer. By this proceeding these wards of the Government would be turned over to human wolves in white skin.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. This amendment applies to the Five Civilized Tribes, and to those only. My remarks were addressed to the amendment, and I hope the gentleman will recognize the scope of the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. I shall be pleased to speak for a minute or two on that precise point.

About a year and a half ago I was a member of a committee that visited this exact region. We met these Indians, saw the conditions under which they lived, tried to understand those

conditions, and to ascertain, if possible, something that might be done for their welfare in certain respects.

While it is undoubtedly true that the State of Oklahoma is to be congratulated for the great progress she has made, having advanced, indeed, more rapidly and more brilliantly than any other like area of our land; and while she is to be particularly congratulated upon the consideration that has been extended by her and her citizens to the Indians, yet I beg to reply that the Indian country there was dedicated to the Indians many years ago and guaranteed to be exclusively theirs by this Government; and, further, if you withdraw the strong hand of the Government, which during these recent years has protected the Indians, you will turn that pleasing picture into one of horror and the blackness of night. Instead of having a peaceable, law-abiding community, where these friendly and amicable relations exist, you will have the hunter and the prey; you will have the spoiler and the despoiled. You will have that condition, not because the people of Oklahoma are any worse than the people elsewhere. It may be that they are a little better. It will be because you will turn over to the rapacious ones among them, who exist there as well as elsewhere, the richest prize that ever yet has been an incentive to greed or tempted the rapacity of mankind.

The most of these Indians are to be found in the eastern part of the State of Oklahoma. A great many of them are just as intelligent and capable of transacting their affairs as almost any man on the floor of this House, and yet, as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] has recently so well said, a great many of them are not. If the Government of the United States does not look after them, does not protect them, nobody will. They are or should be the objects of the consideration of this House.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to ask if the gentleman knows of any of the Five Civilized Tribes who are not capable of self-control and self-government?

Mr. MILLER. Does the gentleman mean any individuals?

Mr. FOWLER. I mean any individuals of the Five Civilized Tribes.

Mr. MILLER. Most assuredly. There are 35,000 Indians in eastern Oklahoma to-day who have not had their restrictions removed, because they are not competent to handle their own affairs.

Mr. FOWLER. Are there not only 18,000 full blood Indians in Oklahoma?

Mr. MILLER. My dear sir, that has nothing to do with the question. I said there were 35,000 who had not had their restrictions removed.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that any reason why they are not capable of self-control and self-government?

Mr. MILLER. They have not had their restrictions removed, because they are not capable of administering their own affairs properly. I do not care to be interrupted further, unless the gentleman has something more important than that to say.

I think very likely the Indian police have a less important place in some parts of Oklahoma than in almost any other Indian country in the United States, but permission should be given to the Secretary to send them there in case of need.

The State of Oklahoma is a prohibition State. Saloons are not to be found in the State of Oklahoma, as far as I know. The sale of liquor is restricted, and yet everybody knows that there is no place in the Union where liquor can not be had. Everybody knows that even in liquor States the Indian gets his liquor surreptitiously. Likewise the Indian in Oklahoma, as well as elsewhere in the United States, can get liquor surreptitiously, unless he is protected from himself. Indian police there, as elsewhere, afford the best protection the Indians have from the curse of liquor.

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

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I will ask the gentleman whether in his judgment there is any relationship between Oklahoma being now a prohibition State and the increase of the appropriation to prevent the sale of liquor to Indians from \$45,000, as it was before Oklahoma was a prohibition State, to \$75,000, now that Oklahoma has been made a prohibition State? [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLER. I think some other parts of the United States have gone dry as well as Oklahoma.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in 10 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. I should like to ask the gentleman—

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. I should like to have 3 or 4 minutes out of the 10 minutes.

Mr. DAVENPORT. So should I.

Mr. MANN. Will not the gentleman make it 15 minutes?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If we can have a unanimous consent agreement, I will agree to 15 minutes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I want about 3 minutes, and I should like to know the number of gentlemen who want to speak on this.

Mr. MANN. Just three; that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, if I thought this amendment would be an injury to any citizen residing in the Five Civilized Tribes, I would not agree to it. If I thought we did not have ample police protection in the Five Civilized Tribes to take care of our outlaws as well as our sister State of Virginia is now taking care of hers, I would not favor this amendment. The Indian police originally were used for the purpose of policing the Indian reservation in the Indian nations. Gentlemen may disagree with me as to the competency of the Five Civilized Tribes in education or intelligence. Twenty-two years of actual experience with them has convinced me that the Indian is no more susceptible to getting drunk than is the average white man; that he takes care of his property as well as the average white man; and that he is as well behaved when sober or drunk as the average white man. [Laughter and applause.] As 100,000 Indian citizens in Oklahoma are to 1,500,000, I say to you to-day that you can not find a class of citizenship in the world that will compare better with the white man than the Indians in Oklahoma. [Applause.]

Something has been said to the effect that if you did not protect the Indian he would be deprived of his property and soon get rid of it. I want to call your attention to-day to the fact that there are many Indians in Oklahoma who can not sell their lands because the restrictions have not been removed. That is not because they are not competent to take care of their interests. I want to call attention to Stephen Peak, of Delaware County, Okla., who is a college graduate and was for three and a half years superintendent of education, and still he could not sell an acre of his land because the Government said he was not competent. A more upright citizen does not live in that country than Mr. Peak. It is not a fact that if the restrictions are removed the Indian would spend his money. An Indian will take care of his property as well as the average white man. When I say that, I class myself with the white man. I have lived among the Indians sufficiently long to know that it is a question of theory instead of practice when they say that the Indian can not take care of his property. I ask you if 40 per cent of the people in Washington to-day are not, so to speak, indigent or without very large holdings of property, and that 20 per cent owns the majority of the property. Would you put a ban on them and say that they ought not to be allowed to sell their property, and send an additional police officer over from Virginia because they could not take care of their property? So here, where 40 per cent do not own much property, is that because of a want of competency? Now, I am not in love with the advocacy of some people of the distribution of property or for equalizing property. You may keep the Indian tied hand and foot, but you will never teach him in that way to take care of his property. There is only one way you can teach a man, and that is to give him instructions and the right to use his property to his best interest. This amendment, if it should fail, would not keep a single Indian's property for him. If the amendment prevails, it will not cause a single Indian to part with his property. It ought to prevail, because we have an organized government, as has been said by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], fully competent to police the country and take care of the affairs, and there is not a people in the world that are more law-abiding and who will assist the officers of that country than the Indian citizens. [Applause.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in defense of the Indian police, not as he is to-day, but as he was in the past. The original duties of the Indian police in old Indian Territory was for the purpose, not of arresting, not of apprehending, but for killing outlaws. Whenever an outlaw got so dangerous and desperate that a deputy marshal was afraid to attack him, the Indian agent called together a detachment of Indian police, ordered them out, and the outlaw disappeared from the face of the earth.

It may seem to be rather a gruesome proposition in this enlightened day to defend or speak in praise of officers in the business of killing people, but as I look back upon our country

as it existed then I am sure that those brave, fearless men, such as the Indian police were, men who did not hesitate to take their lives in their hands for the preservation of law and order, were the moving force in bringing order out of chaos.

Later on the Indian police was used for placing the Indian allottee in possession of his allotment. And he still did valuable service there. I think there were probably then from 15 to 20 Indian police in the service on the east side of our State.

Now they are used for carrying out the orders of the Interior Department. They are used occasionally for placing an allottee in possession of an allotment. Most of that work has been completed. Occasionally there is a case where an allottee who was a Snake, or who belonged to the Ketoowah Society, who would have nothing to do with an allotment. In these cases the Indian may not yet have been placed in possession of his allotment. The only machinery for placing him in possession would be the Indian police.

Now, I am very sure that we have too many Indian police in Oklahoma, and there is a good deal of truth in the statement of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. JACKSON] and in the statement of my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT]. I would favor dispensing with these agents entirely in Oklahoma at the present time were it not for the reason I have stated, were it not that it might slightly disorganize the Indian Service and leave them without men to do this specific work.

There is another small service the police render now, and that is they patrol the timberlands which belong to the tribe, and may render some service in looking after the segregated mineral lands which are soon to be sold. When this property is disposed of I shall be very glad to join the Members of the House in dispensing completely with the police service in Oklahoma.

I want to say, further, in reply to what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has said, that whenever this Congress or the Federal Government gets ready to turn over the affairs of our Indians to the State of Oklahoma for settlement, the State of Oklahoma will gladly accept that responsibility and discharge it in a spirit and manner that will be more beneficial to the Indians than the present system, in my opinion, because they are closer to the Indian and understand him better, and, I believe, are in a position to-day to better know what is to his best interest. But until that time comes some machinery must be provided for the working of the present plan. I agree to what gentlemen have said about this appropriation being too large and expensive and think our committee should see to it that the item is materially reduced next year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I was delighted with the argument presented by my colleague, Mr. CANNON, of Illinois. What was said by him goes to the essence of this amendment. It has always been the theory of those in authority, in order to perpetuate their control and supremacy in Government, to insist that their subjects are weak and helpless and incapable of self-control and self-government. I think that this discussion has revealed one thing, if it has revealed anything, and that is this: That these Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma are as intelligent for the purpose of managing their own affairs, as intelligent to partake in the government of their own counties, in their State, and in this Nation as the ordinary citizen in this country. The wonderful confidence which the 1,500,000 white people of the State of Oklahoma have shown in the ability of these Indians, in their intelligence, and in their fidelity to trust by electing them to important offices in the various counties, in the legislature of the State, and in the Congress of the United States, shows that they are just as competent and just as able and capable of self-control and self-government as any other people in that State, and when I say that I do not reflect at all upon the intelligence of the people of the great State of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, these Five Civilized Tribes are noted for their industry and high state of civilization, for their obedience to organized government and their ability to administer the same. They have become citizens of this country by choice, and it should be the policy of this Government to place them upon an equality with all other citizens of this country, sharing the same rights and assuming the same responsibilities. Mr. Chairman, it has been said that they number less than 100,000, while the white population of Oklahoma number more than 1,500,000. Yet they are held in such high esteem that the white people have elected to send one of them as their Representative on the floor of this House and another to represent the State of Oklahoma in the United States Senate. These men are the peers of any in either branch of Congress, and I dare say none will deny this proposition.

Mr. Chairman, the necessity for policing these tribes by force and arms has passed long ago. To place a policeman with a star on his breast over them is an insult to them and a dis-

grace to the American people. I therefore trust, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so ordered. There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the amendment prevails, does the amount remain at \$200,000, or will the amount be open for amendment by way of reduction?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Debate is closed upon all amendments and also, as I understand, on the paragraph. It can be offered without debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that if the amendment is adopted the paragraph will be open to amendment without debate. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

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

On a division (demanded by Mr. FOWLER) there were—ayes 20, yeas 24.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "two," in line 1, page 8, and insert the word "one."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 8, line 1, by striking out the word "two" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "one."

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

On a division (demanded by Mr. MURDOCK) there were—ayes 23, yeas 30.

So the amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas 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 passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 5137. An act for the relief of Alice V. Houghton;

S. 5246. An act to redeem a certain outstanding certificate of indebtedness issued by the late board of audit of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 5817. An act granting to the county of Hill, in the State of Montana, the jail building and fixtures now upon the abandoned Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation, in the State of Montana; and

S. 290. An act to authorize the appointment of dental surgeons in the United States Navy.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of special agents at \$2,000 per annum; for traveling and incidental expenses of such special agents, including sleeping-car fare and a per diem of \$3 in lieu of subsistence when actually employed on duty in the field or ordered to the seat of government; for transportation and incidental expenses of officers and clerks of the Office of Indian Affairs when traveling on official duty; for pay of employees not otherwise provided for; and for other necessary expenses of the Indian service for which no other appropriation is available, \$85,000.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I merely do this to call the attention of the committee to the fact that this appropriates \$85,000 for special agents for reservations to act in conjunction with and for the Secretary of the Interior. He has the power to designate that these agents go to any part of the United States and perform any task that he desires to have them do, and carry out his orders and his commands wheresoever he may designate them. I merely do that to the end that the committee may not overlook the fact that we are here appropriating \$85,000 for special agents, whereas heretofore we have appropriated \$200,000 for Indian police, both of which are field men to do field service in the service of the United States. I withdraw the pro forma amendment. We shall later on in the bill call your attention to the fact that we have eliminated the \$100,000 item for agents that I do not think we need. I am in favor of a reasonable supply of officers, but there has been in the past too many and should be reduced.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas 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 insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 1) granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War and the War with Mexico disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. BURNHAM, and Mr. GORE as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. For support, civilization, and education of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, \$330,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I would like to ask the gentleman what is the proposition now? What has been the policy heretofore of appropriating for the support and civilization of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico on reservations? Do I understand this is for the support, civilization, and education of all Indians in the State, regardless of whether they are on reservations or not?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I have an amendment which I think will cover that. I have an amendment of this kind: On page 8, line 16, after the word "support," strike out the comma and insert the word "and" and strike out the word "education."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 8, line 16, after the word "support," by striking out the comma and inserting the word "and." Page 8, line 16, after the word "civilization," strike out the words "and education."

Mr. MANN. Is that to be expended on all Indians, regardless of whether they are on reservations or not? Heretofore we have only contributed for Indians on reservations.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. There are many scattered bands of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico. The Indians there live by raising sheep, hogs, cattle, and so forth. There is very little farming in that country, and a great many of them have flocks of sheep, and they herd these flocks and graze them on the public domain. They have the same right on the public domain of the United States as other citizens, and they are often off their reservations and form little scattered communities where they herd their stock, and it is necessary to extend the provisions for schools and other purposes to these scattered bands of Indians.

Mr. MANN. What is the proposition now? The present appropriation is limited to support and civilization of Indians on reservations. What do they do now?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Here is the report. I will read it:

SUPPORT OF INDIANS IN ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO—AMOUNT ASKED FOR, \$380,000.

There are over 20 superintendencies in these two Territories, with a total population of over 56,000 Indians to be supported from this fund. These Indians are engaged largely in stock raising, and to assist them in this industry about \$40,000 has been expended for the purchase of stock, which has been issued to the Indians in order to place them on a self-supporting basis. Practically one-half of the amount appropriated this year was used for the payment of salaries, traveling expenses, fuel for the maintenance of the plants, forage for the stock, and other items necessary to properly administer the affairs of these Indians. The increase in the estimate is for the purpose of providing additional educational facilities for these Indians as a part of their civilization.

Mr. MANN. I know; but what excuse do they give for proposing now to include all the Indians instead of Indians on the reservations?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Because many of the Navajos and other tribes are off their reservations.

Mr. MANN. Well, what does the department—

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I can give the gentleman the information. The statement was made that it was changed for this reason: That there are a number of Indians of Arizona and New Mexico who are not on the Indian reservations, and that the comptroller may limit us in the object of this appropriation if those words are not stricken out.

Mr. MANN. Are they using the present appropriation for that purpose, not yet having been limited by the comptroller?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I presume they are. It was not an important change—

Mr. MANN. It is very important if it proposes to include a large number of Indians who are not now receiving any support.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. We did not increase the amount, but simply provided for the support of the Indians in those Territories.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not know anything about the conditions in New Mexico, but I know there are over 5,000 Papago Indians in southern Arizona who are not in Indian reservations. The public lands where they have been accustomed to live have been withdrawn from entry and been given to them, and some

money has heretofore been expended, and it is to give them money that this change has been made. They are very deserving Indians.

Mr. JACKSON. Did I understand the gentleman's contention, the chairman of the committee, to strike out the word "education"?

Mr. MANN. While I am not satisfied at all with the effort that has been made to extend the scope of education, in the absence of more special language I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, while I have the floor I would like to say to the chairman that I was not aware that an amendment had been proposed.

Mr. MANN. He agreed to propose it.

Mr. JACKSON. Has it already been passed on by the committee?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; and suggested by the hearing.

Mr. MURDOCK. Has the amendment been offered?

Mr. FERRIS. This has been read for information.

Mr. MURDOCK. But has not been offered.

Mr. JACKSON. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, if this appropriation of \$330,000 is made, the word "education" ought by all means to stay in the bill.

Mr. FERRIS. If the gentleman will yield right there—

Mr. JACKSON. Let me complete my statement, and then the gentleman can more intelligently inquire, if he wishes to do so. I have the information from the superintendent, and proof from other sources, that education is needed very badly among the Navajo Indians in Arizona. Perhaps one of the greatest necessities that has not been relieved by this association—

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will state that the Navajo Indians have a large reservation.

Mr. JACKSON. This money can be used upon either reservation. If I recollect it, there are 7,500 of these so-called "roaming" Indians who are not in schools. The Navajos, I think, without exaggeration are among the best Indians the country has ever had. They have always been civilized. They were in a high state of civilization when the country was discovered.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If the gentleman will yield at that point, I will state the reason why the Navajo children are not in school.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. I think I know what the gentleman will say, but I will yield.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The reason given by the department is—and I have been on the reservation and personally know—that these Indians are scattered all over their reservation and adjacent public domain. They live by the herding of their sheep and other stock on the range. They may be here to-day and there to-morrow, and it is impossible to locate them long enough to acquire homes so as to educate their children unless we enact a compulsory education law. There is a bill now pending before our committee to that effect, and I hope it will become a law. It will force these children to go to school.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, what is pending now?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I offer it now.

Mr. MURDOCK. The amendment, I will say, has not been offered, except to be read for information.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I now ask that the amendment be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 16, after the word "support," strike out the word "common" and insert the word "and."

Page 8, line 16, after the word "civilization," strike out the words "and education."

Mr. JACKSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, although I am a member of the committee, I wish to state that I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That was proposed by the department.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not know as that would make any difference. I understand there are some 7,500 of them that are not in school. But the supervisors of these schools tell me that these Indians are perfectly willing to attend school; that the only reason they have not been in schools is that they have not school facilities. The Navajo people are an intelligent people. They have never objected to their children attending the schools. It is true they can not attend their schools, because there are none within their reach. The only way they can be schooled is by taking and putting them into boarding schools. Now, if I understand, it is for the purpose

of using \$50,000 of this money for these extra schools that the appropriation was asked of this sum mentioned on page 65.

Mr. MANN. Sixty-five thousand dollars was not granted. They asked for \$350,000, and the committee granted only \$330,000.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, the argument is practically the same. They asked for \$380,000 and received \$330,000. That is correct. But if there is any opportunity to use any of this sum to further the school facilities among these Navajo people it ought to be done. I can not see any good in cutting out the word "education."

Mr. CARTER. I do not know what the reason is for cutting out the word "education," except it has not been carried in bills heretofore. That amount has been in the past appropriated "for support and civilization" and not "for support, civilization, and education." How the word "education" got in I do not know, and what the purpose of the department is in cutting it out I can not say.

Mr. JACKSON. Did it not get in by Mr. Meritt asking it for educational purposes?

Mr. CARTER. It was in last year.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to give an explanation of this item.

Mr. MANN. Just one moment, Mr. Chairman. Is it the intention to cut the sum from \$330,000 down if the word "education" is stricken out?

Mr. FERRIS. I will reply to that particular phase. This is the situation, and if I make a misstatement in any respect I will ask the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE] to refresh my memory and set me right: The Indian Office had asked for \$50,000 more than they were awarded by the committee. They drew the language of the section on the theory that they were going to get the extra \$50,000 and that the \$50,000 was going to be used for the schools, and it necessitated the words "and education." We disallowed that \$50,000 and decided that they should receive, all told, for schools, only \$1,450,000. That being true, the striking out and refusing to give them the \$50,000 asked for brought it to the basis where they would need all the \$330,000 to maintain the 20 superintendencies or agencies that exist out there. The prospect of receiving the \$50,000 that they asked for, which we did not allow them, was the reason for inserting the words "and education," and when it was not allowed the words ought to have gone out. That would have brought the item back to what it ought to be without them, so that anybody looking for appropriations for education in the bill would find them all in one item, \$1,450,000.

I think the House will recognize the fact that it is wrong in principle and in policy and in everything else to have a little item for education here and a little item there for education, scattered all through the bill, thereby making it difficult to estimate the expenses for that object.

Mr. MANN. That is why I made the point of order.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will permit, I think he will recall that when the limitation was put upon the item of \$1,450,000 for support of schools, the commissioner was asked the question whether, with that limitation, he could not get along with less money, that limitation being that Indians of less than one-fourth Indian blood should not be permitted to be educated in the Indian schools, and the commissioner stated that they expected to educate more children and particularly of the Navajos. We considered therefore that we would strike out the \$50,000 that they desired to be put at that place in the bill and leave the appropriation as it was in the last year's bill; but the word "education" got in there on the supposition that we would allow the other.

Mr. MANN. You increased the educational appropriation by \$30,000.

Mr. FERRIS. That was for another purpose.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Yes; that was for another purpose.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma rose.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McGUIRE].

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I would like to understand this a little more fully. The fact that you omitted the word "education" does not mean that the children of those tribes shall not have educational facilities?

Mr. FERRIS. Not at all.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Because there is not an Indian child in the United States that has not educational facilities, for the reason that if he does not have them at home there are the nonreservation schools that he may enter?

Mr. FERRIS. That is quite true.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. But are we not getting into trouble here? There is a provision to the effect that children of less than one-fourth Indian blood can not enter certain schools.

Mr. FERRIS. That is true. The committee thought it wise to so provide.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Now, there are certainly some children here of less than one-fourth Indian blood. Where are they going to have school advantages?

Mr. FERRIS. In reply to that I will say that the gentleman will recall that we had that matter up yesterday. That amendment has a string to it. Before any Indian child of less than one-fourth Indian blood is excluded from any school his parents must first be citizens of the United States. In other words, the Indian restrictions must have been removed and they must have been declared, either by the department or the Congress, to be full citizens. And a second string is tied to that amendment, and that is that there must be educational facilities open to the child and convenient to him, so that the child can be sent to school. In this event there is no opportunity to exclude any child from schooling, for if he does not attend one he may the other.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I remember that. The gentleman is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS].

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For maintenance, including purchase of electricity for irrigation wells already completed, and the completion of the lateral irrigating ditches thereunder, \$15,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized to locate and construct a dam and necessary works in connection therewith at or in the vicinity of the location known as the San Carlos Reservoir site on the Gila River, in Arizona, for the purpose of irrigating Pima and other Indian lands, together with the lands of the Gila River Valley; and in carrying out said plan to locate and construct irrigation works for the storage, diversion, and development of waters, including artesian wells, and for the purpose of impounding water and providing for the irrigation of said lands; and the authority granted by the act approved June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. L., p. 388), entitled "An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands," so far as applicable and not inconsistent herewith, is hereby extended and made to apply to the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That in carrying out the provisions of this act the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to make suitable provision for the protection of the Pima and other tribes of Indians affected thereby, or who may be benefited thereunder, and to provide that a supply of water shall be first retained out of the impounded waters sufficient to properly irrigate an allotment of 10 acres of land for each member of the said Pima Indian Tribe: *Provided further*, That if the Secretary of the Interior concludes that the reports of reputable engineers have not sufficiently determined the suitability, for foundation purposes, of the rock formation of the sites proposed for construction of the reservoir and irrigation works, he is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to request the President to direct the Secretary of War to convene a board of not less than three engineers of his department, of wide reputation and large experience, to make further investigation thereof; and in event the reports and recommendations of such engineers of the Army thus selected shall show that the rock formation is suitable for the construction of the proposed dam and other irrigation works, the Secretary of the Interior shall proceed with the construction of the said irrigation works as authorized herein. If the reports and recommendations of the said engineers of the Army are to the effect that a suitable rock foundation can not be secured for the construction of a suitable dam for impounding the waters of the Gila, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit the reports of said board of engineers, together with his recommendations in the matter to Congress, on or before the first Monday in December, 1912: *And provided also*, That the sum of \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be required, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to make any further investigation authorized herein, to be made in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph that was read.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I admit that the point of order is well taken, and I offer a substitute for the part that is proposed to be stricken out—an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. MANN. Has the point of order been sustained?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I offer in lieu of that paragraph the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment to the Indian appropriation bill: Commencing with line 12, page 9, strike out all down through and including the word "Interior," and in line 17—

Mr. MANN. The amendment, Mr. Chairman, should be simply to insert it as a new paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Commencing with line 12, page 9, strike out all down to and including the word "Interior," in line 17, page 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"For maintenance, including purchase of electricity for irrigation wells already completed, and the completion of the lateral irrigating ditches thereunder in connection with the irrigation of the lands of the

Pima Indians in the vicinity of Sacaton, in the Gila River Indian Reservation, \$15,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, directed to convene a board of not less than three engineers of the Army of wide reputation and large experience to make the necessary examinations, borings, and surveys for the purpose of determining the reasonability and practicability of constructing a dam and reservoir at or in the vicinity of the Box Canyon on the San Carlos Indian Reservation, known as the site of the proposed San Carlos Reservoir on the Gila River, Ariz., and the necessary irrigation works in connection therewith to provide for the irrigation of Indian, private, and public lands in the Gila River Valley. Said board of engineers to submit to Congress the results of their examinations and surveys, together with an estimate of cost, with their recommendations thereon, at the earliest practicable date. The sum of \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of conducting said investigation."

Mr. MANN. I reserve a point of order on the amendment, and I should like to make this suggestion to the gentleman in charge of the bill: This is a matter which, if entered upon, will involve a very large expenditure of money, and I hope that the gentleman will ask unanimous consent to pass over this amendment, so that we may have the opportunity of examining it. I think outside of the committee probably no one has seen it until it is now offered on the floor.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. At the request of the gentleman, I will ask that this be passed.

Mr. FOSTER. With the understanding that the point of order is reserved.

Mr. MANN. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. HAMMOND. What is the request?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. To have it passed over and returned to later.

Mr. HAMMOND. I desire to ask the gentleman who offered the amendment how it differs from the bill?

Mr. MANN. It is entirely different.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will state to the gentleman that this item in the bill provided for locating and building a dam and reservoir at a place on the Gila River known as the San Carlos dam site for the purpose of furnishing water to these Indians out of the Gila River; but that was seriously objected to by the committee, and we finally agreed, in lieu of that, to ask for a survey for the purpose of ascertaining whether it was a feasible project before proceeding to make a direct appropriation.

Each of these amendments involves the question of abandoning the well system that we have heretofore entered upon, but will continue to operate the wells now completed. We have not contemplated boring any more wells for irrigating these Indian lands. We desire to use the natural flow of the Gila River by building the San Carlos dam, so that they will have river water for irrigation purposes instead of well water, it having been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the committee that if well water is used a few years on their lands that it will render the land valueless for raising crops. If that is true, the money that we are expending on this well system will be entirely lost.

Mr. HAMMOND. I am somewhat familiar with the conditions, but I am trying to get at the condition in which we are now. House bill 18244 has been incorporated into the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That was offered, but was stricken out on a point of order.

Mr. HAMMOND. That has been stricken out on a point of order?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes. Now, we propose to substitute for that the amendment which I have sent to the Clerk's desk, which has been read, and that amendment is to be postponed and passed over until some future time.

Mr. HAMMOND. It will be considered before this bill passes?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes; before the consideration of the bill is finished.

Mr. MANN. Unanimous consent has been asked to pass it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. This amendment provides an appropriation of \$10,000 to make an investigation of the San Carlos project, to see whether or not it is feasible.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Does the gentleman know that thousands and thousands of dollars have already been spent by the Government to determine whether or not that project is feasible, and that there are numbers of reports which have been made upon it by the engineers?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I am aware of that. That happened several years ago; but recently the department seems to have changed that opinion, and the department is now trying to sustain the well system of irrigation. We believe the depart-

ment to be wrong in that. We believe we should return to the system of irrigating these lands from the river, and that is the object of this amendment.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Does the gentleman know, further, that the Casa Grande Water Users' Association, down there, have been trying to get the Reclamation Service and the Interior Department to let them build the dam there and take care of the lands of the Indians, who have a prior right to this water? They want to enter into a contract to build this dam and finance it themselves.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I am fully aware of that, and at the proper time I shall oppose that proposition, because I think the Government should build this dam, and that the water should be distributed between the white settlers owning land there, requiring them to pay whatever may be assessed against them under the reclamation act, and that the Indians should have water furnished to them without payment for it, because the lands are theirs. That should be done under just rules and regulations. There is only one river there and only one system proposed. Let me state that this is the object which we have in view. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is, I understand, in strict accord with this amendment. He was not here at the time this matter was considered, but he has looked it up very closely, and I understand that this amendment meets with his approval.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the proposed amendment be printed?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It will be printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] asks unanimous consent that the amendment which he has offered be passed for future consideration. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the development of a water supply for domestic and stock purposes and for irrigation for nomadic Papago Indians in Pima County, Ariz., to be immediately available, \$5,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend, after line 21, page 11, by adding the following paragraph:

"For beginning the construction of the Ganado irrigation project on the Navajo Indian Reservation in Arizona, in accordance with the plans submitted by the chief engineer of the Indian Service and approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, in conformity with section 1 of the act approved April 4, 1910: *Provided*, That the total cost of the project shall not exceed \$60,100, \$35,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I have reserved a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to quote from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in his justification for this item. He says:

This is a large reservation, containing approximately 12,000,000 acres of land, of which very little is susceptible of irrigation. The Indians are excellent workers and will make good use of all the water furnished for the raising of hay and grain for their flocks during the winter season. They depend largely on the sheep industry for their subsistence, with some farming in the river bottoms, and under conditions which would be discouraging to a white man. Very little assistance has been given these Indians by the Government, and it is believed the expenditure of funds necessary to construct this project will show good returns for the money expended and will protect the water rights for these Indians.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this project is not a new one, and it has been very carefully investigated by the department. In March, 1909, H. F. Robertson, superintendent of irrigation, made a preliminary report on this project, and that report was sent to the Indian Office. By direction of the chief engineer, W. H. Code, a further investigation was ordered. In 1910 this investigation was made, the report, which contained an estimate of the cost, being made October 5 of that year by Mr. Robertson. When this report was referred to the consulting engineer, Mr. Robertson was again requested to go back to the reservation and make a further investigation regarding the amount of silt in the water, and also in regard to the stream flow. In order to obtain this data regarding the silt and water supply, the report was delayed until February 14 of this year, and therefore the amount needed for this project could not be submitted in the regular estimates by the department. All of this information is now available, and plats and surveys are all prepared.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. The report says that very little of the 12,000,000 acres is susceptible of irrigation. Can the gentleman tell us about how much is susceptible to irrigation?

Mr. HAYDEN. A very small part of the 12,000,000 acres. It is estimated that the cost of this project will amount to \$60,100, and that when the land on the river bottom below the reservoir

is irrigated it will cover 1,775 acres. There are now living on this land over 400 Indians, and if they are given an allotment of 5 acres each it would supply 355 of them with permanent homes. The chief advantage of this project is that it is unlike the Indian irrigation work in many other places in the United States, where an irrigation project is started and then they try to move the Indians away from their old homes onto new lands. Here the water is brought to the land that the Indians are already cultivating, which is a great benefit.

Mr. FOSTER. This will give each Indian about 2½ acres of land.

Mr. HAYDEN. There are 1,775 acres. You divide that up in 5-acre allotments and you can supply 355 Indians.

Mr. FOSTER. I misunderstood the gentleman as to the number.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman says 400 Indians. He means men, women, and children.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly; allotments are made in that way.

Mr. MANN. But you do not make allotments of irrigated land to babies.

Mr. FOSTER. Would there be 100 heads of families?

Mr. MANN. My recollection is that there are about 80.

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

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Arizona be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, there are now living in the vicinity of this proposed reservoir over a thousand Indians, and there will be no difficulty at all about getting them to go on the land. The difficulty is to get the water on the land that they now have. Now, in regard to the measurement of the flow of this stream, the water flows in the wintertime, during the rainy season, and the hydrographic data shows that there is enough flood water to fill this reservoir 50 times. The trouble is that the water does not come in the right time of the year when the Indian needs it, and this reservoir is to conserve that water.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. With pleasure.

Mr. MONDELL. What is the source of this water supply?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is the Rio Pueblo Colorado, a stream that rises in the mountains on the Navajo Reservation.

Mr. MONDELL. Is this an entirely new project?

Mr. HAYDEN. Entirely new.

Mr. MONDELL. It contemplates the erection of a dam and the construction of ditches.

Mr. HAYDEN. The land to be irrigated lies right below the reservoir, so that there will be no need of constructing very long ditches.

Mr. MONDELL. Has the matter been carefully investigated?

Mr. HAYDEN. I stated a moment ago that the first preliminary investigation was made in 1909, and the matter was again investigated in 1910 and referred to the consulting engineer of the department. The Assistant Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs have both been upon the ground and strongly recommend this project. Unfortunately the data was not assembled in time to be available for the use of the Indian Bureau this year when the estimates were submitted to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MONDELL. Is this stream a branch of the Gila River?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, no; it is in the extreme northeast corner of Arizona. The waters from this stream flow into the Little Colorado and from there into the Colorado.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. What was the provision in the Indian appropriation act of 1910 in reference to this matter?

Mr. HAYDEN. I presume that was—

Mr. MANN. I do not want what the gentleman presumes; I have the same paper in my hand that the gentleman has in his.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I think I can give the gentleman that information. The act of last year says "hereafter no irrigation project shall be commenced costing more than \$25,000 until a survey and estimate of cost has been submitted."

That, I understand, is what this document refers to. The department has made a survey and submitted the estimate of cost.

Mr. MANN. But there was no specific item relating to this project in the bill.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Not at all; it had no reference to it.

Mr. HAYDEN. The law provides that you can not enter into any new construction or new projects that will cost more than \$25,000.

Mr. MANN. I know what the general law is on the subject.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It has to be approved by Congress.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I accept the amendment for the reason that there is a lump-sum appropriation here for irrigation purposes, and, as has been stated by the gentleman from South Dakota, we can not enter upon any new projects for irrigation costing over \$25,000. As this is to cost \$60,100, it is necessary that Congress should authorize this work.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

FLORIDA.

Sec. 4. The unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$10,000 "for relief of distress among the Seminole Indians in Florida, and for purposes of their civilization," made in the Indian appropriation act approved March 3, 1911, shall remain available until expended.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order—I will reserve the point of order. Will not the gentleman be willing to change that so as to merely reappropriate the money instead of making a permanent appropriation?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I have no objection.

Mr. MANN. How much has been expended; does anybody know?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I have a statement here in regard to that.

SUPPORT OF SEMINOLES IN FLORIDA.

Fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, amount appropriated..... \$10,000.00

Fiscal year ended June 30, 1911:	
Amount appropriated.....	15,000.00
Amount expended.....	2,798.78
Unexpended balance.....	12,201.22

Analysis of expenditures:	
Employees.....	1,600.00
Traveling expenses.....	1,198.78
	2,798.78

With the appropriations heretofore made for support of the Seminole Indians in Florida a special agent was appointed and spent some nine months in the field investigating local conditions and ascertaining particulars regarding these Indians, with a view of establishing schools and other educational facilities for their benefit. A comparatively accurate census was prepared and considerable land set aside by Executive order for their benefit in addition to lands heretofore purchased under special appropriations by Congress between the years 1895 and 1900.

Future conditions among these Indians may require prompt steps for their support and relief, which can best be met by having funds at hand to meet such emergencies as may arise. The unexpended balance of the appropriation heretofore made is deemed sufficient for this purpose, provided it is made available until expended, without an additional appropriation being necessary.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is not a large amount, but it is quite a principle. The Indian Office ought to know better than to ask Congress to appropriate money for support and make it available indefinitely regardless of when it shall be used. These appropriations ought to be made from year to year, so that somebody knows something about whether the money is expended and how expended, and we ordinarily get that information through the committee that has charge of the appropriation. The Indian Office has no business to make such a request.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman offer an amendment? I will accept it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman I withdraw the point of order and offer an amendment, and that is, to strike out in lines 22 and 23 the words "shall remain available until expended" and insert in lieu thereof "is hereby reappropriated and made available during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, lines 22 and 23, strike out the words "shall remain available until expended" and insert in lieu thereof the words "is hereby reappropriated and made available during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913."

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

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. FERRIS. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MURDOCK. The last word of what?

Mr. FERRIS. Of this section, or the first word.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is nothing pending.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; the paragraph is still pending.

Mr. MURDOCK. But we have passed the paragraph.

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, no; I merely made the motion to ask the gentleman from Illinois—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. FERRIS (continuing). If he did not think there might be some reason for thinking they are not going to spend this money. This amount has been appropriated year after year, and they have not been taking any affirmative steps for doing anything for the Seminole Indians. The facts are these Indians are just as wild as rabbits in the Everglades of Florida. I do not care to criticize, but I understand the Indian Office has done nothing as yet—they sent a man who rode around there—and it seems to me if they are not going to expend this money, the question is whether or not there ought to be a direction for the expending of the money or the withdrawal of the appropriation, or something done. That thought was brought about by the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois of reappropriating every year a sum of money to do a specific thing and not have anything done. It seems to me we ought to bring about some action.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the gentleman think that if these Indians are as wild as he says they are—as wild as rabbits—it is pretty hard to spend the money on them? Maybe they are doing the best they can.

Mr. FERRIS. Perhaps that is true. The gentleman may have suggested the truth; and if it is impossible to lasso or catch them or do anything, why keep on appropriating every year this amount of money?

Mr. MANN. We do not keep on appropriating this amount of money. There never has been but one appropriation for this purpose. It went into a bill through, I think, an erroneous ruling of the then Chairman upon a point of order which I made, and I said then that the money could not be expended properly; that there was no way of expending the money and no need of appropriating it; but some gentlemen had gotten interested in the Seminole Indians in Florida through literature, or something of that sort, and insisted upon the appropriation. Now, I suppose they have expended two or three thousand dollars hiring somebody to run around, and I do not suppose the Indians have had any benefit.

Mr. FERRIS. They do not contend that they have.

Mr. MANN. They never will have any benefit from it. They do not need any money from the Treasury of the United States. They have been taking care of themselves since Florida came into our country, and they are still doing so since the other Seminoles were expelled from Florida. It is not necessary for us to take care of these Indians, as they are amply able to do it. I did not endeavor to strike out the appropriation because I did not think it would do any good, and I do not believe in the practice of placing in the hands of a department a sum to be expended when they please, if they please, with no knowledge on the part of Congress of what they are doing.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he thinks any hardship would work to the Indians if we struck out this appropriation?

Mr. MANN. They would never know it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like an answer from the chairman of the committee, if he will kindly give it.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in defense of this proposition, I think this was appropriated for two years ago, and if I am not mistaken the item was put in the bill in another body.

Mr. MANN. Oh, it was put in the bill here in this House over a point of order which I made.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I did not recall that for a certainty, but I do recall that the Senators from the State of Florida interested themselves sufficiently to bring it to the attention of Congress and represented that the condition of the Seminole Indians was very deplorable; that it would be but a short time, in their opinion, when they could no longer support themselves, and it was the judgment of the committee at that time that we ought to make a small appropriation as an emergency measure for their care and support, and also for the purpose of obtaining information and ascertaining their real condition, and also learning their number. My understanding is that the Government has set aside some land for these particular Indians; that there has been some progress made toward doing something permanent looking to their support and welfare, and while, as has been stated, possibly there may not be very much done, if we do not continue this appropriation—only a very modest amount—as we have heretofore been appropriating, and in view of the representations made by the commissioner, as will

appear in the hearings, it seems to me that this provision, limited as it is, simply continuing the appropriation for the next fiscal year, is wise, and that there is no likelihood of its being expended if there is no necessity for it. So I hope it will not be stricken out.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not fail.

Mr. MURDOCK. I withdrew the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of 1 clerk, at \$1,200, and 1 lease clerk, at \$1,000 per annum, an addition to employees otherwise provided for at the Nez Perce Agency; in all, \$2,200.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to this paragraph of the bill. Pending the discussion, I would like to have the chairman of the committee explain the necessity for this additional expense for clerks.

Mr. FERRIS. I have not the statement before me. These are the objections they have had with reference to this item. As we read through the bill, we will come to two or three more items of this kind which will seem to be new matter and do not appear in the former law. However, we have taken that from a general appropriation and distributed it among the States, where it was properly placed, and we thought it would be clearly a better method of legislation.

Mr. FOWLER. That does not answer my inquiry. I want to know the necessity for these additional clerks and the duties performed by them.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not understand that it is an additional clerk at all. We have had this same clerk all the time, only we have not been carrying him under the proper designation. As we have been legislating for these States, we have taken this one from a lump sum, and we thought each item ought to say on its face what it was, and that each State ought to be charged with the force that was employed in it.

Mr. FOWLER. Under what item of this bill is that lump sum provided for?

Mr. FERRIS. The item is eliminated from the bill entirely. It appeared in the former law.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. This bill carries an item for contingencies and general incidental expenses, and the Secretary of the Interior found that from that fund they were employing annual employees at different agencies of the United States, and the commissioner stated that the Secretary took the position that these places that were filled by clerks annually employed ought to be specifically appropriated for. Consequently, we put those clerks in the bill in the proper places, dividing them among the States, and took the total from the appropriation that we otherwise would have made, so it does not add anything to the bill and is really better legislation.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like the gentleman to be more specific about the lump sum.

Mr. MANN. There was last year an item carried in the current law for contingencies in the Indian service, amounting to \$115,000, which provided for the payment of employees not otherwise provided. It is true in this bill, and I think this is the item under which these clerks have been heretofore carried.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] be extended for five minutes.

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

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The amount appropriated was \$115,000, and I think in this bill it was cut to \$89,000.

Mr. MANN. It is out entirely.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. My recollection is, if it is out, it ought to be in the bill, and my recollection is that it is in the bill. We reduced it a few hundred dollars. I do not know just the amount. We reduced it by the further amount that these positions aggregate.

Mr. FERRIS and Mr. MANN rose.

Mr. FOWLER. I yield to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. I thank the gentleman, but I have said what I wished to say.

Mr. FERRIS. On page 4 of last year's Indian bill it provides in certain terms:

For contingencies of the Indian service; for traveling and incidental expenses of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and other officers and employees in the Indian service, including clerks detailed from the Bureau of Indian Affairs for special service in the field; for traveling and incidental expenses of special agents, at \$3 per day when actually employed on duty in the field, exclusive of transportation and sleeping-car fare, in lieu of all other expenses, including expenses of going to

and from the seat of government and while remaining there under orders; for pay of employees not otherwise provided for; and for pay of special agents, at \$2,000 per annum each, \$115,000.

A provision of that kind would separate the different amounts required at the different agencies.

Mr. MURDOCK. There is a remnant of that in this bill. Will the gentleman point it out in this bill?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FOWLER. I do not yield the floor.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Just for a suggestion. My attention is called to the fact and I am not able to find the provision in the bill, but it was so reported and should be in the bill. The item was \$115,000, and we appropriated, as I recall, about \$89,000 or \$90,000, and it puts these few positions, which amounted to something like \$14,000 or \$15,000, in separate places in the bill; but we reduced the estimate by considerable, but I do not know what has become of the item for contingencies of the Indian service.

Mr. FERRIS. We did not intend to eliminate anything but the \$20,000 item.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. More than the twenty.

Mr. FERRIS. They were asking twenty, and we distributed over the States something like—\$12,690, I think, is the exact amount. It is better administration. It shows what was actually being done. It creates no new offices. It saves \$8,000. It must therefore be a wholesome provision that will appeal to the good judgment of the committee and the Congress.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. It is contained on page 8 of the bill, and is the item as to which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] made some remarks. The amount is \$85,000. Is that not the item, the paragraph, that was also covered?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. That is the item. It has been changed.

Mr. MILLER. It has been reduced from \$115,000 to \$85,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for the extension of my time for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOWLER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not yet understand, and no one has yet made it clear, where this lump sum, out of which this appropriation is taken—

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Page 8 of the bill, lines 5 to 14.

Mr. FOWLER. I see; but that does not satisfy me. It goes on with special agents at \$2,000 each—

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman for his own information read lines 12, 13, and 14, on page 8? That answers his question.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, I have already read those lines.

Mr. MURDOCK. It says, "for pay of employees not otherwise provided for, and for other necessary expenses of the Indian service for which no other appropriation is available, \$85,000." That is broad enough to cover anything.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, Mr. Chairman, I desire further to ask the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs how the Nez Perces Agency has been cared for in the past, which is now provided for by these two clerks?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Out of a larger appropriation in the lump sum.

Mr. FOWLER. Are there not other people who look after the clerical work that is intended to be looked after by these additional clerks?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Here is the language heretofore carried in the bill: "For pay of special agents at \$2,000 per annum," etc., \$150,000. That is on page 4 of the Public Document No. 454.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with the explanation. I make the point of order.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. I make the point of order.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I hope the gentleman will not insist upon his point of order if he understands it.

Mr. FOWLER. If I understand it I will not.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The present law provides—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I would like to be recognized in my own time. Or, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Now, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The present law provides: "For the contingent expenses of the Indian service, for salary and expenses of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and other employees of the Indian service," and so forth, and "for pay of other employees not otherwise provided for, and for pay of special agents at \$2,000 per annum, \$115,000." Now, out of that \$115,000 there were employed at these agencies two clerks or employees for which we specifically appropriate now at the salaries stated in this item—the same salaries that are now being paid. The Secretary of the Interior suggested, so the commissioner informed us, that he thought it would be better administration and better legislation if such positions were specifically appropriated for, and the committee thought the suggestion a good one. Consequently we have put such employees in the bill at different places where they belong, dividing them up among the several States, and have deducted the amount of the aggregate of these several places from the \$115,000, "and then some," and have made the item only \$85,000, and have saved, as I remember, \$8,000 by the transaction.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. MANN. What other employees are there at these offices, and how are they paid?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. There is probably a superintendent—

Mr. MANN. What is the superintendency paid out of?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Out of an appropriation that is provided.

Mr. MANN. But what is the theory of maintaining one office and paying one official out of one appropriation and his clerk out of another?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. As to that I am unable to answer the gentleman. I understand that at these agencies they have certain employees that are carried in addition to what are known as the regular employees, and they have heretofore paid these particular persons from the contingent fund.

Mr. FERRIS. If I may suggest to the gentleman, in some cases where the Indians have money we draw from their funds, which makes the method of payment different in different agencies.

Mr. FOWLER. Have the duties performed by these clerks been performed by any other persons in the past?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I will say to the gentleman that these employees have been employed right along, and have been paid these salaries that are stated here out of the lump-sum appropriation of \$115,000. Now we simply provide that they shall be paid in salaries specifically appropriated for at the agencies where they are employed.

Mr. FOWLER. Who fixed the salaries heretofore?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The department.

Mr. FOWLER. Now you intend to create offices for places heretofore performed by employees.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. No; we do not create them.

Mr. FOWLER. You propose to create them and fix their salaries.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. No; we do not create anything. If the gentleman thinks it would be better administration to strike these items out and give them a lump sum, and give the department carte blanche to do as it desires, then he will insist upon his point of order. But it seems to me if the gentleman understood what the purpose of this change is, he would not press his point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not want the gentleman from South Dakota to presume too much on my ignorance, for I have been studying this subject very carefully for some time. I think I know full well the object of this legislation.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I think the fact will appear to the gentleman that it is better legislation as it is carried in the bill than it would be to present a lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. MILLER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER. It seems to me that this is a start in the right direction, and a start that ought to have been made a long time ago, and one that, it seems to me, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] would naturally cooperate in. The Indian Department has been paying a large number of its employees out of a lump-sum appropriation intended for general purposes, and it is sometimes very difficult to find out just what relations—

Mr. FOWLER. Do they not still continue to do that out of the lump sum of \$85,000?

Mr. MILLER. No.

Mr. FOWLER. It says "other employees."

Mr. MILLER. No; these employees would not or should not be paid out of that, and would not be paid out of that if they remained in here. If we strike this out we will have to go back and increase that former paragraph of \$85,000 to \$120,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Why do you not segregate the entire work of the different departments and make a specific appropriation for each one of them?

Mr. MILLER. That is just what I was talking about. The job is too big to tackle all at once, but this is a start. Now, I will say to the gentleman that there are certain general superintendents of agencies who are now being paid out of the educational fund. I do not think that is right. I do not think any general superintendent of an agency in the United States in the Indian service ought to be paid out of the educational fund. I think he ought to be paid specifically, the same as we are providing for these two clerks at this place.

Mr. FOWLER. Why did you not do that with all of the rest of the force and service provided for in the \$85,000?

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman asks a pertinent question, and I can only answer it by saying that the job is too big to tackle all at once, but that this is a start in the right direction.

Mr. FOWLER. If you had done that and segregated them there might have been less objection to the paragraph under consideration.

Mr. MILLER. It is absolutely impossible to make a general separation, covering all of the employees at one time.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it not a fact that under the lump sum appropriation the person in control could put his force here and there, wherever there was work to be done; but in the segregation as you undertake to make it in the Nez Perce Agency, if there is no work to be done there by these two clerks they are idle, are they not?

Mr. MILLER. There is work for them to do or they would not be there.

Mr. FOWLER. I have seen nothing to show that there has been a sufficient amount of work there at this agency to employ these two clerks.

Mr. MILLER. Oh, well, the assumption of the gentleman certainly is not well founded. They would not have been employed originally if there had not been work for them to do; and if the gentleman is familiar with the work at that agency he must know that there is work there for each of these clerks to perform.

Mr. FOWLER. How big is that agency?

Mr. MILLER. It is big enough to require more than these two.

Mr. FOWLER. Then why did you not provide for more?

Mr. MILLER. I have answered the gentleman's question. I can not answer it more specifically.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows.

Sec. 6. For pay of one financial clerk, at \$600, and one physician, at \$480 per annum, in addition to employees otherwise provided for at the Sac and Fox Agency, Iowa; in all, \$1,080.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to that paragraph of the bill.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, that is founded on the same facts as the last one ruled upon by the Chairman.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to be captious about any of these appropriations, but I do say that under the former rulings of the Chairmen of this committee, not only is this item subject to a point of order, but the last item against which a point of order was made was also subject to it.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the creation of new offices.

Mr. FOWLER. It is not only the creation of a new office, but it is a diversion of the money which has been appropriated to a new purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague will permit, I think it is the duty of the gentleman in charge of the bill to show any authorization of law for these officers, and where they have ever been created by law.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That has been stated several times.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not desire to yield at this time.

The second section of Rule XXI, found on page 400 of the Manual, provides that—

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress. Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill: *Provided*, That it shall be in order further to amend such bill upon the report of the committee or any joint commission authorized by law or the House Members of any such commission having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such amendment, which amendment being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures.

On page 403 of the Manual:

An appropriation for a public work in excess of a fixed limit of cost or for extending a service beyond the limits assigned by an executive officer exercising a lawful discretion or by actual law or for purposes prohibited by law is out of order. * * * In the administration of the rule it is the practice that those upholding an item of appropriation should have the burden of showing the law authorizing it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are a number of decisions upon this question.

On page 404 there is a ruling by a former Chairman which held that the purchase of a separate and detached lot of land is not admitted. That decision is quoted at length in volume 4, paragraph 3776, of Hinds' Precedents:

Also a proposition to change a rule of the House is subject to a point of order. The object to be appropriated for may be described without violating the rule. Propositions to establish affirmative directions for executive officers, or to take away an authority or discretion conferred by law, are subject to the point of order. Limits of cost for public works may not be made or changed or contracts authorized.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are a number of decisions holding that where a certain agency has been created for the use and administration of a certain fund, if the name of the agency is changed or if the appropriation be fixed from an indefinite to a definite sum of money, it is a new appropriation or new legislation and is subject to a point of order.

Mr. HINDS, in his Precedents, shows examples of former rulings in the House sustaining points of order of that character.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I have a precedent here in point. I cite Hinds' Precedents, page 502, volume 4, which is not just the point I had in mind, but it bears upon that same question:

The Chair has found two precedents which may be claimed to sustain the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois. The first is a ruling made by Mr. Hopkins, of Illinois, in the first session of the Fifty-fourth Congress, to be found on page 1192 of the *Itzcomp* for that session. In that case an amendment providing for the establishment of a manual-training school had been offered and a point of order was made against it. It appeared that the general object of educating the Indians was carried on at the place where this training school was intended to be located, but that no education of the class or kind described in the amendment had yet been undertaken. Upon that ground it was pressed upon the Chair that the amendment provided for something other than "a public work or object in progress," and upon that ground, apparently, the point of order was sustained.

Now, there is another holding that I do not lay my hand on just now where the Chair, in a former ruling in this House, held that where an appropriation had been made, as I recollect, practically in a lump sum for the purpose of carrying out certain objects, where it was sought to change it from a lump sum and segregate it to specific objects in which there was created certain offices with fixed salaries, it was held to be new legislation and subject to a point of order.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. FOWLER. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman in that connection contend that where a lump sum has covered, say, the services of five men in the civil service, that a recitation in the law of the five men, naming their respective salaries, is new legislation? Does he claim it subjects the bill to a point of order; is that his point?

Mr. FOWLER. No; that is not exactly the point of order. The point of order is that you create here new offices and undertake to fix the salaries therefor.

Mr. MURDOCK. If this paragraph in issue does not create new offices, if these offices were covered in another paragraph in the current law, then does his point of order lie?

Mr. FOWLER. I think so, because it is a diversion from the channel which is authorized by the previous law, and this is a

new law in which it is intended to create new offices or new positions, fixing the salaries, and thereby diverting the funds from the way in which there is authority under the law at present for that purpose.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the gentleman's point is good, is not Congress powerless to segregate a lump sum?

Mr. FOWLER. I think not.

Mr. MURDOCK. Why not?

Mr. FOWLER. Because of the fact that that matter can be reached any time Congress sees fit to reach it.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman from Illinois will permit me, I want to ask the gentleman from Kansas if he thinks that a mere appropriation of a sum of money in an appropriation bill is an authorization for an office?

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly, where under a lump sum carried as a contingent fund the same men have been employed.

Mr. CARTER. But does it follow that that is an authorization of law?

Mr. MURDOCK. These precise offices have existed before.

Mr. FOWLER. No; that is not the contention by anybody that these offices have existed at all, because this lump sum has been appropriated and placed under the jurisdiction and control of a certain agency that carries that out by himself alone, and he has the disposal of the services and is the director himself.

But here there is an effort to divert that fund from the purpose for which it was intended. It is an attempt to segregate it and create two new offices and fix the salaries therefor.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will my colleague allow me to ask the gentleman from Kansas a question?

Mr. FOWLER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAHAM. Under the old law, where \$85,000 was appropriated as a lump sum—

Mr. MURDOCK. One hundred and fifteen thousand dollars.

Mr. GRAHAM. Whatever the amount was, that could be paid out by the commissioner to such employees as he saw fit to employ. But this provision specifies two particular cases and takes it out of the power of the commissioner to change them, thereby creating two new offices.

Mr. MURDOCK. Would the gentleman think the point of order would lie against this very paragraph if it was included as a part of the paragraph, on page 8, which relates to contingent expenses?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes; if it specified two particular new offices in such a way that, in spite of the commissioner, those who held them should remain in them for one current year. Even though the work they are required to do should disappear the offices remain and they are not under the discretionary power of the commissioner. Two new offices are thereby created over which the commissioner would have no discretionary power or control. He could not abolish them or deprive the men holding them of their salaries, even though the work ceased.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire the attention of the Chair for one moment to make myself clear on the proposition. The lump sum which has been appropriated heretofore, I presume, was under authority of law. That lump sum was placed under the control of the commissioner to carry out this work as he saw proper. He could hire a man 1 day or 20 days or a year, if he saw fit under that authorization, and pay him any sum agreed upon.

Now, it is proposed to take a portion of this work away from the control of the commissioner and give it to two specified created offices, entirely new, without any authorization under the law as it stands now, and fix their salaries, over which the commissioner has no control whatever. Therefore it becomes new legislation, creating new offices and fixing the salaries therefor, different from what the authorization is now, and hence, I take it, Mr. Chairman, it is new legislation. I do not desire to take up the time of the House, but I insist upon my point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it has been more or less of a controverted question in the House where a lump-sum appropriation was made under authority at law and an office was created by the person in charge of that lump-sum appropriation, as to whether that office could then be specifically carried in an appropriation bill by name at the same salary as under the lump-sum appropriation. I do not propose to discuss it at length, but perhaps the latest ruling made on the subject was during the discussion of the agricultural appropriation bill. There the question was distinctly presented on a point of order whether it was in order to appropriate specifically for an office at a specified salary, which office had heretofore been filled and paid out of a lump-sum appropriation. I have forgotten at present who was in the chair, but the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole at that time ruled distinctly that where an office was created and paid out of a lump-sum appropriation,

that then it was in order for the committee to report in order on a bill making appropriations an item for that office with the salary carried which was already being paid. I take it, Mr. Chairman, that there is no doubt Congress, either by express provision of law or by reason of the policy of the Government, is entitled to maintain Indian agencies. I do not now recall just what was said, but I referred awhile ago to the fact that I made a point of order on the item in the bill for the Seminole Indians last year or the year before when it first appeared. I thought it was a perfectly good point of order. We were under no obligations, so far as treaties were concerned, to aid in the support of those Indians. So far as we were concerned, they were like other citizens of the United States, but for reasons which were then presented on the floor the then Chairman held that it was the policy of the United States, either by expressed law or by inference of law, to give aid and support to the Indians, and to the end of that policy it was in order to make an appropriation for the first time without specific treaty or other authority of law for the benefit of the Seminole Indians, and that item went into the bill and remained in the bill. The same rule would apply in general terms to the maintenance of the Indian agencies, would apply in general terms to the lump-sum items in the bill, or in the existing law out of which these officers are now paid, and if that rule is to be followed and then the ruling made recently by the Chair on the agricultural bill is to be followed, why this item would have to be held in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair fully appreciates that the point of order made against the paragraph is similar to the one made against the previous paragraph. The Chair's ruling on that paragraph was based largely upon the information received from the committee, that this appropriation, for such it may be called, is merely an itemization of the lump sum provided on the previous page of the bill. Heretofore, as the Chair understands it, this appropriation has been made in a lump sum, and the manner of the distribution of the amount has been left to some other authority than the Congress. Under the action of the committee in this bill the committee has undertaken to distribute these items to the several States where they think they properly belong, and with that understanding the Chair held that the point of order was not well taken. If the Chair was right in the previous ruling, as he believes rulings of this sort have been made before, he must also overrule the point of order in this instance, and he does so, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of one special agent at \$1,100 and one financial clerk at \$900 per annum, in addition to employees otherwise provided for at the Mackinac Agency; in all, \$2,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to this paragraph of the bill. I desire to ask if the services which are provided for here have been administered heretofore and dispensed by the commissioner?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this is the language carried in the last bill and in this:

For pay of one special agent, \$1,100, and one financial clerk at \$900 per annum.

The lump sum amounted to some \$85,000 this year, and heretofore it amounted to some \$125,000, if I remember correctly, so there is a reduction, and it is on all fours with the other points of order which the gentleman has made.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I am not complaining of the amount of the appropriation at all. I want to congratulate the chairman and his committee upon their conservatism in making reductions and retrenchments in these appropriations; but, Mr. Chairman, I think that this is new legislation, and I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOWLER. That the paragraph creates new positions. It says, "For the pay of one special agent at \$1,100," and there is no authorization for this special agent, Mr. Chairman. Then it provides for "one financial clerk at \$900." There is no authorization for that clerk. I say there is no authorization under the law for those particular positions. It is subject, in my opinion, to the point of order, because it is without authorization and is new legislation.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to suggest that it is carried in the lump sum that we have been discussing at length this afternoon—\$85,000 in the present bill—and this one special agent was inserted for the State of Michigan, and it is the only special agent they have there. We are paying out of the lump sum for this special agent, and it is not a new office or a new officer and does not increase the amount, but decreases the amount of the lump sum.

Mr. FOWLER. What becomes of this new office? Is it in existence to-day?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is not a new office. The one special agent has always been used and heretofore appropriated for under the lump sum.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there any provision in the law for this special agent?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. There is a special agent now, and this amount will be segregated to pay for these positions.

Mr. FOWLER. Can you refer me to the law creating this special agent?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. They have general authority to run all these agents, or else they could not maintain them. They have the power to appoint them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on this unless the gentleman wishes to be heard further.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to be heard further.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

MINNESOTA.

Sec. 9. For support and education of 225 Indian pupils at the Indian school, Pipestone, Minn., and for pay of superintendent, \$39,175; for general repairs and improvements, \$2,500; in all, \$41,675.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out the words "twenty-five hundred dollars," in line 10, page 15, and inserting in lieu thereof "\$4,500, \$1,500 of which shall be used for the installation of an electric lighting system and \$500 of which shall be used for the construction of coal sheds," and by striking out the word "forty-one," in line 11, on page 15, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "forty-three."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that at the time this matter was presented the bill had been made up and was not before the committee, and I have no objection to the item going into the bill, because it has been agreed to by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on his amendment?

Mr. HAMMOND. Just a word, Mr. Chairman. The amendment increases the appropriation by \$2,000, \$1,500 of which amount shall be appropriated for an electric lighting plant and \$500 for coal sheds. The situation is this: There are about 200 pupils in the school. No provision for housing coal at all. About 1,000 tons are used each year, and the greater portion of it is left outside to be disintegrated by the elements and destroyed. The gas plant is an antiquated one. Seven out of the 12 buildings are lighted by gas generated from 4 separate generators. I do not desire to take up the time of the committee. I presented the matter to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and this amendment was accepted by the committee. Unless there are questions to be asked me I desire a vote upon the amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to advance to the executive committee of the White Earth Band of Chippewa Indians in Minnesota the sum of \$1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended in the annual celebration of said band to be held June 14, 1912, out of the funds belonging to said band.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the last paragraph and desire to ask the chairman of the committee if the bridge for which this \$1,000 is appropriated is expected to be beneficial to this tribe of Indians.

Mr. MILLER. This is not a new item. It has been carried in every appropriation bill for many years. The Chippewa Indians of Minnesota have a reunion and sort of festival each year about the 14th of June. It has grown to be a great event. To this festival, as it may be so termed, Indians from the Dakotas come by invitation. They have elaborate ceremonies and games, and they comport themselves in a highly creditable manner, and I think it is the most picturesque and valuable entertainment among the Indians of anything in the Northwest. It is as dear to them almost as the burial grounds of their fathers. They look forward to it as one great event. It is their own money. We are not appropriating any money belonging to the Government. Of course, the only way they can get the money is in this way.

Mr. MURDOCK. What is the action of the expenditure of the \$1,000?

Mr. MILLER. A thousand dollars is simply part of what it costs. These Indians have in the Treasury about \$10,000,000, and there are about \$3,000,000 more for timberlands that have already been sold but not paid for.

Mr. FOWLER. About how many Indians congregate in this festival?

Mr. MILLER. They congregate from every part of the Northwest, and I think they come from Canada now. I think, conservatively stated, there are 6,000 Indians who participate.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you think it has created a friendly feeling?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. And has been beneficial in its results?

Mr. MILLER. Splendid. And they take up for discussion and consideration questions for their own benefit.

Mr. FOWLER. I withdraw my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make an investigation of the conditions on the Navajo Indian Reservation at Shiprock, N. Mex., with respect to the necessity of constructing a bridge across the San Juan River at Shiprock on said reservation, and also to cause surveys, plans, and reports to be made, together with an estimated limit cost for the construction of a suitable bridge at that place, and submit his report thereon to Congress on the first Monday in December, 1912, and the sum of \$1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated for the purpose herein authorized.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that paragraph.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to state, Mr. Chairman, that this bridge was washed out, I understand, last year. The abutments are still there, but the bridge has gone, and the main part of the Navajo Reservation is, I understand, on the south side of the river. This San Juan River is a tributary to the Colorado River of the West. A considerable portion of this Indian reservation is on the opposite side of the river from the railroad, and it has to be crossed by the Indians in order that they may get to the railroad points of shipment, and so forth. They must haul their wool and other products across this bridge. It is a dangerous mountain stream and unsafe to ford, and very often extremely dangerous when there is a rise in the river. The matter was submitted to our committee, and we were unanimously of the opinion that the bridge should be rebuilt for the benefit of these Indians.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it may be necessary. I do not know. It is only recently they have adopted the policy, I think, for building these bridges for the benefit of the Indians out of the General Treasury. A few years ago there were various propositions of this sort introduced in the House which went to the committee of which I had the honor to be a member and for a while the chairman. We never reported any of them favorably, but last year we put a provision in for three new bridges in Arizona and New Mexico, payable out of the General Treasury.

Now, here is the new State of New Mexico, which has some obligation in reference to building bridges. Here is an Indian reservation that ought to have some obligation in reference to the construction of bridges that are needed. On what principle do the gentlemen expect the Federal Treasury to pay for the construction of bridges in a State? We fought here for three whole days as to whether we would contribute the sum finally of \$15,000 to help construct a bridge the necessity for which was caused by the Government taking possession of some property over in Massachusetts for a naval station of some kind. And yet offhand, without consideration and without knowledge, we propose to expend money in the State of New Mexico for the construction of a bridge which may or may not be needed. It certainly is not needed, so far as the convenience of the Government of the United States is concerned.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MANN. I will yield at any point for information.

Mr. FERRIS. The Government did build the former bridge, and when the floods came they washed away a bridge that had been constructed by the Federal Government. It cuts off five or six hundred Indians from their trading point. The Department now asks in their estimate for \$16,000 for the construction of this bridge. We gave them an amount sufficient to go and investigate what the real situation was and to determine whether or not the Federal Government ought to build a bridge there again and to determine also what it should cost.

Mr. MANN. I should think that \$1,000 for making an estimate on the cost of constructing a bridge that costs only \$16,000 was an exceedingly liberal estimate of the estimated expenses of the estimate. [Laughter.]

Mr. FERRIS. Well, it is not required that more shall be expended than is necessary.

Mr. MANN. Does the Government maintain the roads that lead up to the bridge? Ah, the gentleman nods his head. But does it?

Mr. FERRIS. I will say to the gentleman that I did not nod my head.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman who lives in the far West did. I am not referring to the gentleman from Oklahoma. Under what obligation does the Government rest, having built a bridge and given it to these people, now to rebuild it because it has been destroyed? We would think ourselves very lucky, indeed, in my town if we could get the Government to build a bridge the first time, much less follow it up and rebuild it every time it needs rebuilding.

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, you are not an Indian. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. We have more Indians in Chicago than there are in the United States outside of Chicago of red skin. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOEHNE. Of what tribe? [Laughter.]

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the item is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MANN. The item is subject to a point of order, but I will withdraw the point of order, although the item should never have been in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of one special agent at \$1,050, one physician at \$600, and one financial clerk at \$600 per annum, in addition to employees otherwise provided for at the New York Agency; in all, \$2,250.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against that paragraph.

Mr. Chairman, I have discovered, in comparing this bill with the law which was passed at the last session of the last Congress, that it appropriated for New York \$10,500. Now, the same \$10,500 is appropriated, and in addition to that there is \$1,050 appropriated for a special agent, \$600 for a physician, and \$600 for a financial clerk. Mr. Chairman, I can not understand why it is that these three places should be created here in this section when they have not had any existence heretofore.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to inquire of the gentleman now relative to some of these tribes. I see that the Senecas of New York are dealt with and that the Six Nations of New York are dealt with. I desire to ask if these two different appropriations are intended for two different and separate reservations?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. They are Indians in reservations, but under treaty stipulations with the United States Government. They are wards of the Government.

Mr. FOWLER. Do these two reservations approximate each other, or are they some distance apart?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I have never been in that country, and I can not answer.

Mr. FOWLER. I should be glad to have an answer.

Mr. FORNES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I can answer. They are 50 miles apart.

Mr. FOWLER. I thank the gentleman. Now, I desire to know from the chairman of the committee, or some one else of the committee, where this special agent will be located that looks after these two different reservations?

Mr. FERRIS. In reply to that, if the gentleman desires an answer, I will say that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs has full power to direct the agent to go from one part of the agency to the other, and has full power to send the agents out into the field, and from one agency to another. And I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that this is simply one of those items that have been segregated, and the amount in the aggregate is \$8,000 less than the sum total of the general fund that we have segregated.

Mr. FOWLER. If he is a traveling agent you do not fix any limit to the expense for his mileage or traveling expenses.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, the department has some latitude with reference to that. I do not know exactly what it is. The commissioner has some general appropriation that he can use for that purpose.

Mr. FOWLER. Where is the physician located?

Mr. FERRIS. Wherever the commissioner thinks his services are needed most.

Mr. FOWLER. These agencies are 50 miles apart, as I understand. Do you expect to send a physician 50 miles, back and forth, on a salary of \$600 a year?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not know what is in the mind of the commissioner.

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

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have my time extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOWLER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I can not understand the provision creating this position. It provides for only one

physician. There are two agencies at least, and they are at least 50 miles apart.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Does the gentleman imagine that there could be several hundred Indians 50 miles apart that did not have an agency doctor?

Mr. FOWLER. That is the point I make. There is only one position created by this act. Now, where is he located? Is he on one of these reservations, or on the other, or on both? Do his duties require him to deal with both of these reservations?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will permit, it seems to me this paragraph locates this physician. The item says, "For pay of one special agent, at \$1,050, one physician, at \$600, and one financial clerk, at \$600 per annum, in addition to employees otherwise provided for at the New York Agency." That is wherever the New York Agency is.

Mr. FOWLER. That is, in addition to what is otherwise provided for at the New York Agency this position is provided. Now, where is he located, and what services is he to perform?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. He is to perform the services for the Indians of the New York Agency—whatever Indians are accessible to that place. I take it that this is one of the smallest amounts appropriated for a physician. Not infrequently a large number of Indians will be living near a small place.

Mr. FOWLER. Where is the New York Agency located? Will the gentleman answer that? I want to get an understanding of your bill.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. In the State of New York.

Mr. FOWLER. No; I mean at what definite point.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I do not know at what definite point. Evidently it is near some town, and the chances are that the physician lives in some town.

Mr. FOWLER. The gentleman does not give me any information.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. The gentleman does not give me any opportunity to. Will the gentleman yield to me for a further statement?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. No; I do not yield further, Mr. Chairman, because the gentleman does not give me any further information. [Laughter.]

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. The gentleman will not permit me to.

Mr. FOWLER. It is because the gentleman can not.

Mr. FORNES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FORNES. In answer to the gentleman's question, I will say that one agency is in the western part of my county, near Lake Ontario, and the other is in Cattaraugus County, near the southern boundary of the State of New York.

Mr. FOWLER. Where is this physician to be located?

Mr. FORNES. He may be located at one place, but he attends both these places. He is the consulting physician.

Mr. FOWLER. How far apart are these agencies?

Mr. FORNES. About 50 miles apart.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you run your doctor 50 miles, back and forth, at a salary of \$600?

Mr. FORNES. He can go by rail from one agency to the other.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is very kind in his explanation. I would like to insist upon my point of order, but inasmuch as the committee has shown a disposition to try to segregate this work and make it specific and more intelligent, I will withdraw my point of order. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States, at his discretion, the sum of \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the funds on deposit to the credit of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, for the support of the agency and pay of employees maintained for their benefit, and he is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury the further sum of \$40,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the funds on deposit to the credit of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, for the construction and equipment of an Indian hospital upon the Fort Sill Indian School Reservation in Oklahoma, to be used only for the benefit of Indians belonging to said tribes; in all, \$65,000.

Mr. MANN. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, for the past three years the Kiowa Indian agent at Anadarko, Okla., has been constantly at work trying to secure a hospital and a home for the Indians of his reservation that are afflicted with trachoma and ophthalmia, diseases of the eyes. A physician was sent down there by the Indian Office last year to make an examination of the different schools, to see what per cent of the Indians were afflicted, and to see whether the conditions were as severe as the agent had

represented them to be. I have here and will read a statement of the result of that investigation which I think will show the grave necessity for this item. The physician who made the examination was Dr. W. H. Harrison, designated by the department to go out there and make the investigation.

I read from the hearing:

The total number of boys examined at the Fort Sill School was 92, 23 of whom had trachoma, 19 ophthalmia, and the percentage of those diseased was 45; 42 were under treatment. The total number of girls examined was 80, 23 of whom had trachoma, 30 ophthalmia, and 66 per cent were diseased; 53 were under treatment. The total number examined at the Fort Sill School was 172, 46 of whom had trachoma, 49 ophthalmia, and 55 per cent were diseased; 95 were under treatment.

At the Riverside School—

These are two schools on the same reservation—

the total number of boys examined was 66, 56 of whom had trachoma, 21 had ophthalmia, and 84 per cent were diseased; 56 were under treatment. There were 85 girls examined, 56 of whom had trachoma, 28 ophthalmia, and 66 per cent were diseased; 56 were under treatment. The total number examined at Riverside was 151, 112 of whom had trachoma, 49 ophthalmia, and 75 per cent were diseased; 112 were under treatment.

At the St. Patrick's Catholic Indian School there were 36 boys examined, 21 of whom had trachoma, 10 ophthalmia, and 58 per cent were diseased; 21 were under treatment. There were 52 girls examined, of whom 39 had trachoma, 15 ophthalmia, and 75 per cent were diseased; 39 were under treatment. The total number of pupils examined at the St. Patrick School was 88, 60 of whom had trachoma, 25 ophthalmia, and 66 per cent were diseased; 60 were under treatment.

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

Mr. FERRIS. I hope I may have 10 minutes in which to explain this matter. It is a very important matter, and I am anxious to lay the whole matter before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERRIS. He says:

At the Rainy Mountain School the number of boys examined was 69, 59 of whom had trachoma, 21 ophthalmia, and 85 per cent were diseased; 59 were under treatment. There were 72 girls examined, 61 of whom had trachoma, 18 ophthalmia, and 85 per cent were diseased; 61 were under treatment.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman state those figures again?

Mr. FERRIS. He says there were 72 girls examined, 61 of whom had trachoma and 18 ophthalmia.

Mr. COOPER. Sixty-one and 18 added together making 79, or 7 more than the total number of girls.

Mr. FERRIS. He states that 85 per cent were diseased. It may refer to another school. There seems to be a slight discrepancy in those figures.

Mr. COOPER. What were the ages of these children?

Mr. FERRIS. From 6 years to 21 years. This statement is found on page 253 of the hearings. The total number examined at Rainy Mountain School was 141, 120 of whom had trachoma, 39 ophthalmia. Eighty-five per cent were diseased, and 120 were under treatment. Then, there is a telegram signed by 20 or 30 doctors, which reads as follows:

LAWTON, OKLA., December 15, 1911.

HON. SCOTT FERRIS, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.:

We, the physicians of Lawton, Okla., and members in good standing of Comanche County Medical Society, having had some hospital experience with Indians of this vicinity and knowing they are in great need of hospital attention and will be greatly benefited by same, urge that you spare no effort to secure the passage of the Stecker Hospital bill.

Very respectfully,

E. Brent Mitchell, M. D.; H. A. Angus, M. D.; E. S. Goch, M. D.; L. T. Goch, M. D.; P. G. Dulap, M. D.; Jackson Broshears, M. D.; W. N. Hitch, M. D.; B. D. Mecker, M. D.; James L. Lewis, M. D.; F. W. Hammond, M. D.; C. S. Meredith, M. D.; E. S. Dunlap, M. D.; C. H. Hues, M. D.; Louis A. Milne, M. D.; and D. A. Myers, M. D., secretary.

I have a letter from the agent—it is a very long one—to the effect that they will not admit these afflicted children to the regular hospital.

I want to explain that few of the Kiowa and Comanche Indians are far enough along with civilization to be readily admitted to the white hospital. They are almost blanket Indians.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman explain to us the reason for this appalling state of affairs?

Mr. FERRIS. I will give the gentleman the facts as I know them.

Mr. MURDOCK. How long has this condition obtained?

Mr. FERRIS. This disease prevails among the old Indians as well as the young ones. They come to my office to see me about their matters, and their eyes are so glued together and stuck together from the disease that they have to be led.

Now, these people have in the Treasury over \$4,000,000 to their credit and more than a million yet due them. I am not asking the Federal Government to appropriate it for them, but

I think there ought to be a small sum withdrawn from their own funds for the present for the benefit of these Indians.

Mr. MURDOCK. Has this condition obtained for a long time or is it something of recent development?

Mr. FERRIS. It seems to be growing worse. I have lived there now about 11 years, and some of them have had eye diseases all that time. For awhile few, if any, knew what it was. I did not know what ailed them. I thought it was a kind of scrofula or something of that kind, but the physician of the Interior Department, Dr. Harrison, who was sent out there, and the local physicians who come in contact with it, call it ophthalmia and trachoma. They designate it in two ways. I am not able to distinguish which is which. The only thing I know is that they walk the streets of my town and neighboring towns with their eyes glued together and in a pitiable condition.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not understood that trachoma can be communicated by the use of the same towel or anything of that kind?

Mr. FERRIS. I understand that is a well-recognized fact.

Mr. COOPER. It is a most remarkable thing to read that out of 72 girls in a school there are 61 afflicted with that horrible disease.

Mr. FERRIS. I have merely read all of these things so that gentlemen may see how almost universal the disease prevails among them.

Mr. COOPER. It is a sickening recital.

Mr. FERRIS. It is, indeed.

Mr. COOPER. It is strange that such a condition, amounting almost to a pestilence, should have been raging there among these Indians in any such way as that.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, I want to read what the agent in charge says.

Mr. KINDRED. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. KINDRED. May I inquire of the gentleman how many Indians is it proposed may use the hospital? How many are there to be accommodated?

Mr. FERRIS. About 4,081 Indians on this reservation.

Mr. KINDRED. And all of them are to have the privilege of using a hospital to cost \$40,000?

Mr. FERRIS. That is the intention. They would not all be there at once. The disease does not confine them to their beds.

Mr. KINDRED. Is it intended to have a hospital so constructed that these diseases can not be further communicated to other patients in the hospital?

Mr. FERRIS. I may say that it provides that the hospital shall be constructed near the center of the reservation, out in the country, where patients can be treated for these terrible diseases.

Mr. KINDRED. Has not the gentleman observed that there are fewer cases of trachoma and ophthalmia among the Indians who are careful about the sanitary surroundings and observe the rules of personal cleanliness?

Mr. FERRIS. I think that is true. I think it prevails only among the backward tribes. They do not have it on the east side, where the Indians are well along with civilization and education.

Mr. KINDRED. That comports with the fact that it is a highly contagious disease, but flourishes mostly among those who are uncleanly.

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

Mr. FERRIS. With pleasure.

Mr. MORGAN. I observe that the hospital is to be located on the Fort Sill Reservation.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. Can the gentleman state any substantial reason why the hospital should be located at Fort Sill rather than at Anadarko or some other agency?

Mr. FERRIS. It is very near the center of the entire group of counties that have the Indians living in them. That is the first reason. The second reason is that it is near the largest Indian boarding school—the Fort Sill boarding school. An additional reason is that the lands that are to be sold from which the revenue is to be derived lie practically all in this locality. I think that will be satisfactory to the Indians, will be satisfactory to the white citizens, and satisfactory to all concerned when it is once explained.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman thinks that that would be a more suitable location than at the agency at Anadarko?

Mr. FERRIS. We thought so. It is 40 miles south to the Texas line, it is 40 or 50 miles to the extreme northern line of the reservation, and it is equally divided between the east and the west; it is 35 miles to the line to the former Indian Territory and about 35 or 40 miles west to the Greer County, where there are no allotments, as it formerly belonged to Texas.

Mr. MORGAN. I did not hear all of the gentleman's statement, for I was out for a few moments, but I want to ask him if this hospital is intended simply for the children afflicted with diseased eyes, or is it for the infirm and old Indians as well as the young?

Mr. FERRIS. I take it, and it is so stated in all the conversations with the agents of the Indians, and the Indians themselves have expressed the hope that it will be for all of them.

Mr. MORGAN. The entire sum will be used to construct the hospital. Now, where is the provision for maintaining it?

Mr. FERRIS. I have an answer to that question. That has not been overlooked, but has been submitted to the department. They have little remnants of land left over from land sales and openings, and there has been a bill introduced and referred to the Indian Committee, on which a very emphatic and favorable report is to be made, to the effect that these remnant lands shall be sold and the proceeds therefrom go into a hospital fund for maintenance and original cost.

Mr. MORGAN. If the gentleman will permit me a word, a portion of these Indians, as the gentleman knows, live in the second congressional district.

Mr. FERRIS. That is true.

[The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] having expired, by unanimous consent he was given 10 minutes more.]

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, I was very much interested in this proposition, or in any other that will be for the benefit of the Indians in my district.

Mr. FERRIS. I understood the gentleman, and he has been interested at all times, and full credit should be given to the gentleman for his part in securing this legislation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may proceed a little further, I will read from a letter from the Kiowa agent:

There are under my supervision 4,081 Indians, and as far as ordinary business matters between man and man are concerned, 95 per cent of these people are noncompetent and require governmental supervision. They are scattered throughout 108 townships, or over an area 70 by 90 miles in extent, which makes it impossible to properly care for them from a medical standpoint, as it is a physical impossibility for the agency physician to cover so large a territory and keep in proper touch with his patients. Trachoma, tuberculosis, various other diseases, and the usual per cent of painful accidents prevail among them. When within reach of an agency physician they call on him for treatment, if the medicine man or woman does not get the patient first.

I will explain what he means. The Indians have been in the habit of using an herb. I think they call it pyote. They have a superstition that it is the only medicine that can be of any use in curing these diseases. There are a number of Indians who now think they do not want the hospital. They have talked to me about it and they have talked with several Members of the House. They think that a hospital ought not to be built. However, the older Indians, those afflicted with the diseases, want it built, and have so expressed themselves in my office within a few months. Three or four of the Indians came to Washington and said that they wanted a hospital, and wanted the Federal Government to pay for it. They did not want it paid for out of their funds. I said to them that they had \$4,000,000 in the Treasury and had \$1,000,000 yet due from lands that had been sold and are being paid for one-fifth each year, and that that money ought to be used to cure them.

The letter goes on to say:

If they have individual funds, the nearest practicing physician is called, and, in the case of necessary operations a transfer is frequently made to a hospital in one of the neighboring cities. These cases are expensive, and the Indians can not afford the financial drain on their limited resources.

The death rate among children is large, as there is no proper place provided where they can be treated under trained supervision; the physician's efforts invariably fail because his directions are not followed, and dieting is not understood by the Indians generally.

The establishment and maintenance of an Indian hospital is a necessity and should no longer be delayed. Once in operation it will prove a great blessing to these people and will be fully appreciated by them. It will provide a place where their own language is spoken, enabling them to explain intelligently their sufferings and bring them all the relief that science can command, free of cost.

This institution could be made self-supporting. The reserved agency lands herein recommended for sale can well be spared for this purpose, and I know of no better purpose to which the proceeds of such a sale could be applied.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that aside from the schools the physicians have investigated that a large number of children on these reservations remain away from school because they are the severest cases—that their cases are so intensified that they are unable to go to school, and of those the gentleman has no report?

Mr. FERRIS. That is correct. Old men come hobbling up on my porch leading each other by the hand afflicted with this

disease. Now, it is a disease that can be cured. This record was submitted to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and the committee was almost appalled, and they uniformly authorized it to be inserted, and the Indian Commissioner stated in the hearings that he was in hearty accord with the proposal.

Now I want to refer to the objection of a few Indians. There are a few Indians, as I have said, the young and stalwart, that are now and they now think they will be displeased with this provision. Some of them may have called on some of the Members of the House. They want a hospital, but they want the Federal Government to build it. I took the responsibility of this provision myself, and I think the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] will share it with me, particularly as he has some of these Indians in his district. I think that where Indians have more than \$4,000,000 to their credit and only 4,000 of them and have more than \$1,000,000 due them, it will not do an injustice to them to withdraw a small sum of about \$10 per capita, so that they may have a place where they can be treated. The agent told me himself he had found water running under the tents where women were giving birth to children, and where a physician would not go unless the Indian does pay the money for it. That is the situation that prevails. The agent is very anxious about this; he is familiar with every detail of this. He has lived in the barracks with some of these Indians while some of them were scout officers, as he has said in another part of the letter, for the past twenty-odd years, and shows that he is entirely familiar with the disease; that he is entirely familiar with the Indians and entirely familiar with the country, and he thinks that this ought to be given. Now, unless somebody cares to ask a question—

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. FERRIS. I will.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say I favor this appropriation, and in justification for taking the money of the Indians in this instance and appropriating it for the purpose of erecting a hospital for their benefit—in justification thereof I want to say that an agreement was made with the Kiowa and Comanche Indians some years ago by which they ceded and sold to the United States all of their reservation for a consideration of \$1,000,000, and that agreement, of course, had to be ratified by Congress. When it was received here it was ratified by the House and sent to the Senate, and a reservation was made in the agreement by which 480,000 acres was reserved for the use of the Indians as a pasture.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Five hundred and five thousand acres.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Four hundred and eighty thousand acres, as I remember.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then there was a small wood reservation reserved.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The treaty provided that the Indians cede and convey to the United States all their interest in the reservation for a consideration of \$1,000,000, subject to 480,000 acres being reserved temporarily for their use as a pasture, as I have already stated. The balance of the reservation was open to settlement and disposed of, with the exception that 25,000 acres was arbitrarily reserved by the Secretary of the Interior for the use of the Indians as a wood lot, as I recall it, without any authority of law. That 25,000 acres was reserved and not disposed of, in addition to the 480,000 acres. By reason of the opening to settlement of the surplus lands, towns and cities sprung up, railroads were extended, and the lands increased very materially in value.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I ask that my time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Of course, the Indian allotments greatly increased in value also by reason of this development, and later a bill was introduced by the distinguished gentleman, the present chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, proposing to sell the 505,000 acres reserved, if that is the correct amount, and give to the Indians the proceeds. I opposed that bill in one Congress and it was defeated in the House. My opposition was based upon the theory that we had once purchased the land from the Indians and had paid them therefor a full consideration. That if there was no further use by the Indians of this undisposed of land then it belonged to the United States and it was not necessary for us to again purchase it from the Indians. Later a bill was again presented in another Congress and it finally

passed and became a law, and the 505,000 acres were sold under conditions by which the lands sold to the highest bidder and brought on an average about \$11 an acre. Am I correct?

Mr. FERRIS. Twelve dollars and a half.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Twelve dollars and a half an acre, so that we gave to these Indians, after having once purchased all the lands within their reservation, a fund of something like \$5,000,000. Now, my own opinion is that they would probably be better off to-day if they never had had the \$5,000,000; that the condition that the gentleman has described, which is certainly deplorable, would not prevail if it had not been that they had such a fund upon which they could depend for their support. Having given them the money, as I have already indicated, we certainly can and ought to appropriate it as in our judgment will be for their best interests, and I know of no better way of using some of this money than for the purpose that this \$40,000 is to be used.

I was somewhat surprised to learn from the gentleman that the conditions are as deplorable as he has described, in view of the laudatory speeches which were made earlier in the afternoon as to the attitude of the people of Oklahoma toward the Indians; and it simply demonstrates, Mr. Chairman, that the Indian, I do not care whether he is in Oklahoma or wherever he is, has to depend upon the Federal Government or else he suffers when distress overcomes him. Now, I say again that I think this is a worthy proposition, and I think we could expend the money of the Indians in no better way than as provided for in this item.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state that I hope this item in this bill will be adopted. I have passed through this reservation frequently in the last few years on my way from the Capital to my home, and I know the condition described by the gentleman from Oklahoma is true. I have seen these Indians, and these diseases of the eye are certainly not only painful, but there is great danger of infection. I understand that these diseases originated in Mexico among the Mexican Indians and came down through Arizona, passed through New Mexico to Oklahoma, and these Oklahoma Indians have become infected, as I have personally observed. I therefore hope that this item in this bill will become a law and that this hospital will be built for these Indians.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the Government is now employing between 100 and 150 physicians for the purpose of giving treatment to Indians. It maintains a hospital for the treatment of trachoma in Arizona, where extreme cases can be sent. The gentleman from Oklahoma gives to the House a statement concerning trachoma in Oklahoma which has no application whatever to the proposition pending before the House now. There are something less than, I believe, 4,000—

Mr. FERRIS. Four thousand and eighty-one.

Mr. MANN. Where does the gentleman get his figures?

Mr. FERRIS. From the letter of the agent who has them in charge.

Mr. MANN. If the letter of the agent is no better than some other figures furnished in the report of the committee or in the hearings before the committee, it is not worth much. I see, for instance, statistics of the department in one place give the census of the Indians as now proper that was taken 20 years ago and gives a statement of two or three thousand Indians, where the census of the United States, taken last year, gives a little over 1,000, and I apprehend the figures are somewhat similar in this case. My information is there are 2,880 members of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes in Oklahoma, covering a territory of 70 by 90 miles, scattered sparsely through that territory.

Talk about bringing these Indian women to a hospital in the center of it for childbirth. How absolutely ridiculous! The last place they want to go is to a hospital, and they would not be able to gather together from over this territory 70 by 90 miles for that purpose. I apprehend there are not accidents enough to demand a hospital. There is \$40,000 proposed for less than 3,000 individuals. That there may be some trachoma is extremely likely. I do not deny that there may be, but trachoma is not treated by segregating the patients in a hospital.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FURNES. Would you consider it a useless effort to build a hospital in a town containing, say, about 3,000 people? It is claimed there are about 3,000 Indians here. Is it not as well to say those Indians ought to have some place to be sent in order to be treated as to say so where there is an aggregation of about 3,000?

Mr. MANN. The cases are quite different than putting a hospital in a territory covering about 70 by 90 miles square. But there is not a town in the United States with 3,000 that has a \$40,000 hospital. But that is not all. Lawton, in this very reservation, has several hospitals that are open to these Indians.

A MEMBER. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman says I am mistaken, but I believe I am correct.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Does the gentleman believe the infectious diseases ought to be brought in in connection with others?

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman believe that these contagious diseases should be brought into a hospital in connection with all the ills of mankind? That is what you propose to do. You propose to bring these diseases into hospitals where you have cases of childbirth and accident cases.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is the gentleman not aware that buildings can be scattered over quite a distance, like they are here—a considerable distance apart?

Mr. MANN. You can not separate many by means of \$40,000.

Mr. KINDRED. Did not the gentleman from Oklahoma state—

Mr. MANN. I do not know what he stated. Ask him.

Mr. KINDRED. He asked that the eye diseases, and so forth, were to be detached from the main hospital. And that would obviate the objection of the—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from New York knows that there is nothing of that kind here, nor is it the intention of the Indian agent to erect detached hospitals there. Nor did they expect, when it was first presented, to make it a hospital for trachoma. They find a sad state of affairs there and elsewhere in reference to trachoma, and they do not need a hospital to control it. What they need is better police regulations. What they need is to wipe Oklahoma off the map and have General Government control, but that is impossible to do. If Oklahoma were not a State, there would not be any trouble about trachoma there, because the gentleman would not control it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent that all debate be closed in five minutes.

Mr. MANN. I shall object to that. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] had 25 minutes, and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE] had 20 minutes, and half of my time was taken by other gentlemen.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman agree to 10 minutes more?

Mr. MANN. So far as I am concerned, you can close debate now.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The reason for that is that I wish to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] to bring up that part of the bill under the State of Pennsylvania, because I understand there is sickness in his family, and he desires to get away.

Mr. MANN. I can close in two minutes.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. It depends upon how much time I have.

Mr. DAVENPORT. We will get you the time.

Mr. MANN. Then I yield.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Do you think if it were possible to wipe Oklahoma off the map and give the Indians the funds that have been withheld by the Government, it would wipe the disease out of the United States?

Mr. MANN. I would not wipe Oklahoma off the map under any circumstances. [Applause.] We know what they have done under the direction of the gentlemen of the Committee on Indian Affairs and Congress itself.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to know whether this hospital ought to be constructed or not. The gentleman from Oklahoma stated that some Indians came here. Among other Members of the House, they visited me. Whether their statement in reference to the case is correct or not, I do not know. They said they did not need the hospital; that they do not want it. If the Government desires to build it out of the Federal Treasury, of course they would not object. Last February, only recently, when this matter was still pending in the Committee on Indian Affairs, these tribes asked the Indian Commissioner for permission to come to Washington and be heard before this committee.

This was his reply, dated February 20:

Answering your telegram of February 18, requesting permission to visit Washington to protest against the proposed erection of a hospital on the Kiowa Reservation, you are advised that, since the bill for the

proposed hospital does not contemplate the use of tribal funds, the office sees no reason why your committee at this time should visit Washington, and your request is therefore not approved.

That is signed by Mr. Charles F. Hauke, Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and is transmitted through this Indian committee to the superintendent.

Now, it strikes me that under these circumstances these Indians are entitled to a hearing before their committee before their matter is foreclosed.

Mr. Chairman, I think the item is subject to a point of order. It proposes to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, among other things, to withdraw from the Treasury \$40,000 of funds on deposit to the credit of these Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes in Oklahoma for the construction and equipment of a hospital on the Fort Sill Indian School Reservation. Those funds are placed in the Treasury by reason of a law which provides with reference to their disposition, and there is no authority now existing for Congress to take that fund out of the Treasury for the purpose of constructing this hospital. I make the point of order.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the gentleman would not make the point of order, for the reason that I did not want to have him appear hostile to this proposition. But, fortunately for the Indian and fortunately for the community, the item is not, in my opinion, subject to a point of order, as I think I can demonstrate from the law. I read from the Revised Statutes, chapter 2580, page 213, which provides for the opening of the land from which this fund is derived, and under the subhead which provides for the disposition of these funds I read:

Provided, That the money arising from the sale of said lands shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States and placed to the credit of said tribe of Indians, and said deposit of money shall draw 4 per cent interest per annum, and the principal and interest of said deposit shall be expended—

I want the committee to hear this last part—

for the benefit of said Indians in such manner as Congress may direct.

This law is now in full force and effect. This is the act which opened that country to settlement. This is the law that governs the payment of these funds. After the gentleman reads that section I am sure that he will admit that the point of order is not good. Congress having full authority to expend the money for any purpose it desires, the committee having full jurisdiction over Indian matters, the amendment itself being germane, the law itself authorizing us to expend this money for whatsoever purposes Congress directs—all this renders the point of order not well taken, and the amendment is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is mistaken. Congress has the power by legislation to provide this hospital out of these funds, or make any other disposition of the funds. That is a matter of legislation. What we meet now is a point of order on an item in an appropriation bill, and the question is whether that item is authorized by law. Congress has not disposed by legislation of these funds. It is competent for Congress to do it. Why, Mr. Chairman, we have millions of money in the Treasury. Every dollar of it is subject to disposition by Congress. It does not require a statute law to say that Congress may appropriate every cent of it. But when it comes to an item in an appropriation bill you must have authority for the appropriation. We have the authority to legislate and provide for the disposition of the funds, and this Committee on Indian Affairs undoubtedly has the authority to report a bill which is pending before it making provision for this hospital. But it has not reported such a bill. No such bill has been passed. There is no law providing for it, and so long as that is the case I maintain that there is no authority for the item in the appropriation bill.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I just desire to add one statement to the suggestion I made a few moments ago. The Congress of the United States and the Committee on Indian Affairs have the authority to appropriate money for the welfare of these Indians so long as it does not change an existing law. This authority was given when the act was passed opening the country which created this precise fund, and I do not think the gentleman ought seriously to contend that his point of order is good.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have to ask the indulgence of the committee until he investigates the matter.

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent, or will ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] to ask unanimous consent, if he wants to go to the other item, if the Chair desires to pass this one over temporarily.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then I will submit the request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FERRIS. Reserving the right to object, let us have a ruling before we quit to-night, so that we will not have to hash the thing all over to-morrow.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent that the Pennsylvania item may be called up out of its order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the Pennsylvania item be taken up out of its order. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will ask the Clerk to read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PENNSYLVANIA.

SEC. 20 For support and education of Indian pupils at the Indian school at Carlisle, Pa., and for pay of superintendent, \$132,000; for general repairs and improvements, \$5,000; for completing steam heating plant, \$7,500, to be immediately available; in all, \$144,500.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED], for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED].

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 29, line 5, strike out the word "five" and insert the word "twelve," so that as amended it will read "for general repairs and improvements, \$12,000."

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] and the committee for the courtesy extended to me. I offer this amendment in the hope that it will be acceptable to the committee. I shall take but a moment to explain it.

The Carlisle Indian School is located on property which the Government has owned for nearly a century. It was formerly used as a Cavalry barracks. It has cost the Government something like a million of dollars. Some of the buildings are pretty old, and the cost of repairs is at least equal to that of any other school with similar buildings and capacity. The amount allowed in this instance is very much lower than the needs of the institution require. Sherman Institute, California, which has 550 pupils, is allowed in the bill \$10,000 for repairs and improvements. Haskell Institute, with 750 pupils, is allowed \$10,000. Salem, Oreg., with 600 pupils, is allowed \$9,000. Rapid City, S. Dak., with 250 pupils, is allowed \$8,000, while Carlisle is allowed but \$5,000. This institution needs \$12,000 for repairs. It had last year 1,228 pupils enrolled, and the average attendance was 1,021; so that if \$12,000 be allowed for repairs and improvements to this institution, it will be less in proportion than the sum allowed in this bill to other schools, while the buildings at Carlisle are older and more repairs are needed. I offer the amendment in the hope that the chairman [Mr. STEPHENS] will accept it.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. There is a measure pending that will, I hope, transfer the 120 students at Hampton, Va., to Carlisle or some other school. I do not think the Hampton School is any better than the Carlisle School. I am simply making a statement of the reasons why I will agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania to meet him halfway. The estimate on this item was, I understand, \$9,000 for improvements. The committee reduced that estimate, and if the gentleman will meet me on that halfway ground I will agree to that.

Mr. OLMSTED. I believe the estimate by the department was \$9,000.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. OLMSTED. Since then the superintendent of the school has had an interview with the department, and he writes me that the department, if called upon, would approve \$12,000. However, the Superintendent of Indian Affairs is not here today. He went to Carlisle yesterday to attend the commencement. I have had no communication with him, and am not authorized to speak for him. I do not wish to have any controversy at all with the Committee on Indian Affairs on this matter, and if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] will say \$10,000, I will consent to modify my amendment, although the school really needs the \$12,000.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it would be violating the precedents, or rather furnishing a bad one, for an Appropriation Committee to exceed a department estimate. The only reason I agree to \$9,000 is because it is the amount the department asked for in their estimate. And for the further reason that I hope the students at Hampton will be transferred to this Indian school at Carlisle or some other equally good one; and the further reason that a great many of the buildings at Carlisle are

old frame buildings and badly out of repair. I have visited the school frequently and know the conditions there. The number of students is greater than in any other Indian school in the United States, and they are conducting an excellent school there. In view of all the existing facts and conditions I am willing to let the amount stand as estimated by the department at \$9,000.

Mr. OLMSTED. Very well, Mr. Chairman, if I may have consent, I will modify my amendment so as to make it \$9,000 instead of \$12,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modify the amendment by striking out "twelve" and inserting "nine."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I desire to say just a word on the point of order pending against the item for the hospital for the Kiowa and Comanche Indians at Fort Sill. My contention is that we have already by legislation provided that the proceeds from the sale of certain lands should be placed in the Treasury to the credit of these Indians. The money therefore is their money. It is not in the same status as are funds generally that belong to the United States that are in the Treasury. These moneys were deposited there to the credit of these Indians and belong to them; and in my judgment there is no question at all but what they are subject to appropriation without any additional legislation. Now, if it was general money in the Treasury, it would be a different proposition. We appropriate annually for these Indians for their care and support from the funds in the Treasury belonging to them, strictly in accordance with the law, and under the language of the act which was read by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] I can not see how it is possible to sustain the point of order that this is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to call the attention of the committee to section 822 of the House Manual and Digest:

Appropriations for new buildings and Government institutions have sometimes been admitted when intended for the purposes of the institutions; but later decisions, in view of the indefinite extent of the practice made possible by the early decisions, have ruled out propositions to appropriate for new buildings in navy yards and other establishments. Appropriations for new schoolhouses in the District of Columbia, for new Army hospitals, for new lighthouses, armor-plate factories, and for additional playgrounds for children in the District of Columbia have also been held not to be in continuation of a public work.

The citation by the gentleman from Oklahoma of the statute which he says authorizes this action by the committee seems to the Chair to provide that the funds of these Indians derived from the sale of lands shall be placed in the National Treasury to their credit and draw a specified interest. But it occurs to the Chair that after these funds are placed there by statutory enactment it would certainly require legislation of some sort to take these funds out and disburse them, and therefore require new legislation. The Chair is inclined to hold that the point of order by the gentleman from Illinois is well taken, and does so hold, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment to that same section.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas how long he intends to continue to-night.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I would like to reach the paragraph in relation to the Five Civilized Tribes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have an amendment that will probably take considerable time to discuss, and I would like to get away before long. It will come in on this same page.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. We will determine that when we reach it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 23, after line 4, insert the following paragraph:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States, at his discretion, the sum of \$250,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the funds on deposit to the credit of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, and pay out the same for the benefit of said tribes for their maintenance and support and improvements of their homesteads, for the ensuing year, in such manner and under such regulations as he may prescribe."

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in justification of that item I desire to submit the following letter, dated March 19, 1912, from the department:

Three successive crop failures in Oklahoma, resulting from severe droughts, have left the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians in a deplorable financial condition, and they are now in urgent need of assistance until a crop can be produced.

In this connection your attention is invited to the inclosed copy of a letter dated March 6, 1912, from Ernest Stecker, superintendent of the

Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians, setting out in detail the financial conditions of these Indians, particular attention being invited to the following paragraph from said letter:

"The years of 1909, 1910, and 1911 were disastrous on account of severe droughts, which burned up the crops year after year, and owing to these conditions and the large Indian credits outstanding business was paralyzed. Banks refused to make loans; wholesale houses are crowding the retailers, who, in turn, are crowding the Indians for a settlement. The money lenders harass them to such an extent that they are afraid to remain at home and they wander about, dodging the collectors, in state of unrest which is becoming a menace to their progress. Because of the fact that these three tribes have large funds and always enjoyed liberal payments, business of all kinds has taken long chances with them, and to-day I believe their section of the country is in a more embarrassing financial condition than any other section in the United States."

Here is what the department recommends:

I have the honor to recommend and urge that the proposed legislation receive the early and favorable consideration of your committee and the Congress.

This is the same item that the bill has been carrying year after year. The committee cut it out of our bill as reported to the House without knowing the condition of these Indians, and I therefore ask that this amendment be placed in the bill. It was estimated for by the department.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman says that we have been carrying the item year after year.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. For four years.

Mr. MANN. On account of the drought conditions?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No; we have been giving this amount of money, and we thought this year we could dispense with it. It is from their own funds.

Mr. MANN. I understand that, but we have given them appropriations several times on account of the drought down there. Does the gentleman think, as suggested by some one near me, that next year it will be a flood that we will be asked to provide against?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I hope not. Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof, as the Good Book says.

Mr. MANN. Is it not a fact that the Indians have already been taught to believe that they can live on what they can get out of the Treasury of the United States, which belongs to them, it is true, and that they will not and do not do any work of any kind?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas a question or two. I would like to know if there is any provision made for the Cheyennes or Arapahoes?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No; there is no request from the department in their behalf. Had there been, we would have investigated the matter and made the appropriation if the facts justified it. This amendment has been authorized by the committee on Indian Affairs and at the request of the agent of these Indians and of the department we have agreed to accept the amendment, and I have therefore offered it on the floor. Had the Cheyennes or any other Indians come before the committee and shown the same condition and state of facts, we would have treated them in the same way.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

For support and education of 500 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Chillico, Okla., and for pay of superintendent \$83,500; for general repairs and improvements, \$6,500; in all, \$90,000.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this item be passed.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment and have it read for information and have it printed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 21, page 23, insert the following:
"The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with the Campbell Soil Co., of Lincoln, Nebr., or any other competent persons or company, for a demonstration by said soil-culture company of what is known as the Campbell system of intensive, scientific soil culture and dry farming, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him; such contract to provide 640 acres out of what is known as the Chillico Reservation, used in connection with the Chillico Indian School, in Oklahoma, shall be entered upon by such soil-culture company so contracted with and used for intensive and scientific farming for a period of 20 years; said farm to be open at all times for Indians and other citizens of the United States wishing practical instruction in and information as to the value of such system of farming, the consideration for such instruction being the free use of said land for said period of 20 years; *Provided*, That the party or parties contracting to operate such farm shall give a sufficient bond, to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, for the faithful performance on its part or their part of the conditions of the contract and the observance of the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against the proposed amendment.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. UNDERWOOD having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. BARNHART, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20728—the Indian appropriation bill—and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 14918. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 252. An act to establish in the Department of Commerce and Labor a bureau to be known as the children's bureau;

S. 5718. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to secure for the United States title to patented lands in the Yosemite National Park, and for other purposes;

S. 3475. An act extending the time of payment to certain homesteaders on the Cheyenne River Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and on the Standing Rock Reservation, in the States of South Dakota and North Dakota;

S. 2434. An act providing for an increase of salary of the United States marshal for the district of Connecticut; and

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution authorizing the Librarian of Congress to furnish a copy of the daily and bound CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the undersecretary of state for external affairs of Canada in exchange for a copy of the Parliamentary Hansard.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 5137. An act for the relief of Alice V. Houghton; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5246. An act to redeem a certain outstanding certificate of indebtedness issued by the late board of audit of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 5817. An act granting to the county of Hill, in the State of Montana, the jail building and fixtures now upon the abandoned Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation, in the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 290. An act to authorize the appointment of dental surgeons in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. CRAVENS, 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. 20842. An act to provide for a tax on white phosphorus matches, and for other purposes;

H. R. 15471. An act making appropriations for repair, preservation, and exhibition of the trophy flags now in store at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.; and

H. R. 14918. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,

Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Very respectfully, yours,

M. E. OLMSTED.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ELECTION OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means and at the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], chairman of the conference of

the minority, I nominate Mr. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH, of Minnesota, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. OLNSTED, which has just been read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri moves the election of Mr. LINDBERGH, of Minnesota, to fill a vacancy on the Committee on the Election of President and Vice President.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move, at the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, that Mr. J. HAMPTON MOORE, of Pennsylvania, be elected to fill a vacancy now existing on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means and at the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], chairman of the conference of the minority, I nominate Hon. MARLIN E. OLNSTED, of Pennsylvania, to fill a vacancy on the Committee on Appropriations, and move his election.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Saturday, April 6, 1912, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to provision in Agriculture appropriation bill, approved March 4, 1911, statement of expenditures for national forest administration, etc. (H. Doc. No. 681), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Texas, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21960) to authorize the Port Arthur Pleasure Pier Co. to construct a bridge across the Sabine-Neches Canal, in front of the town of Port Arthur, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 502), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MONDELL, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21221) making a grant of lands for school purposes in block No. 31, town site of Powell, Shoshoni reclamation project, Wyoming, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 503), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LOBECK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21768) to provide for a primary nominating election in the District of Columbia, at which the qualified electors of the said District shall have the opportunity to vote for their first and second choice among those aspiring to be candidates of their respective political parties for President and Vice President of the United States, to elect their party delegates to their national conventions, and to elect their national committeemen, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 504), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16518) for the relief of the Fifth-Third National Bank, of Cincinnati, Ohio, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 500), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 22907) to provide American registry for the steamer *Damara*; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 22908) providing for the adjustment and payment of the accounts of letter carriers arising under the eight-hour law; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HANNA: A bill (H. R. 22909) providing that the United States shall in certain cases make compensation for the use of highways for carrying free rural-delivery mail; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATHRICK: A bill (H. R. 22910) to place upon the free list certain food and other products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOBSON: A bill (H. R. 22911) to provide for auxiliary vessels for the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PROUTY: A bill (H. R. 22912) regulating lobbying and preventing employees of the Government of the United States and the District of Columbia from raising funds for lobbying purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 22913) to create a department of labor; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LENROOT: Resolution (H. Res. 482) amending Rule XXVII, providing for a Suspension Calendar; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FORNES: Memorial of the Senate of the State of New York, asking legislation for the protection of migratory game birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 22914) granting a pension to John R. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22915) granting a pension to Otto Marlotzi; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AKIN of New York: A bill (H. R. 22916) granting a pension to Melvin Howe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 22917) granting a pension to Virginia Hendrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 22918) granting a pension to Mary J. Chambers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22919) granting a pension to Sarah E. Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 22920) granting an increase of pension to John Phelan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 22921) granting a pension to Frank Morgan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22922) granting a pension to Mary Dunn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 22923) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Degman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22924) granting an increase of pension to David A. Tipton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 22925) granting an increase of pension to Philip Fitch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 22926) granting a pension to Edward Flannery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22927) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 22928) granting a pension to Thomas Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 22929) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 22930) granting a pension to John Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 22931) granting an increase of pension to Edward Lenihan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McMORRAN: A bill (H. R. 22932) granting a pension to Elizabeth Bowles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 22933) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Edgar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 22934) granting a pension to Margaret E. Oursborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22935) granting a pension to P. B. Pulley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22936) granting an increase of pension to John H. Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 22937) granting a pension to Daniel J. Strout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 22938) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Langdon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 22939) for the relief of John K. Wren; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 22940) granting an increase of pension to Reason J. Dobbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 22941) for the relief of the heir of John Holloway; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 22942) granting a pension to Rachel Biggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22943) granting a pension to William E. Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22944) granting a pension to James F. Morrisey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22945) granting an increase of pension to William Rigsby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 22946) granting an increase of pension to William H. McAtee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. AIKEN of South Carolina: Petition of the third division of the Edgefield Association, of Madoc, S. C., for passage of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of O'Neal Street and Mollohon Methodist Church, of Newberry, S. C.; of Baptist Association of Edgefield, S. C.; and of the Woman's Missionary Society of South Main Street Church, of Greenwood, S. C., in favor of passage of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AINEY: Petition of citizens of East Athens, Bradford County, Pa., in favor of passage of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Granges Nos. 237 and 1166, Patrons of Husbandry, for enactment of House bill 19133, providing for a governmental system of postal express; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petition of the Christian Union Church and others, of Blue Ridge, Harrison County, Mo., for passage of Kenyon-Webb interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota: Petition of J. A. Larson and 5 others, of Hayfield, Minn., against extension of parcel-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petitions of Dr. Homer S. Ainsworth and A. I. Clymer, of Van Wert, Ohio, for enactment of House bill 17222; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of E. M. Kizer (H. R. 15288); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of Caroline L. Loftus (H. R. 2270); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Rev. J. S. Harvey and the West Bedford charge of the Methodist Episcopal Church, West Bedford, Ohio, for passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Louis Bleber and 20 other citizens of Newark, Ohio, protesting against passage of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Resolutions of the city council of Pittsburgh, Pa., and Civic Club of Allegheny County, Pa., protesting against House bill 21292, authorizing construction of bridge across Monongahela River in city of Pittsburgh by Liberty Bridge Co.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of 120 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of the construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of 172 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of House bill 20281, providing for a 1-cent tax on margarin; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of the Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal.; the Board of Trade of Kansas City; the Business Men's League of St. Louis, Mo.; the American Manufacturers' Export Association of New York City; and the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of proposed International Congress of Chambers of Commerce, to be held in Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Workmen Helpers' Association, the Aloysius Untuetzung Verein, and the St. Boniface Society of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against a resolution of inquiry in relation to Catholic Indian missions; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petitions of 15 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., asking that the duties on raw and refined sugars be reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of S. H. Morton & Co., of St. Louis, and citizens of Jefferson Barracks and Valley Park, Mo., in favor of a parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of the St. Louis Advertising Men's League; the Jno. M. Eckles & G. A. Tany Hardware Co.; the Hammer Dry Plate Co.; the Missouri Retail Hardware Association; the C. J. Harris Lumber Co.; the Majestic Manufacturing Co.; the Simmons Hardware Co.; the A. C. Clayton & Sons Printing Co.; Albert Ashwell; W. H. Vogt and 28 other citizens of St. Louis; the Grossheim Hardware Co., of Webster Groves; and V. B. Beckman & Co., of University City, Mo., protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of United Spanish War Veterans and members of Camp Corporal Lorraine B. De Witt, Army of the Philippines, of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of enactment of House bill 17470; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petitions of the Pendleton Grain Co.; George D. Barnard Co.; the Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis; and the Mexico Commercial Club, of Mexico, Mo., for 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of the Business Men's League, Scudder-Gale Grocer Co., Ferguson Waterproof Co., American Fixture & Showcase Manufacturing Co., the Koken Barbers' Supply Co., T. B. Boyd Furnishing Goods Co., J. F. Conrad Grocer Co., and the Campbell Iron Co., of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against House bill 16844, providing for the marking of all manufactured articles; to the Committee on Interstate & Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Polish National Alliance of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the illiteracy test of immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Missouri Fish and Game League, of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of House bill 36, providing for the protection of migratory game birds of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Consolidated Coal Co., of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of President Taft's proposition to create a national commission on labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of St. Philomena's Technical School, St. Louis, Mo., protesting against Borah bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Augustus L. Abbott and 46 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of the children's bureau bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, St. Louis, Mo., in favor of the children's bureau bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of sundry women of New York, in favor of the restoration of the Army canteen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of House bill 16450, introduced by Mr. Carlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Parker-Russell Mining & Manufacturing Co., of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the reduction of the tax on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Petition of J. F. Waldrup, W. F. Daniel, and other citizens of Macon, Ga., asking to have one battleship built in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CRAVENS: Petition of citizens of Greenwood, Ark., for construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Petition of voters of the township of Henderson, Sibley County, Minn., for passage of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of voters of North Mankato, Nicollet County, Minn., for passage of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Pine Island and Zumbrota, Minn., protesting against parcel-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Thomas F. Shaughnessy, of Belle Plains, Minn., and by Minnesota Cooperative Dairies' Association,

against Lever oleomargarine bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOREMUS: Petition of Charles A. Bush and others, of Detroit, Mich., for passage of the Berger old-age pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Luther Detwiler (H. R. 17304); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FORNES: Memorial of Camas (Mont.) Hot Springs Commercial Club, relative to certain irrigation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of the State Board of Charities of New York, for illiteracy test of immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Illinois Bankers' Association, for farm demonstration work throughout the country; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the National Civic Federation, for a workman's compensation law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of William McKinney, of New York City, protesting against certain proposed patent legislation; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Max John and other merchants, of Mendota, Ill., against the enactment of parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the National Civic Federation, favoring the passage of the Sutherland bill (S. 5382), to provide remedy and compensation for accidental injuries to railway employees, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOULD: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ripley, Me., and the People's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Ripley, Me., for passage of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HAWLEY. Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of The Dalles and citizens of Oregon City, Oreg., for passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of John Echaff (H. R. 22395); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of Ashford Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Ashford, Conn., for passage of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Thompson, Conn., against passage of parcel-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Waltham, Mass., favoring passage of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petition of D. Y. Richards and 60 other citizens, of Conway, Ark., for the Sulzer parcel-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Petition of the members of Mohegan Tribe, No. 106, Improved Order of Red Men, of Pittsfield, Mass., in support of the bill for an Indian memorial building in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEVY: Petition of the Retail Cutlers' Association of New York and Vicinity, for legislation to prohibit the issuance of coupons and trading stamps; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Illinois Bankers' Association, for farm demonstration work throughout the country; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, endorsing pending legislation to improve the foreign service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Camas (Mont.) Hot Springs Commercial Club, relative to certain irrigation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of Noah E. Cramer and 200 other citizens of Frederick County, Md., for a Lincoln memorial highway from Washington to Gettysburg; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MCKINNEY: Petition of citizens of East Moline, Ill., for passage of the Griest bill, extending the benefits of free delivery of mail to smaller cities; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Petition of Frank Burt and others, of Capac, Mich., protesting against the enactment of parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Frank Burt and others, of Capac, Mich., asking legislation with reference to the express business; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the pastor and members of the Bethlehem Presbyterian Church, of Philadelphia, favoring House joint resolution 163, in opposition to alcoholic liquor traffic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARRAN: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Rachel A. Houck (H. R. 22804); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: Memorial of Trades and Labor Assembly of New Athens, Ill., favoring House resolution 396; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of Trades and Labor Assembly of New Athens, Ill., favoring House bill 11032; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorials of Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, and Local No. 7, International Brotherhood of Photo-Engravers, of Belleville, Ill., favoring House bill 13114; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPEER: Papers to accompany bills for the relief of James Miller, Alexander C. Kellam, and Richard M. Hoffman (H. R. 22449, 22453, and 22902); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Memorial of the South Pasadena (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, for improvement of the Railway Mail Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Charles D. Chase, of Los Angeles, Cal., for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SULZER. Memorial of the Seattle (Wash.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to encouragement of American ships engaged in coastwise commerce through the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAGGART: Petitions of citizens of the State of Kansas, for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of citizens of the State of Kansas, protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and citizens of Prairie Center, Kans., for passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of citizens of the State of Kansas, for enactment of House bill 21225; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of Camps Nos. 9 and 15, Department of Kansas, United Spanish War Veterans, for enactment of House bill 17470; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorials of the Mercantile Club of Kansas City, Kans., and the Kaw Valley Drainage District, for improvement of a certain portion of the Missouri River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of citizens of the State of Kansas, for construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Golden Belt Educational Association of Kansas, for enactment of Senate bill 3; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Kansas City Live Stock Exchange, asking that the special tax on oleomargarine be reduced to 1 cent per pound; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Local No. 158, United Garment Workers of America, of Fort Scott, Kans., for enactment of House bill 20432; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of A. H. Lathrop, pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Creston, Iowa, for speedy passage of Kenyon-Sheppard bills (S. 4043 and H. R. 16214); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS: Petition of citizens of Shreveport, La., for construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Petition of Central Labor Union of Trenton, N. J., urging that a clause be inserted in this year's naval appropriation bill, providing for the building of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of J. G. Saffarhwait, of Trenton, N. J., for a Lincoln memorial road from Washington to Gettysburg; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of N. L. Coleman, of Trenton, N. J., asking that the duties on raw and refined sugars be reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Petition of A. M. Tate and other citizens, of Kemp, Tex., in favor of legislation to prohibit gambling in farm products, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.