

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Corpl. Edward Oliver Halbert, Forty-seventh Company, Coast Artillery Corps, to be second lieutenant in the Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from August 30, 1913.

Master Gunner Harry Lee King, Coast Artillery Corps, to be second lieutenant in the Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from August 30, 1913.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander Frank Lyon, an additional number in grade, to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1913.

Lieut. Commander John McC. Luby to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1913.

Lieut. Frederick L. Oliver to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1913.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Arthur A. Garcelon, jr. to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1913.

Stanley E. Crawford, a citizen of Pennsylvania, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 25th day of August, 1913.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Joseph E. Terral, of Hobart, Okla., to be receiver of public moneys at Woodward, Okla., vice Charles C. Hoag, term expired May 21, 1913.

D. E. Burkholder, of Chamberlain, S. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Gregory, S. Dak., vice Oliver C. Kippenbrock, term expired March 15, 1913.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Edwin M. Starcher, of Fairfax, S. Dak., to be register of the land office at Gregory, S. Dak., vice Thomas C. Burns, term expired March 15, 1913.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 4, 1913.

AMBASSADOR.

Henry Morgenthau to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Turkey.

SECRETARY OF EMBASSY.

Edward Bell to be second secretary of embassy at London, England.

SECRETARY OF LEGATION.

John Van A. MacMurray to be secretary of legation at Peking.

POSTMASTERS.

IOWA.

M. H. Kelly, Waterloo.
J. S. Wildman, Blockton.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Samuel K. Henric, Youngwood.
George F. Kittelberger, Curwensville.
Harry B. Krebs, Mercersburg.
Edward J. Loraditch, Sand Patch.
William H. McQuilken, Glen Campbell.
Charles E. Putnam, Linesville.
John H. Shields, New Alexandria.
Clayland M. Touchstone, Moores.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn September 4, 1913.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Joseph E. Terrell to be receiver of public moneys at Woodward, Okla., which was sent to the Senate August 29, 1913.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, September 4, 1913.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Infinite and Eternal Spirit, Father of all souls, we bless Thee that Thou hast spared our lives and brought us to the light of this day. Keep us, we beseech Thee, throughout its remaining hours to the high-water mark of Christian manhood, that whatever work we may accomplish may be to the good of the common weal and redound to Thy glory. And Thine be the praise, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

SALE OF MEAT IN ENGLAND.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the letter which I send to the Clerk's desk be read.

Mr. FOSTER. Reserving the right to object, what is the letter about?

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. It is about the sale of meat in England, showing the discrepancy in the price.

Mr. FOSTER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. BORLAND. Objection has already been made.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7898, a bill making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1913, and for other purposes. 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. 7898, with Mr. Flood of Virginia in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7898. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The bill was reported by title.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Examination of fourth-class postmasters: For necessary additional office employees, printing, stationery, travel, contingent, and other necessary expenses of examinations, \$30,000; field examiners at the rate of \$1,500 per annum each, for work in connection with members of local boards and other necessary work as directed by the commission, \$9,000; in all, \$39,000, to be available during the fiscal year 1914.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I do so for the purpose of asking that the communication I send to the Clerk's desk be read in my time.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is clearly out of order. I have been recognized, and I am talking under the five-minute rule.

Mr. FOSTER. The letter, I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey, can only be read by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can read the letter himself if he desires to do so.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order, that the letter does not apply to the paragraph under debate.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make the point of order that it is too late. Debate has already commenced and an amendment has been offered.

Mr. BORLAND. No debate has commenced.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The amendment has been offered.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. This letter, I will say, Mr. Chairman, comes from the Rev. John J. Lawrence, of Binghamton, N. Y., and it reads as follows:

253 WASHINGTON STREET,
Binghamton, N. Y., September 2, 1913.

EUGENE F. KINKEAD, Esq.

MY DEAR SIR: Your two telegrams of yesterday are to hand. I presume that any newspaper statement you have seen connecting my name with a criticism of the American Beef Trust must have been based upon the statements made by a reporter in the Binghamton Press of last Saturday. That account was "written up" by a reporter in a way distasteful to me, and terms and phrases were used for which my interview gave no warrant. I will place the whole case before you very carefully.

I have long had a suspicion that some American productions are sold more cheaply in Great Britain than at home, and on my recent visit I promised a friend that I would compare the prices of American meat in England with the prices here.

On or about Wednesday, July 30, my daughter and I visited the city of Hereford, England. It is not a large city (probably not more than 20,000 people). The railway station is at one extreme end of the city; in fact, there appears to be a walk of nearly one-fourth of a mile from the station before getting right into the city.

On our way from the station, on the left-hand side, and just past the entrance into Hereford, we noticed a meat store, with prices affixed to nearly every piece of meat for sale.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman is not speaking to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey will suspend the reading. The point of order is made that the gentle-

man from New Jersey [Mr. KINKEAD] is not speaking to his amendment. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the bill that we have before us to-day has a peculiar connection with the question I have presented, and realizing that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] understands the connection with the bill, I will proceed with the reading of the letter in order.

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

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand that because of the appointment of fourth-class postmasters the gentleman is beefing? [Laughter.]

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. The gentleman has had more experience with fourth-class postmasters than I have. I come from the city of Jersey City, whereas he comes from the town of Chicago.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman had given attention to the question I asked he would have been able to catch my remarks.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I can not hear you. I have tried to be as courteous to the gentleman as he has been to me. I said I could not hear him.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is so excited since he became candidate for State chairman he does not listen to anybody else.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I know, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] agreed to come up to New Jersey and make a speech for me if I needed it. [Laughter.]

I continue to read:

I can not now recall the name of the store, but am positive as to its location. We saw that the prices were low. We inquired, and were told that it was "American meat" (exclusively). Thinking that the word "American" might be ambiguous to the salesman, I said, "What do you mean by 'American'? Do you mean Canadian?" He replied, "No; I mean the States."

Both my daughter (a young college student of 19) and I carefully priced the meat. The most expensive piece was a fine sirloin of perhaps 10 or 12 pounds. That was 8d. (16 cents). The next piece was 7d. (15 cents). Hind quarters of lamb were marked 7d. (15 cents). There were excellent boiling pieces of beef marked down as low as 5d. (10 cents). I could not discover any pork.

Both my daughter and I can positively swear to these prices. On that point there can be no possible question.

The quality of the meat looked splendid. Now the question is, Was it American meat? You can readily see that on that point—really the vital point—I have no positive proof. It would not be English meat sold as American, because English meat commands a higher price. In assuring me that the meat came from "the States" the man may have been speaking falsely. I noticed splendid meat at about the same prices in Shrewsbury, England, but on careful examination I found that came from Argentina.

One thing seems sure. Either that Hereford butcher was selling United States beef at prices about 50 per cent less than we pay for the same, or he was selling Argentine beef or beef from some other part of North or South America as United States beef and deceiving the English people.

And even if it was United States meat I can, of course, have no proof that it was sold by the Beef Trust. I never mentioned Beef Trust to the Binghamton reporter. For all I know there may be a hundred independent concerns selling United States beef all over Britain.

What I do know and can swear to is the fact of that Hereford store; the prices of the meat; the quality of the meat; the fact that the salesman assured me that it was United States meat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to conclude the reading of this letter. It is only about half a minute longer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], in charge of the bill, whether it is his intention to permit during the afternoon the discussion of any one of a thousand and one subjects that have no relation to the bill? Of course, if he intends to do that, I shall object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not propose to have any further extraneous discussion.

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman is playing favorites.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KINKEAD] is a member of the committee.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from New York knows that he can not discriminate in that way.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from New Jersey was not permitted to speak yesterday. Let us hope he will get 10 minutes to-day. I hoped that he would have 10 minutes of the time set aside for general debate.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am only asking for six minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to be allowed to proceed for one minute longer. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I proceed:

My own opinion, which I offer respectfully, is that this whole matter calls for very careful and impartial investigation. Are you aware that taking the "lb" as the unit, the American pays two and a-half times as much for his bread as does the Englishman, while a large proportion of English bread is made from American flour. This I have tested and proved by actual loaves of bread, priced, paid for, and exhibited side by side. It is all part of the same general question.

I am rather curious to know your impression of these statements of fact carefully made.

Yours, truly,

JOHN J. LAWRENCE.

Mr. Lawrence is from Binghamton, N. Y. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I do not wonder at my good friend from Chicago [Mr. MANN] now and then showing signs of temper. I said during the Sixty-second Congress that we would be able to prove before the discussion of the tariff was over that American beef was sold in Great Britain and other European countries at a lower price than we were paying for it in this country. I do not wonder now, I say, that the gentleman representing the home of the packers, representing the home of Morris and Swift, the home of Armour and Cudahy, should rise in his place and ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if he were going to allow discussion in this Chamber during the afternoon on a question of whether Americans would be further compelled to pay more for their meat than the prices at which American meat is sold to the people of European countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from New Jersey have five minutes more.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order. I object.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to this paragraph. I offer it on my own responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, at the end of line 6, by inserting the following: "The Executive orders of May 7, 1913, October 15, 1912, and November 30, 1908, placing the positions of postmaster of the fourth class in the classified service and all regulations made thereunder are hereby revoked, and hereafter appointments to said positions shall be made in the same manner as obtained prior to the making of such Executive orders."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] makes the point of order. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman from New York on the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is new legislation, and it is not germane to this paragraph.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph—I am discussing the point of order—provides for \$39,000 in this bill to pay the expenses of holding the examinations for the selection of fourth-class postmasters, which had not been done prior to these orders.

Rule XXI, paragraph 2, 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.

*This proposition, Mr. Chairman, has been before the House since the adoption of this rule, known as the Holman rule, and it has been enforced since the beginning of the Sixty-second Congress, and, in my judgment, this amendment meets absolutely the exceptions to the rule provided for in the rule.

It certainly will save the expenditure of this \$39,000 carried in this paragraph of the bill, because the paragraph in the bill and the evidence which is before the House now, accessible to the Chair, which will not be disputed by the Chair, is that this \$39,000 and the \$9,000 which is asked for in this bill is to pay the traveling and other expenses made necessary by this order of 1913 and the other orders which required the examination

under the Civil Service Commission of all applicants for postmasterships. So that, Mr. Chairman, we reduce the expenditures of the Government and we reduce the amount carried in this bill.

If I were to discuss the question for an hour I could not make it plainer than by this statement that its purpose is to repeal the orders which make it necessary to expend this money. If this proviso is adopted, then it will not be necessary to expend the \$39,000 that we carry in this paragraph of the bill. That is all I desire to say, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the amendment is subject to the point of order. It is new legislation and does not reduce expenditures. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. If the Executive order made by President Wilson, modifying the Executive order of President Taft relative to fourth-class post offices, is to remain in force and effect the \$30,000 appropriation provided for in this paragraph is absolutely necessary. Whether or no that modification ought to remain in force is of course a matter of opinion.

For a good many years I had to do with recommending the appointment of fourth-class postmasters. It was never an altogether pleasant job, and I do not think that in the aggregate it added to my popularity, though I did make an earnest effort to recommend the postmasters the majority of the people wanted and those who would render good service. I am inclined to think that the old method, so far as it affected the service, was a good one, because I am sure that under the old system we got good postmasters in my part of the country at least.

But the old system did entail a very great deal of work, and placed a large responsibility upon Members of Congress, which I do not think ought to be placed upon them. There ought to be some other method devised. But unfortunately, in my opinion, the method that has been devised is not a very satisfactory one. Of course this appropriation will give the Democratic brethren a chance at the post offices, and I think they ought to have it. However, it will not only give them a chance, but a cinch, for under the plan that has been devised, unless there be three Republicans standing higher in the examination than any Democrat, a Democrat will get the job; and when we contemplate the long and weary years during which the brethren were kept from the pie counter, I do not know but this is a fair evening up of matters, provided they get good postmasters, which I hope they will. The difficulty is that the new rule applies to small offices, and it is going to be difficult in many instances to find people qualified, and so situated locally that they can take these offices, who will take the trouble to pass an examination. If the limit was placed at post offices paying \$250 or \$300 a year, then I think the plan would probably work out fairly well; but to provide for examinations in all offices paying above \$180 a year will include many offices where the department will find a great deal of difficulty in getting people who are willing to serve, who will take the trouble to take the examination. I have been asked by the Civil Service Commission as have, I assume, all Members, to assist by suggesting to people in the various localities that they bestir themselves and take the examination, and in some cases I have taken the trouble to do that, realizing of course that some Democrat is almost certain to get the job. The difficulty is that few are inclined to take the trouble to take an examination for a small office when there is great doubt as to whether or no he will secure the position, no matter how well qualified, after he has gone to some considerable trouble and expense. In my opinion the real fault of the order is that it includes the smaller offices.

As to the offices paying less than \$250 per annum, in my opinion the policy ought to be followed that is now followed with regard to the smaller offices—the postmaster being appointed on the recommendation of an inspector of the department. I am sure if we had control of the administration, I for one would not clamor for the responsibility of recommending fourth-class postmasters.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand the various orders on this subject, which I will insert in the RECORD so that the Members of the House and the country may be informed as to what they were and the dates when they were promulgated.

The orders are as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER.

Schedule A, Subdivision V, paragraph 4, of the civil-service rules is hereby amended to read as follows:

"4. All employees on star routes and in post offices having no city free-delivery service, other than postmasters of the fourth class, in

Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan."

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 30, 1908.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

EXECUTIVE ORDER.

Schedule A, Subdivision VII, paragraph 4, of the civil-service rules is hereby amended to read as follows:

"4. All employees on star routes and in post offices of the third and fourth classes, other than postmasters of the fourth class, except those in Alaska, Guam, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Samoa."

The regulations governing the appointment of postmasters of the fourth class shall be amended so as to provide that all appointments at offices where the compensation is \$500 or more shall be made from a certification of three names instead of one, and where the compensation is less than \$500 all appointments shall be made on the recommendation of post-office inspectors, after personal investigation, in the manner prescribed for making appointments in the States of Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, and Illinois.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 15, 1912.

EXECUTIVE ORDER.

The Executive Orders of November 30, 1908, and October 15, 1912, bringing the positions of postmaster of the fourth class into the competitive classified service are hereby amended by adding thereto the following:

"No person occupying the position of postmaster of the fourth class shall be given a competitive classified status under the provisions of said orders unless he has been appointed as a result of open competitive examination, or under the regulations of November 25, 1912, or of January 20, 1909, or until he is so appointed.

"At any post office of the fourth class where the present postmaster was appointed otherwise than as above set forth, appointment shall be made in accordance with the regulations approved November 25, 1912, as amended this date; and for this purpose the Civil Service Commission shall hold an open competitive examination for each such office having an annual compensation of as much as \$180, such examinations for all such post offices to be held by States as requested by the Postmaster General; provided that in the event that for any such examination less than three persons apply, the Civil Service Commission may, in its discretion, authorize selection in accordance with the provisions of the regulations as amended this date governing selections for appointment to offices having annual compensation of less than \$180; and in like manner the regulations of November 25, 1912, as amended this date, shall be applied to each office where the annual compensation is less than \$180 and where the present incumbent was appointed otherwise than as above set forth."

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 7, 1913.

Mr. Chairman, it is a little remarkable that this spasm of civic righteousness with reference to the appointment of fourth-class postmasters should come from our Republican friends after they have been in office for 16 years, and then by a general order covered their appointees into the classified service, as now done by the order of President Taft, being dated October 15, 1912. Of course it will not do now to say that the order of President Wilson was passed in order to give Democratic Congressmen an opportunity to select fourth-class postmasters. It does nothing of the sort. President Wilson's order simply provides for an examination of postmasters under the civil service where the compensation is more than \$180 a year. Where the compensation is less than \$180 a year the office is to be filled on the recommendation of an inspector. Where the compensation is more than \$180 a year there is to be a competitive examination under the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Chairman, it was never contemplated when the civil-service law was enacted that these fourth-class postmasters, or any other kind, should be put under the civil-service law. The first order of President Roosevelt exempted from operation the postmasters south of the Potomac River. That looked like a sort of a political move, to which I have called attention heretofore, that the only people, mostly the people in that section, were Republican officeholders. That was done to permit the Republican national committee, whose chairman was at the same time Postmaster General, the opportunity to manipulate these offices and employees in the interest of the Republican candidate for President at the national convention.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I will.

Mr. STEENERSON. When a postmaster has filled the office for 15 or 16 years satisfactory to the patrons, what is the object of a civil-service examination? Is it to make a vacancy, or is it to find out if he is really fit for it?

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not know whether it is to create a vacancy or not; but what was the object of covering him into the place when he was appointed on the recommendation of the members of the party in power, regardless of whether the people of that section desired him for postmaster or not? Take my own section of the country. There has not been a postmaster from the Potomac River to the Rio Grande appointed within the last 16 years upon the recommendation of the patrons of the office or of the Congressman. [Applause on the Democratic side.] A Congressman when he would go with a petition of every patron in the office to the Postmaster General, saying that

the people of that place desired the appointment of this man or this woman, without regard to politics, the Postmaster General would say, "You know the rule; these are political appointments, and we must consult Mr. Johnson," or some Republican referee, sometimes a white man and very often "a nigger." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. STEENERSON. Then the gentleman admits that the purpose of this order is to create vacancies and not to improve the service?

Mr. BARTLETT. No; the purpose of this order is to right the wrong and injustice that President Taft did when he placed all the fourth-class Republican offices under the civil-service law and did not permit an opportunity for investigation.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. Under the modified form of the order my friend now will go to the Post Office Department and name one man of the three highest on the list. Is not that satisfactory to him?

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not know whether I will or not.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman realizes that he will have an opportunity to do that?

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not know whether I will or not.

Mr. MONDELL. Then the gentleman is not well informed.

Mr. BARTLETT. I apprehend that the Democratic Postmaster General will carry out the law better than the Republican Postmaster General, who run it for the purpose of serving the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] As far as I am concerned, I would put the law where there would be no pretense or sham about it, and where the people's representative who knows who the people desire to be appointed should recommend the man for appointment, without being hobbled and strangled by a specious pretense of the civil service.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. When we get down to brass tacks, is not the real purpose of the amendment to enable the Democratic Party to return to the vicious spoils system?

Mr. BARTLETT. Not to return to any vicious Republican spoils system.

Mr. MOORE. Would not the Democrats take advantage of it if they could?

Mr. BARTLETT. I apprehend that the Democrats, or most of them, think that when we turned the Republicans out we intended to turn them all out, from the President down.

Mr. MOORE. And put Democrats in?

Mr. BARTLETT. We believe, at least speaking for my people and the section from which I come, that this order will at least give us an opportunity to demonstrate that the men in office, put there without regard to competency, are not as competent and as satisfactory as will be men put there by the recommendation of the people's representatives, who know what the people want. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

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

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for a question.

Mr. MOORE. Will not the spoils system be sweeter under Democratic rule than under Republican rule?

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not know what the gentleman calls the spoils system under Democratic rule. I know that there is no office, in my judgment, under Democratic administration that could not be better filled by a Democrat than by a Republican. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If you can call that the spoils system, you are welcome to so denominate it.

Mr. MOORE. But it will be sweeter under Democratic rule.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will modify that motion. The gentleman from Illinois, my colleague [Mr. MADDEN], wants five minutes and I want five minutes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer a genuine amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not insist upon that motion.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Who desires time?

Mr. MANN. My colleague desires time, and I want some time, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] desires to offer an amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will make it 15 minutes. I might want 5 minutes myself.

Mr. MANN. Make it 20 minutes and take 5.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, let us make it 15.

Mr. AUSTIN. I only want a minute.

Mr. MANN. Very well.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then I modify it to 15 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, in line 2, page 2, by striking out the figures "\$30,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "\$30,000."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am moving to strike out only one item at this time. Later on we can strike out more. It seems to me that the order of the President did not go quite far enough. If I were President of the United States and were going to issue an order which had for its purpose the changing of the politics of the men who occupied places under the Government, I would have written an order so plain that everybody would understand what it meant. Of course, this order calling for examinations to ascertain the qualifications of men who occupy places as fourth-class postmasters is a mere subterfuge. There can be no doubt about that. Why spend money to do something which is bound to be done anyway? I am in favor of turning these offices over to the Democrats. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I believe that Republicans are better Republicans when they go up and down with their party, and I believe that Democrats are better Democrats when they go in and out with their party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I believe that the administration, whatever its politics, ought to be surrounded with men of like political faith; and if I were issuing this order I would issue an order so broad that it would say upon its face that what we wanted to do was to put Democrats in where Republicans now are. I would not put the Government to the additional expense of spending \$30,000 to do a thing which I had already made up my mind to do without the expenditure of any money.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. I have not the time to yield now.

Mr. MONDELL. Just a short question.

Mr. MADDEN. Just a minute. You are imposing a burden upon the taxpayers in your attempt to change the politics of the men who occupy these places. Why not change them and not impose these burdens? It is an outrage on the people of the Nation to call for an appropriation to turn men out of office and put other men in, when you have already made up your mind that you are going to turn them out anyway.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman not think that if Democrats are to be appointed to these places it is important that we should know that Democrats are appointed who will be able to read and write—hence the necessity for the examination?

Mr. MADDEN. Of course it does not always follow that a man who is a Democrat needs to know how to read and write to hold an office. I know a good many cases where within the last three months they were appointed to local offices to hold clerical positions in violation of all the civil-service laws of our State, and many of them that were appointed could not even handle a pen.

They had to remove those men because they were not capable of performing those duties. But I am in favor of doing everything the Democrats want to do except that I am against the appropriation of any money as a subterfuge to try to blind the people with the idea that an examination is being held to ascertain the qualifications of men when, as a matter of fact, no attempt will be made to ascertain those qualifications. They will just take the man by the coat collar who has the proper brand upon him and has the political influence in the neighborhood from which he is to be appointed and put him first on that

list, and whether he is first or last upon the list they will appoint him to the place.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Surely.

Mr. HEFLIN. An examination has been conducted at a fourth-class office in my district. The man who received the highest grade was the man appointed to that position—

Mr. MADDEN. And he is a Democrat.

Mr. HEFLIN. He is a Democrat and—

Mr. MADDEN. Of course he is.

Mr. HEFLIN. No Republican who contested for the place was competent to stand the examination. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman made the statement that some person in the community would be taken by the collar and put at the head of the list. Does the gentleman realize that the local examining boards throughout the United States who hold these civil-service examinations are 90 per cent Republicans?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, I do not know anything about that. Of course, I would not undertake to say what their politics will be, but I know the purpose of this order, and the order will result in a restoration of Democrats to all the places which are now occupied by Republicans, and I am glad the Democrats have got nerve enough to do the thing they want to do, and the only objection I have to the whole proposition is that they did not have influence enough with the President to have him write a plain order that everybody could understand.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for one question—

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

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman think the civil service under the Democratic rule is as big a farce as it was under the Republican rule?

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

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know anything about the civil service.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized for three minutes so that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] may have the other two minutes. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] that after searching through all the examinations which have been held that is the only conspicuous instance he has been able to find where a Democrat stood at the top of the list. I supposed that you might possibly find a case where they would stand at the bottom of the three, and thereby secure the appointment; and it was upon that theory that the present order was issued. The order was, of course, an abandonment of real civil-service reform. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] Mr. Chairman, when the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] was talking to the House and inveighing against the merit system and in favor of the spoils system and declaring that every office under the Democratic administration ought to be filled by Democrats, nearly every gentleman on the Democratic side of the House waved his hands in wild applause. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Chairman, the Democratic side of the House is in favor of the spoils system, but lacks the nerve to put it into the law. Nearly every man there has applauded the spoils system to put Democrats in office. You have a two-thirds vote in the House. You have the Committee on Rules that can make it in order at any time. If you believe in it, why do not you have the sand to bring in a rule and pass it? You are too cowardly to do that. You content yourself with applauding and then writing home to your constituents and saying that when Mr. BARTLETT, of Georgia, declared that every office under the Democratic administration ought to be filled by a Democrat you applauded him and used your influence in favor of it; but you are afraid to put it into the law. We dare you to put it into the law.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman just a moment?

Mr. MANN. I have only three minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman will recall on a roll call that we voted to repeal this order last year and it then went over to the Senate and was stricken out.

Mr. MANN. You did not propose to repeal the law at all last year. You had an amendment in, yes, that did not amount to anything; and it is true we let you pass it in the House, and a large share of your Members were afraid to vote for it, and you only receded when a Republican Senate struck it out. You did not need to recede.

You had the power in the House. It is nonsense to say that you have not the power to do this. You have the power, and you have the desire. The only thing you lack is the nerve. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BARTLETT. We did not have a Democratic Senate last Congress.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment, but I will wait until the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has been disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. There are two minutes left to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] and five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, at the end of line 6, amend by adding the following proviso:

"Provided, That no examination shall be ordered at any fourth-class post office filled by an honorably discharged Federal or Confederate soldier or sailor or the widow of any honorably discharged Federal or Confederate soldier or sailor."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, first, that there was an amendment pending, and, second, that this is new legislation.

Mr. MANN. Let us vote on the pending amendment, then.

Mr. AUSTIN. I will reserve my time, then, until the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], to strike out "\$30,000," in line 2, page 2.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is new legislation.

Mr. MANN. Will not the gentleman reserve the point of order until the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] has used his time?

Mr. AUSTIN. I am entitled to my two minutes, anyway.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I had entertained the hope that the gentleman who has charge of this bill, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, would permit the House to vote on this meritorious proposition. There is new legislation written all over this deficiency bill, and when the committee comes in here reporting a bill carrying new legislation it ought not to hesitate, to say the least, in the matter of giving the membership of this House an opportunity to write new legislation in the bill, especially where a majority of the House may desire to do so. This amendment should not be objected to. There should not be a vote on either side of the Chamber in opposition to it. There are a number of fourth-class post offices filled in a satisfactory and efficient manner by honorably discharged Federal and Confederate soldiers and the widows of soldiers.

Mr. BURNETT. Does the gentleman know of any Confederate soldier that ever got an office under a Republican administration?

Mr. AUSTIN. There are a number in the district represented by my colleague from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP].

Mr. BURNETT. Will you name them? It is not so.

Mr. SLEMP. I will say that the postmaster at Tip Top, Va., was an old Confederate soldier and under the rules of the Civil Service Board will not be entitled to the examination.

Mr. BURNETT. And he went over to the Republicans?

Mr. SLEMP. No, sir; he has been a Republican for over 30 years.

Mr. BURNETT. And he deserted from the Confederate Army?

Mr. SLEMP. He did not. His name is J. H. Gillespie, and there is no finer character living in Virginia, and no soldier in the Confederate Army had a better record, and yet he will not be permitted to hold this office under the new rule.

Mr. AUSTIN. I will say to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] that Mrs. Longstreet is the widow of a distinguished Confederate soldier, and I appeal to the chairman of this committee, in the interests of the old soldiers of this country, both those on the Union and Confederate side, to withdraw his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The amendment is clearly new legislation.

Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] desire to be recognized?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentlemen on that side who are criticizing the order of President Wilson should at least read it before they indulge in criticism. It is:

The Executive orders of November 30, 1908, and October 15, 1912, bringing the positions of the postmasters of the fourth class into the competitive classified service, are hereby amended by adding thereto the following:

"No person occupying the position of postmaster of the fourth class shall be given a competitive classified status under the provisions of said orders unless he has been appointed as a result of open competitive examination, or under the regulations of November 25, 1912, or of January 20, 1909, or until he is so appointed."

In other words, this horde of Republican officeholders who have been selected in the southern section of the country, which has uniformly voted the Democratic ticket, upon the recommendation and approval of the so-called and well-known political Republican referees, shall not be fastened upon the pay rolls of the country to the end of their days until they have demonstrated their capacity to discharge the duties of the offices they fill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Should any Republican object to such a provision as that? And the criticisms indulged in by the two gentlemen from Illinois demonstrate that they are unable to conceive of any public official in any administration being actuated by a motive higher than the sordid political one which actuated the Republicans during the past six or eight years. It was not necessary and it is not necessary to legislate these Republicans out of office. The President could have revoked President Taft's order covering them all into the civil service. But although Members on this side of the House and members of the Democratic Party throughout the country believe that in a Democratic administration Democrats should be appointed to office, so that the country will get the character of administration for which it voted, they have no desire to follow the practice of Republicans and put incompetent persons in office. They are ready to subject the men they recommend for office to the severest tests that can be applied under the civil-service law; and they do it, Mr. Chairman, with a confidence that is not possessed by our Republican friends. The Democrats know that the men they recommend for office are so highly qualified that they can pass the civil-service examinations. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Republicans know that the men who are now in office never will qualify if subjected to the test. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The matter is so simple that it needs no argument. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] has found one Confederate soldier holding office under a Republican administration. But so far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, believing in the merit system, the mere fact that a man has served either in the Confederate or the Federal Army would not induce me to put him upon the pay roll of the Government in some lucrative office if he were not competent to fill the office. I do not believe that the honorably discharged soldiers of either army—the men who sacrificed so much in the contest, either those who marched in the Army of the Gray, or the men who fought according to their convictions in the Army of the Blue—desire to be treated in such a manner and put unfairly and improperly upon the pay rolls as a burden to the country unless they are competent to discharge the duties of the offices to which they are appointed.

By the terms of the Revised Statutes, honorably discharged soldiers of the Army and sailors of the Navy in certain conditions are given a preference under the civil-service law, and the only thing they have asked is that that law be honestly administered. During the 14 years of my service I have had brought to my attention continually complaints that in the administration of the law, in the discharge of men from various governmental services the Republican administration, although it boasted so much of its interest in the old soldiers and sailors, frequently turned them out because it was of some petty political advantage to put more active and younger men in their places. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The old soldiers and sailors never asked to be held regardless of qualifications. They did ask and did expect an honest administration of the law. They will get that in this administration, and be a man a Democrat or a Republican, the law will be impartially enforced with respect to him. If there be any Republicans in office who are competent to fill the places and who have the qualifications to enable them to pass the examinations—and I doubt, from my experience, whether there are many—they need not worry. They will continue on the pay roll. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] offers an amendment. Where does this amendment come in? The Chair will ask the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. AUSTIN. On page 2, at the end of line 6.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, at the end of line 6, insert the following: "No portion of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the purpose of holding an examination for the purpose of filling an office now held by an ex-Federal or an ex-Confederate soldier, or the widow of such a soldier."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this amendment is new legislation.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is only a limitation on the appropriation, and I think under the invariable rulings of the Chair has been held in order under the Holman rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is a limitation on the appropriation. The question is on the amendment.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 45, noes 75.

Mr. MANN. I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. AUSTIN and Mr. FITZGERALD.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported—ayes 48, noes 82.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Relief and transportation of destitute American citizens in Mexico: For relief of destitute American citizens in Mexico, including transportation to their homes in the United States, to be expended under the direction and within the discretion of the Secretary of State, to be available during the fiscal year 1914, \$100,000. Authority is granted to reimburse from this appropriation the appropriation for "Emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service" for such sums as shall have been expended for relief purposes in Mexico from said appropriation for "Emergencies."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if any provision has been made or asked for with a view to protecting the property of American citizens who are obliged to leave Mexico.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The only request was for an appropriation so that destitute Americans who desire to leave Mexico may be brought to the United States.

Mr. MOORE. Has the committee any information that it can give to the House with regard to the important question of the preservation of the property of Americans who are compelled to abandon it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The committee has no information. All the information the committee has is printed. There is nothing on that question.

Mr. MOORE. We have passed the opium item. I will ask the gentleman whether \$1,000 was all that the department asked for that purpose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That was all.

Mr. MOORE. Bills have already passed the House relating to this question, which were prepared, I think, very largely, by one of the department agents who was abroad. I desire to know whether you need any more money.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They stated that \$1,000 would pay the expenses incurred.

Mr. MOORE. Much money has been spent, however.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; \$45,000; and in addition to that considerable sums from the emergency funds available under the diplomatic appropriation.

Mr. MOORE. But the department is satisfied that \$1,000 is all that is now needed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is all the department finally asked.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation seems to be intended to assist American citizens to leave Mexico. I want to preface my remarks by saying that I have no property in Mexico and no relatives there; neither has any member of my family any property in Mexico.

This is the first time in the history of diplomacy that I have ever known a request for the citizens of one country to leave another country in the face of the declaration that there would be no war. Let us analyze this proposition of paying the way of American citizens out of Mexico and a listing of their property. Who is to guarantee the repayment of that property in the event that it is destroyed by the bandits in Mexico? Evidently this Government can not do it under its present policy. It will fall upon the future administration of Mexico. Let us assume that it will amount to no more than \$1,000 apiece for each of the 40,000 Americans in Mexico, on an average. That would make it amount to more than \$40,000,000, and it is fair

to say that it will amount in the aggregate to a billion dollar claim upon Mexico, which will stagger that country, without counting the expense of its civil butchery.

And where will those American citizens ever get the return of their property? Yesterday we witnessed here a controversy over the payment of \$6,000 to the heirs of an Italian subject who had been murdered in this country. What will it be with Mexico after the trouble is over, if it ever ends, and we demand the payment of that \$1,000,000,000? It will end there unless we enforce it by arms, and it will cost more to enforce it than to protect this property now.

Mr. Chairman, I am as much opposed to war as any man, but there are worse things than war. Rapine and murder are worse than war. In the early history of this Government we have other illustrations that showed the absurdity of moral suasion. We believe in moral suasion, but will it reach a mob? If it will, why do we not appeal to the anarchists of this country and remove the guards from the gates at the White House? If moral suasion is a sufficient protection against crime, why not repeal all the laws which provide hanging for murder? Let us be practical men. We know from experience that no argument will convince a mob except that argument be spoken through the voice of the cannon and musket.

Peace and moral force; that is a great philosophy. It is the thing we hope for, the thing we are driving to, but which we shall never reach until the entire world is Christianized and they understand the philosophy of Christianity. The altruism or philosophy of Christianity is "Love thy neighbor as thyself." I call your attention to the philosophy drawn from history, that the first thing people think about when they first embrace Christianity is to fight. The spread of Christianity over Europe and the organization of the crusades to redeem the holy sepulcher is an illustration of that. The awakening of China and the breaking out of secession is another illustration. If I had time I could produce other illustrations tending to prove this nature of mankind.

The philosophy of Christianity—"Love thy neighbor as thyself"—in the last stage and Confucianism are the only doctrines in the world that believe in peace. Confucius said, "Build a wall around you; let no one go out and no one come in; live at home"; and under that doctrine for 4,000 years the Chinese lived in peace.

We choose to embark on the seas of world relations and a world commerce. Then we see that thereafter we have established expensive consular service throughout the world, with ambassadors and foreign banks, as provided in the bill just passed Congress, and we established the gold dollar that would be good all over the world. What for? To encourage commerce. We have long since learned that commerce is the handmaid of agriculture, and without commerce agriculture could not live.

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma be given five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Then we started in with the policy of saying to Americans, "Get out of Mexico"; and yet the very purpose of encouraging American citizens to go into another nation is to carry on commerce and trade. We defend that trade. In 1842 we sent a navy to China to conduct the ships of merchandise through the straits. In 1843 we landed the marines on the coast of China, when there were then only 200 Americans in all China, to protect those Americans, or a part of them, from the mob. In 1872 we took Matamoras, Mexico. In 1863 we opened the ports of Japan by force of arms in obedience to a treaty made with Japan in 1852 or 1853 by Perry. And never have we had war when we stood upon the rights of treaties, nor will we have war when we stand upon the rights of treaty, although we have intervened more than forty times to protect the lives and property of our citizens in foreign lands.

The doctrine of protecting American citizens' life and property in all the world is not a new doctrine. It is a doctrine that has gone hand in hand with every administration of this Republic, and the men who have adhered most closely to it have enjoyed the greatest personal popularity. Among them were Monroe, Jackson, Lincoln, Grant, and Roosevelt, who steadfastly adhered to the doctrine of protecting American citizens everywhere.

Reference to the political conventions will show that at no time has a party gone into power that did not have a stronger

platform than its opponent. The strongest platform in line with those ideals is that laid down in the Baltimore platform.

It is interesting to observe the platform declarations made since the organization of the Government touching American foreign policies—the Monroe doctrine and the protection of American citizens abroad as well as at home. I repeat that prior to the Civil War no political party, except the Democratic Party, announced a foreign policy, save and except the platform upon which Henry Clay ran for President in 1832. This declaration was but a meager one, and in these words:

We consider the life, liberty, property, and citizenship of every inhabitant of every State is entitled to national protection.

And even this is susceptible to a double construction and could be construed as meaning such national protection at home without such protection abroad.

Prior to the Civil War the Democratic Party, both by administration and treaty, as well as by platform declaration, was bold and vigorous in its adherence to an international policy. In its platform of 1840, with Martin Van Buren as its candidate for President, it announced:

That every citizen and every section of country has a right to demand and insist upon an equality of rights and privileges, and to compel ample protection of person and property from domestic violence or foreign aggression.

This same section was specifically reaffirmed in 1844, with the adoption of an additional provision for American expansion. These planks were repeated in 1848, in 1852, and again in 1856. In addition to this declaration in 1856 the Democratic Party announced a more comprehensive international plank by affirming the Monroe doctrine, commerce, and protection of American citizens abroad. In the platform it declares:

Resolved, That the administration of Franklin Pierce has been true to the great interests of the country. * * * It has signally improved our treaty relations, extended the field of commercial enterprise, and vindicated the rights of American citizens abroad.

Again, in section 2, it says:

Resolved, That our geographical and political position with reference to the other States of this continent, no less than the interest of our commerce and the development of our growing power, requires that we should hold as sacred the principles involved in the Monroe doctrine. Their bearing and import admit of no misconstruction; they should be applied with unbending rigidity.

And again, section 5:

Resolved, That the Democratic Party will expect of the next administration that every proper effort be made to insure our ascendancy in the Gulf of Mexico, and to maintain a permanent protection to the great outlets through and emptied into its waters the products raised out of the soil and the commodities created by the industry of the people of our western valleys and the Union at large.

In 1860 we find in the platform upon which Breckinridge was nominated a broader policy governing American territory, together with the following declaration:

The Democratic Party of the United States recognizes it as the imperative duty of this Government to protect the naturalized citizen in all of his rights, whether at home or in foreign lands, to the same extent as its native-born citizens.

Then came the Republican convention of 1860, which nominated the immortal Abraham Lincoln, and which was the first party platform in opposition to the Democratic Party that announced, in unmistakable language, its policy to protect American citizens at home and abroad. It used this language:

The Republican Party is opposed to any change in our naturalization laws * * * and is in favor of giving a safe and efficient protection to the rights of all classes of citizens, whether native or natural born, at home and abroad.

In the same year the Constitutional Union Party, which nominated for President John Bell, of Tennessee, announced the same doctrine in these words:

We hereby oblige ourselves to maintain, protect, and defend, separately and unitedly, that great principle of public liberty and national safety, against all enemies, at home and abroad.

After this the Democratic Party, until after the nomination of Tilden and Cleveland, had but meager expressions touching the Monroe doctrine and the policy of protecting American citizens abroad, and the obligations of the Government having fallen upon the Republican Party, they with great energy asserted some doctrines adhered to for the first 60 years of the Republic under Democratic rule. In the midst of a great civil war, when it taxed its resources to maintain itself, in the face of the Mason and Slicell controversy with Great Britain and the fear that Great Britain would recognize the Southern States as an independent government, with the election of a President in 1864, nominated Abraham Lincoln again for the Presidency, and, following the example of the President in contesting the claims of the Holy Alliance of Europe, seeking by subterfuge to place Maximilian on the throne of Mexico, the Republican

Party fearlessly and boldly, in section 11 of their platform, announced this doctrine:

Resolved, That we approve the position taken by the Government that the people of the United States can never regard with indifference the attempt of any European power to overthrow by force or to supplant by fraud the institutions of any republican government on the Western Continent, and that they will view with extreme jealousy, as menacing to the peace and independence of their own country, the efforts of any such power to obtain new footholds for monarchical governments, sustained by foreign military force, in near proximity to the United States.

Students of history will recall that from the beginning of this Government there had been an issue between us and European Governments, particularly with Great Britain, upon the question of the right to impressment of American seamen; that this was the first cause of the War of 1812; and that although this war terminated satisfactorily to the United States, it left this question unsettled—the question of “expatriation,” the British doctrine that “Once a citizen, always a citizen”—and it was not settled until Grant was made President of the United States, and its settlement was largely due to the firing on a foreign war vessel by the United States Navy and the prevention of the taking away of an American citizen who had become naturalized from one of the European monarchies.

In the Republican platform of 1868, when Gen. U. S. Grant was nominated for the Presidency, we find this broad principle enunciated:

The doctrine of Great Britain and other European powers, that because a man is once a subject he is always so, must be resisted at every hazard by the United States as a relic of feudal times not authorized by the laws of nations and at war with our national honor and independence. Naturalized citizens are entitled to protection in all their rights of citizenship as though they were native born; and no citizen of the United States—native or naturalized—must be liable to arrest and imprisonment by any foreign power for acts done or words spoken in this country; and, if so arrested and imprisoned, it is the duty of the Government to interfere in his behalf.

We find in the platform of 1872, when Grant was nominated for the second time for the Presidency, a repetition of this doctrine:

The doctrine of Great Britain and other European powers concerning allegiance—“Once a subject always a subject”—having at last, through the efforts of the Republican Party, been abandoned, and the American idea of the individual's right to transfer allegiance having been accepted by European nations, it is the duty of our Government to guard with jealous care the rights of adopted citizens against the assumption of unauthorized claims by their former Governments.

The settlement of this doctrine of the right of “expatriation”—the right to change citizenship—finally won by the United States Government, was due to the vigorous, broad, and comprehensive foreign policy and administration of President Grant. This second Grant platform enunciated the principles of Jefferson in his first inaugural address. In section 4 it reads as follows:

The National Government should seek to maintain honorable peace with all nations, protecting its citizens everywhere and sympathizing with all people who strive for greater liberty.

After the administration of Grant the foreign policy enunciated by the Republican Party was weak until the nomination of William McKinley in 1896. In this platform it enunciated the principles of reciprocity, trade with foreign nations, merchant marine, foreign relations with the Western Hemisphere, and sympathy with the victims of the Armenian massacres, and a reassertion of the Monroe doctrine. After this the policy of the administration of the Republican Party departed from the old principles of Jefferson—“Peace and commerce with all nations and entangling alliances with none”; “Encouragement of republican governments and their protection from the monarchies of the Old World”—and substituted therefor the doctrine of imperialism.

It may be noted in all the platform-making history of this Republic that there was never an instance of an election of a candidate for President upon any ticket where his foreign policy, as expressed in his platform, was less comprehensive than his opponent upon the Monroe doctrine and the protection of American citizens in foreign lands.

Returning to the Democratic doctrine since the Civil War, we find that in the canvass of 1866, with Horatio Seymour for the Presidency, enunciations of the old principles of the Democratic Party, but with less vigor than his opponent, Gen. Grant. Here is section 8 of that platform:

Equal rights and protection for naturalized and native-born citizens at home and abroad; the assertion of American nationality which shall command the respect of foreign powers and furnish an example and encouragement to people struggling for national integrity, constitutional liberty, and individual rights, and the maintenance of the rights of naturalized citizens against the absolute doctrine of immutable allegiance, and the claims of foreign powers to punish them for alleged crime committed beyond their jurisdiction.

The next broad and comprehensive declaration of the old ante bellum Democratic doctrine was found in the platform of

1884, upon which Grover Cleveland was elected to the Presidency:

We favor an American continental policy based upon more intimate commercial and political relations with the 15 sister Republics of North, Central, and South America, but entangling alliances with none.

The Democratic Party insists that it is the duty of the Government to protect with equal fidelity and vigilance the rights of its citizens, native and naturalized, at home and abroad, and to the end that this protection may be assured, United States papers of naturalization, issued by courts of competent jurisdiction, must be respected by the executive and legislative departments of our own Government and by all foreign powers. It is an imperative duty of this Government to efficiently protect all the rights of person and property of every American citizen in foreign lands, and demand and enforce full reparation for any invasion thereof. An American citizen is only responsible to his own Government for any act done in his own country and under her flag, and can only be tried therefor on her own soil and according to her laws; and no power exists in this Government to expatriate an American citizen to be tried in any foreign land for any such act.

This country has never had a well defined and executed foreign policy, save under Democratic administration. That policy has ever been in regard to foreign nations, so long as they do not act detrimental to the interests of the country or hurtful to our citizens, to let them alone; that as a result of this policy we recall the acquisition of Louisiana, Florida, California, and of the adjacent Mexican territory, by purchase alone, and contrast these grand acquisitions of Democratic statesmanship with the purchase of Alaska, the sole fruit of a Republican administration of nearly a quarter of a century.

Under a long period of Democratic rule and policy our merchant marine was fast overtaking, and on the point of outstripping, that of Great Britain. Under 20 years of Republican rule and policy our commerce has been left to British bottoms, and the American flag has almost been swept off the high seas. Instead of the Republican Party's British policy, we demand for the people of the United States an American policy.

Another instance where the broader international policy was successful is found in the defeat of Cleveland by Harrison, wherein they expressed themselves on the protection of our fisheries and the Monroe doctrine. Upon the Monroe doctrine the platform says:

The conduct of foreign affairs by the present administration has been distinguished by its inefficiency and its cowardice. Having withdrawn from the Senate all pending treaties effected by Republican administrations for the removal of foreign burdens and restrictions upon our commerce and for its extension into better markets, it has neither effected nor proposed any others in their stead.

Professing adherence to the Monroe doctrine it has seen, with idle complacency, the extension of foreign influence in Central America and of foreign trade everywhere among our neighbors. It has refused to charter, sanction, or encourage any American organization for constructing the Nicaraguan canal, a work of vital importance to the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine and of our national influence in Central and South America and necessary for the development of trade with our Pacific territory, with South America, and with the islands and farther coasts of the Pacific Ocean.

In the race for the Presidency of 1892 the Democratic platform, upon which Cleveland was elected for the second time, announced a foreign policy, as follows:

The Democratic Party is the only party that has ever given the country a foreign policy, consistent and vigorous, compelling respect abroad and inspiring confidence at home. While avoiding entangling alliances, it has aimed to cultivate friendly relations with other nations, and especially with our neighbors on the American Continent, whose destiny is closely linked with our own, and we view with alarm the tendency to a policy of irritation and bluster which is liable at any time to confront us with the alternative of humiliation or war. We favor the maintenance of a navy strong enough for all purposes of national defense and to properly maintain the honor and dignity of the country abroad.

In addition to this comprehensive policy this platform gave expression to the question of “reciprocity,” “sympathy for the oppressed in foreign lands,” “immigration,” “waterways,” and “Nicaraguan canal.”

In the platform of 1896, upon which W. J. Bryan was first nominated for the Presidency, we find the following declaration:

The Monroe doctrine, as originally declared and as interpreted by succeeding Presidents, is a permanent part of the foreign policy of the United States and must at all times be maintained.

We extend our sympathy to the people of Cuba in their heroic struggle for liberty and independence.

Again, in the platform of 1900 the Democratic Party dealt with the question of “Cuba,” “the Philippines,” “the Monroe doctrine,” “militarism,” the “Nicaraguan canal,” and the “Hay” treaty, but made the mistake to adopt negative policies without affirming a constructive policy upon these several questions, and hence it may be observed that the American people, through their party platforms and administrations, have invariably stood for a constructive, progressive international policy rather than a negative one; that on the whole they prefer peace and commerce with all nations and entangling alliances with none; the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine and the protection of American citizens in foreign lands; sympathy for the oppressed and encouragement to Republican institutions; that on the whole they have opposed imperialism or force for the purpose of acquisition of territory, while standing equally strong for the American system of government and the rights of

American commerce in foreign seas and the rights of American citizens in foreign lands, not only by party platform declarations but by more than 40 instances of intervention by force during the past hundred years of administration.

In the campaign of 1912 the marked difference between the Democratic, the Republican, and the Progressive platforms is noted. The Democratic Party took a bold stand in favor of the "Monroe doctrine," the "efficiency of an army and navy," the "independence of the Philippines," the "protection of Americans in foreign lands," and particularly the Jews in Russia, and a demand for a new Russian treaty guaranteeing these rights, and the "Panama Canal," which constitutes the broadest constructive affirmative declaration in many years touching an international policy, crowning these policies with the following bold and aggressive stand touching the rights of American citizens wherever resident or sojourning:

We commend the patriotism of the Democratic Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives which compelled the termination of the Russian treaty of 1832, and we pledge ourselves anew to preserve the sacred rights of American citizenship at home and abroad. No treaty should receive the sanction of our Government which does not recognize that equality of all our citizens, irrespective of race or creed, and which does not expressly guarantee the fundamental right of expatriation.

The constitutional rights of American citizens should protect them on our borders and go with them throughout the world, and every American citizen residing or having property in any foreign country is entitled to and must be given the full protection of the United States Government both for himself and his property.

From all these platform declarations it will be observed that all parties that had for their support any great body of the American people have proclaimed adherence to the Monroe doctrine and "the protection of American citizens at home or abroad."

For years before 1912 we had taken a negative policy, but this time we pursued a constructive policy, and on that it may be asked, What is a constructive policy? I insist, Mr. Chairman, that intervention does not mean a declaration of war against Mexico or any other nation. It does not include imperialism, a large standing army or navy. It does not mean the acquisition of territory or involve any other program of force or sordid commercial dollar diplomacy nor a violation of any sound progressive policy of peace. A sound, just, and comprehensive American policy consists in this: A well-equipped and thoroughly trained but relatively small army and navy; the extension of American commerce to all seas and ports of the world; peace, honest friendship, and commerce with all nations, entangling alliances with none; adherence to and maintenance of the Monroe doctrine as the sheet anchor of protection of republican institutions in the Western Hemisphere; the protection of American citizens, their property, homes, and families, whether found in America, upon our borders, or in foreign lands throughout the world; the preservation and integrity of the Nation and the glory of the flag; the encouragement of liberty everywhere and the extension of republican governments and democratic institutions throughout the two Americas—all this by peaceful diplomacy, if possible; by force, if necessary.

That, Mr. Chairman, I conceive to be the genuine American doctrine. I am as strong an advocate of peace as anybody, and it is no new doctrine. I call attention to failures in the past in an effort for peace by an impractical policy. Up to 1807 we had for 20 years paid the Barbary States more than a million dollars to keep them from arresting American citizens. In 1787 we made a treaty with Morocco, in which we paid them \$80,000 not to make slaves of Americans. In 1796 we made one with Algiers, and paid \$40,000 for the liberation of 13 Americans, and then we gave them tribute of \$25,000 a year for exemption from capture of our people. In 1800, when the tribute was sent upon an American war vessel, William Bainbridge, the great American citizen, was compelled to go to Constantinople at the instance of the Bey, flying a foreign flag. He then said: "I hope the next time that I pay tribute I can bear it with arms." Finally, after an effort to restore peace, paying them tribute every year, they, the Barbary States, themselves could not be satisfied and declared war, and what was the result? Decatur and Bainbridge went there and wrecked their ships. William Eaton, of the United States Army, went into the interior and organized an army and came across the border and dethroned the reigning Bey. When that treaty was concluded the first Christian Nation in the world said to the Barbary States: "We will pay you no more tribute." And yet that war cost us less, in all that war there were fewer Americans imprisoned and fewer murders committed than there were during the 20 years that we paid the Barbary States tribute in the name of peace, in a vain effort to preserve peace by our servility. Such will our experience prove to be by such cowardly policy with the groups of banditti in Mexico.

Less loss of life and property will occur if we will boldly stand upon our treaty rights with Mexico and make their mobs to understand that no American citizen must be harmed.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to get some information about this item of \$100,000 for the Secretary of State to pay the expenses of American citizens now in Mexico and to know whether that is the full amount asked by the State Department?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is.

Mr. AUSTIN. A morning paper states that there are 7,500 Americans on their way from Mexico to the United States. An appropriation of \$100,000 would not mean an average expenditure of \$20 apiece.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the accuracy of the press upon some occasions, but my experience has been that it would never do to appropriate money in accordance with the statements appearing in the press. We base our action in appropriating money upon the requests submitted by the departments in charge of the various services. Prior to the submission of this request, the Red Cross Society, cooperating with the State Department, had expended about \$20,000 in defraying the passage of destitute Americans in Mexico who desired to come to this country. The Red Cross Society was unable to continue the work because of limited funds available for that purpose. The State Department has used some funds that could be used for that purpose. The Secretary requested \$100,000 at this time, and the committee recommended it.

Mr. AUSTIN. When was the request of the Secretary made to the Committee on Appropriations? Was it not before this general exodus of Americans began?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think it was in June.

Mr. AUSTIN. The transportation of 7,500 Americans at \$10 each would be \$75,000, and no transportation can be obtained from Mexico to the United States for any such sum.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I assume that the State Department is better informed about these matters than is the gentleman, or the sources from which he is obtaining his information, and if this sum be not sufficient, the Department of State undoubtedly in a proper manner will communicate that fact to Congress. So far as I am aware there will be no disposition to refuse ample funds to meet these necessities.

Mr. AUSTIN. What is there in the complaints made by American citizens that they are forced to leave Mexico in the steerage of the vessels plying between the Mexican ports and the ports of the United States?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know whether there have been such complaints or not, but I do not believe that the Government is under any obligation to furnish accommodations de luxe to destitute Americans who desire to come home.

Mr. AUSTIN. Well, but the administration has told them to come home, and the administration has gone further and said, we will not invade Mexico—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I believe it has done a patriotic thing. Mr. AUSTIN. We will not send any troops into Mexico to protect Americans, and therefore we put them on notice to leave Mexico, and if the Government of the United States takes that position we ought to make an appropriation sufficiently large here to bring every American out of Mexico and not on a freight train or in the steerage, but by the very best accommodations.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield? Does the gentleman think this Government ought to pay the way of men worth millions of dollars from Mexico who have gone there and stole property belonging to the Mexicans; does he think that we ought to pay their way? Those whose way we propose to pay are those who are not able to pay their way.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not believe the American citizens in Mexico have obtained their money there or property there by larceny—

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I can not answer both gentlemen in my limited time.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I desire to answer the question of the other gentleman. I will state to the gentleman who has just spoken that those who own millions in Mexico are now in the United States. The men we are taking out are the colonists who have gone there under concessions to make homes for their families. The rich are already here. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me say to the gentleman from Tennessee, which will perhaps explain some of the misinformation which sometimes gets out about these matters, at one time

my recollection is that there were a large number of our citizens in Mexico who wanted to come back at once. There was one steamer available for everybody if they were put on that steamer. There were many in excess of accommodations if it were entirely occupied, and I suppose some discomfort and inconvenience existed, and unsatisfactory arrangements had to be made to bring those people out in time, but I do not know there is any disposition at any place to do other than to provide accommodations which would be reasonably satisfactory to everybody desiring to leave Mexico if they are available.

Mr. AUSTIN. Can the gentleman tell us how much money has been already expended out of the funds of the State Department for this purpose?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no information as to that. The Red Cross expended \$20,000 and some other funds have been expended.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is it the purpose to reimburse the Red Cross money out of the appropriation?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not at all. The first suggestion was that the appropriation be made to the Red Cross, but the committee declined to consider that suggestion and made the appropriation to be expended under Government officials, and they could utilize such means as they deemed advisable.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the President, in his message to the Congress, stated that he would send word to the various Mexican officials in Mexico that the Americans in that country should leave the country, and a great many of them have accepted that statement, believing that the declaration meant war, and they started to come home. There are now a large number at some of the seaports without accommodations, without money, and without means themselves to obtain passage, with nobody able or willing to furnish them with the money. In July, before the President had read his message to the Congress, the Secretary of State had sent an estimate through the Secretary of the Treasury to the Congress asking for this \$100,000 to enable Americans to be brought out. At that time there was no expectation they would need as much as it is plain they will need, and yet, dallying along as the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations has been doing, with no feeling of responsibility in the matter at all, a communication addressed to the House on the 31st of July asking for \$100,000 in order to give protection to these Americans by sending them home, the House now on the 4th of September proposes to include in a general appropriation bill an item which can not possibly become a law for several weeks, and our distinguished and beloved Speaker yesterday, with naïveté which was truly interesting, stated that when the bill introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] to make this appropriation was introduced the Speaker, contrary to the rule, referred it, not to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that had jurisdiction, but to the Committee on Appropriations, which did not have jurisdiction of the bill, in order that it might be expedited.

We could have passed the Flood bill days ago. It could have passed the Senate before this time. Even this little appropriation could have been made available so that American citizens, advised by their own country to leave a friendly nation, should not be hanging around the streets of seaboard towns urging for a chance to be given even steerage accommodations in the hottest climate on earth. [Applause on the Republican side.] And that is the responsibility. It is very like much of the rest that is going on.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the statements of the gentleman from Illinois would be very unfortunate if based on fact. The State Department has been using a fund of \$90,000 for this purpose. This appropriation will reimburse that to the extent it is used. No one has suffered. There has been no delay. Accommodations have been furnished to those needing or desiring them. The Government will pursue the even tenor of its way without getting into a flight of excitement unnecessarily every time the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] imagines that it should.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] accuses me of getting excited on the Mexican situation seems very peculiar. I believe I am one of those who have kept their heads on the Mexican situation, and that is more than can be said of the majority side of this House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no indication of anybody losing his head.

Mr. MANN. We have kept cool on this side of the House on the Mexican situation. We have not rushed into print, as the other side of the House has and even as the President has. But this is not a matter of determining what our course should be in Mexico. American citizens are at the seaports without accommodations to come home, and the best they can expect by remaining there for days is steerage accommodations

in the hot holds of hot vessels in the hottest climate on earth. And the gentleman says that we are taking good care of them!

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman's statement is still inaccurate. They are not waiting at those ports to be brought home.

Mr. MANN. I say they are.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The fact is not conclusive, although the gentleman frequently thinks his statements are.

Mr. MANN. Well, my statement may not be conclusive, but it is true. That is more than the gentleman's statement is, for it is not correct.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, whether the American people in Mexico are waiting for steerage passage to the States, or whether they are standing about in hot places, the fact remains they are in distress. When a number of people, with their all, are told to leave a place where they have gone to carve out for themselves a livelihood, and are told to abandon what they have there in order to save themselves from the assassin's dagger, in order to prevent seeing all that they have lost, and they are told that their only safety is in flight, I say that they are in distress. When they turn from their homes, when they leave their positions, when they take their little ones and try to find a place of exit from that country, they are entitled to sympathy and consideration; and it grieves me to hear the gentleman from the State of Texas [Mr. GARRETT], the Lone Star State, the State that celebrates San Jacinto Day, the State where the Battle of the Alamo was fought, the State where there is more pride and more courage and more enthusiasm over all the battles with Mexico than anywhere else in this country—I say, it grieves me to hear him, in a moment of this kind, refer to those people with any such words as "stole" or "robber" or "thief." The men who are down there in Mexico—

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. Just for a moment.

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to ask the gentleman if he gets his information from the Washington Post?

Mr. BRYAN. I do not get my information from the Washington Post. I get my information from the fundamental sentiments of humanity. Anybody who does not know, anybody who does not realize the situation those people are in, fails, it seems to me, to grasp a fundamental principle. I am as ready to denounce as anyone else the attempt of a few to gain large possessions, grants, and all that kind of thing; but of the people who have gone into Mexico by far the large majority of them, I believe, are honest, straightforward people, and I consider that while they are there we ought to give them the benefit of the doubt and at least believe them honest American citizens, and not refer to them in any such terms as they have been referred to.

And I favor some kind of an active policy and some kind of a movement that will mean a fair consideration of those people. I protest against their being referred to with sneers and with the statement that they deserve no sympathy. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and say that this House has been derelict and slow in appropriating this money, and that the amount ought to be doubled, and that those people ought to be out of there by now or have had an opportunity to get out.

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

Mr. OGLESBY. I want to ask the gentleman if he is opposed to this item?

Mr. BRYAN. I am not opposed to appropriating the \$100,000, but I am taking advantage of this opportunity to express my protest against the methods by which we are affording relief to those people and to object to the language that was used in reference to them.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARRETT] is recognized.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, when I referred in my question a moment ago, addressed to the gentleman from Tennessee, to certain people in Mexico who had acquired property rights there by fraud I did not mean to say that there were not American citizens in Mexico that were just as honorable and just as honest as any man now residing in his home country. But if the gentleman believes for one moment that there are not now people in Mexico to-day who have acquired the property by unfair means that they claim to hold, and much of it, in my opinion, through the graft in connection with the administration that has passed away, which Madero overthrew, he is not familiar with the current history of that people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, so far as Texas is concerned, we do not want any trouble with Mexico. We had that 75 years ago, and we whipped her "to a frazzle"; and if there is any war talk

going to come on here all you have to do is take the bridle off the boys in Texas and they can attend to Mexico any time that is needed to be done.

But Texas is opposed to war. Texas is in favor of peace. Texans and the people who represent Texas on the floor of this House know something about the history of Mexico and her people, and if I had my way I would say, not only let the neutrality laws prevail, but I would go further and say, Give to those poor, struggling Mexicans who are trying to establish constitutional government the right to buy arms and ammunition on equal terms with the Federals, and let them have, if they can, the kind of government that they rightly deserve, and let them have for them and their children that great country that belonged to their fathers.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I can not yield now.

I want to say right here and now that I am opposed to war with Mexico and opposed to intervention. But I will say to this House that there are citizens and patriots in Mexico who are fighting, as they see it and understand it, for constitutional government, and I as a Texan will never agree that this Government shall ever recognize Huerta or anything that he stands for. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARRETT] yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I insist on my motion, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman's time has not expired. With reference to those who may properly or improperly be in Mexico, and have property there, the gentleman apparently concedes that there are some Americans who are lawfully in Mexico, does he not?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. And there are some who own property there which they do not hold fraudulently?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Oh, beyond question. I will say here and now if this appropriation is not large enough to pay the way of every American who can not get out of Mexico, I am in favor of making it larger.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed.

Mr. FERRIS. I hope the gentleman will withhold his motion for a moment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I think the gentleman had better not discuss Mexico.

Mr. FERRIS. I am not proposing to discuss Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] moves that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, have I not the opportunity to speak?

The CHAIRMAN. Not if this motion carries. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$250,000" on page 2, at the end of line 18.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 18, by striking out "\$100,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$250,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$250,000."

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Canton, Ohio, post office: The appropriation of \$20,000 contained in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1914 for alterations, improvements, and repairs of the Canton, Ohio, post office is made available also for enlargement and extension of said building within the limit of said sum.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the item for the Canton (Ohio) post office, \$20,000. The Clerk will read.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, in the last session of Congress authority was given—

Mr. MANN. Did the Chair sustain the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order or reserve it?

Mr. MANN. I offered to reserve it, but the Chair said, "The Clerk will read," so I thought probably he had sustained it. I supposed the gentleman from New York would make some explanation of it. If he does not, I will make the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I was about to make an explanation. In the last session of Congress authority was given for alterations, improvements, and repairs of the public building in Canton, Ohio. It was proposed to rearrange the upper story so as to provide additional facilities. Upon more thorough investigation it was the opinion of the Post Office Department and the Supervising Architect's Office that it would be better, instead of putting some of the offices in the upper story, to build a small extension at the same cost. The Comptroller of the Treasury held that under the language in the authorization that could not be done, as it was an enlargement, not an alteration. This is to meet the recommendation, in order to permit the extension to be built, rather than an alteration of the upper story.

Mr. MANN. The original act authorized alterations, improvements, and repairs of this post office.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has not given any reason why we should increase the limit of cost \$20,000 and at the same time authorize an enlargement of the post office.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no increase of the limit of cost. This is to permit the \$20,000 that was appropriated for alterations, improvements, and repairs to be used to do certain work that the Comptroller of the Treasury has held to be an enlargement, and not to come within the definition of the three terms used.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lynchburg, Va., rent of buildings: For rent of temporary quarters at Lynchburg, Va., for the accommodation of Government officials, \$1,500.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer, and I suppose this is as good a place as any.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting two paragraphs after line 20 and before line 21, on page 4, as follows:

"General expenses of public buildings: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to execute and give effect to the provisions of section 6 of the act of May 30, 1908, as related to recent legislation; for foremen draftsmen, architectural draftsmen, and apprentice draftsmen, at rates of pay from \$480 to \$2,500 per annum; for structural engineers and draftsmen, at rates of pay from \$840 to \$2,200 per annum; for mechanical, sanitary, electrical, heating and ventilating, and illuminating engineers and draftsmen, at rates of pay from \$1,200 to \$2,400 per annum; for computers and estimators, at rates of pay from \$1,600 to \$2,500 per annum; the expenditures under all the foregoing classes not to exceed for the six months ending February 28, 1914, \$62,000; for supervising superintendents, superintendents, and junior superintendents of construction, at rates of pay from \$1,600 to \$2,900 per annum, not to exceed for the six months ending February 28, 1914, \$24,000; for expenses of superintendence, including expenses of all inspectors and other officers and employees on duty or detailed in connection with work on public buildings and the furnishing and equipment thereof under orders from the Treasury Department; office rent and expenses of superintendents, including temporary stenographic and other assistance in the preparation of reports and the care of public property, etc.; advertising; office supplies, including drafting materials, specially prepared paper, typewriting machines, adding machines, and other mechanical labor-saving devices, and exchange of same; furniture, carpets, electric-light fixtures, and office equipment, telephone service; books of reference, law books, technical periodicals and journals, subscriptions to which may be paid in advance; for contingencies of every kind and description, recording deeds and other evidences of title, photographic instruments, chemical plates, and photographic materials, and other articles and supplies and such minor and incidental expenses not enumerated connected solely with work on public buildings, the acquisition of sites, and the administrative work connected with the annual appropriation under the Supervising Architect's office as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary and specially order or approve not to exceed for the six months ending February 28, 1914, \$36,216; Provided, That nothing herein contained shall include any appropriation for heat, light, janitor service, awnings, curtains, or any expenses for the general maintenance of the Treasury Building, surveys, plaster models, progress photographs, test-pit borings, or mill and shop inspections; in all, as in addition to the appropriation for 'general expenses of public buildings' contained in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1914, \$107,216."

SALARIES, OFFICE OF THE SUPERVISING ARCHITECT.

"For additional employees in the technical and administrative branches of the Office of the Supervising Architect for the six months ending February 28, 1914: Inspectors, 2 at \$2,400 per annum; 3 administrative clerks, at \$2,000 per annum; clerks, 5 of class 4, 10 of class 3, 9 of class 2, 9 of class 1, 14 at \$1,000, 5 at \$900 per annum; skilled laborers, 4 at \$960 per annum; messengers, 4 at \$540 per

annum, 2 at \$720 per annum; 1 messenger boy at \$560 per annum; total, \$43,000; in all, as in addition to the appropriation for 'salaries, Office of the Supervising Architect,' contained in the legislative appropriation act approved March 4, 1913."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this item is not authorized by law; second, that it is a change of existing law; and, third, that it is not germane to this portion of the bill.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think we can dispose of the point of order, and in that way avoid a general discussion of the matter.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to make an additional point of order that this is a deficiency bill and that the amendment does not properly belong on a deficiency bill.

Mr. HARRISON. I think, Mr. Chairman, that this appropriation is authorized by law, and the status of the matter is this: There are 47 projects of public buildings that have been set aside from their chronological order by the Supervising Architect, some of them at the suggestion of Members of Congress and others because of circumstances that have arisen which necessarily have caused them to be held up. This appropriation is to give the Supervising Architect's Office an additional force, so that these 47 projects can be taken care of. They have not sufficient force to draw the plans and specifications for these 47 projects.

This proposition has been recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury. It was fully discussed before the Appropriation Committee of the House. The Supervising Architect appeared there and presented the question in full, and the whole matter is contained in the hearings before the Appropriation Committee.

In the event that this point of order is sustained or this appropriation is not written into this deficiency bill, this proposition will confront us: These 47 projects that ought to be now in course of construction, and for which two and a half million dollars have already been appropriated, will be delayed because of the want of an appropriation of approximately \$150,000.

Now, I think that these positions enumerated in the amendment can be created under this appropriation, because, as I understand it, executive departments of the Government are authorized under the law to employ such clerks or other employees as they need and for which appropriations are made. I read from the House Manual, page 355:

Executive departments being authorized by section 169, Revised Statutes, to employ such clerks, etc., as Congress may appropriate for from year to year held to be authority for making appropriation to pay salary of such clerks, etc.,

Now, some of these are clerks, some are copyists, laborers, messengers, and so forth, that are intended to perform a part of the work that the Supervising Architect and the Secretary of the Treasury say is necessary to draw the plans and specifications, and so forth, for these buildings.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman think the appropriation carried in this amendment would be a deficiency appropriation?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; it is clearly a deficiency, because these buildings have been appropriated for and are being held up because, as the architect says, they have not sufficient force to make the plans and specifications, and it will take \$150,000 to do that work; that is, it will take that amount to run the office for six months.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I read from section 169 of the Revised Statutes:

SEC. 169. Each head of a department is authorized to employ in his department such number of clerks of the several classes recognized by law, and such messengers, assistant messengers, copyists, watchmen, laborers, and other employees, and at such rates of compensation, respectively, as may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year.

Now, this amendment certainly comes within the meaning of that statute. These employees are necessary, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, the head of the department, and under this section of the Revised Statutes he has the legal right to ask for that appropriation.

Now, in construing that section, I will read from the Manual a case in point, at page 356:

On December 6, 1912, third session Sixty-second Congress, Chairman GARNER ruled as follows:

"It seems to the Chair that the first question for the Chair to ascertain is whether or not section 169 of the Revised Statutes authorizes these clerks or whether the head of a department has the right to employ these five clerks. In 1906 Mr. Hull, of Iowa, was in the chair, and this identical question came up and was decided by him on a point of order made by Mr. Tawney upon clerks of a similar nature in the War Department. Mr. Hull held at that time, quoting section 169, that where the statute had authorized the heads of the department to em-

ploy clerks and other laborers that it was in order, and he overruled the point of order. He used this language:

"The first question is, What law authorizes this appropriation? The only law referred to is that contained in section 169 of the Revised Statutes, which is as follows."

Here he quotes the statute.

This is a similar case, Mr. Chairman, but then the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] happened to be on the other side of the question and cited the statute, section 169, as authority for that legislation.

Mr. Hull made this comment:

The next question, of course, is whether these clerks referred to in the items to which objection has been made are to be employed by the head of a department and in his department. The gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Hull, is quite correct in his statement of the ruling made by the occupant of the chair, Mr. Hopkins, as referred to on page 2404 of the Record, third session, Fifty-fifth Congress; but it appears that at that time the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole was not familiar with the ruling of the Attorney General, which has been submitted to.

And he went on and held that these clerks were to be employed as contemplated in section 169 of the Revised Statutes. The Chair is of the opinion that section 169 would apply to the clerks in this item, and, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, there was a case on all fours with this, and it says that under section 169 of the Revised Statutes, the head of the department had a right to employ these additional clerks, and so forth, and in this case all we ask for is that they employ these additional clerks, employees, and so forth, in order that the work that we have already appropriated for may be carried on and consummated. We submit that if we had to come in here and name specifically these 47 items and ask an appropriation of \$10,000 for, say, Laurel, Miss., because that is the one that I am particularly interested in, it would not do, for the reason that we do not know just how much of an appropriation would be needed to make the drawings, and so forth, for Laurel, Miss., or for some other place, or for any one of the 47 projects. So the amendment for the appropriation must be drawn in some language like that embodied in the amendment, and I submit that the point of order ought to be overruled.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi relies on section 169 of the Revised Statutes for the authority for the employment of the persons enumerated in the amendment which he offers. Section 169 of the Revised Statutes provides that—

Each head of a department is authorized to employ in his department such number of clerks of the several classes recognized by the law, and such messengers, assistant messengers, copyists, watchmen, laborers, and other employees and at such rates of compensation respectively as may be appropriated by Congress from year to year.

This amendment does not cover clerks of the several classes, because the classes are fixed by section 167, and there are four—the fourth, the third, the second, and the first—and the compensation runs from \$1,800 to \$1,200. They are not messengers, assistant messengers, copyists, watchmen, laborers; and the only authority under which the gentleman can contend that these draftsmen and engineers and other employees specified in the amendment would be authorized is under the language "and other employees."

Mr. Chairman, that language has been construed definitely and followed for many years in the House in the consideration of appropriation bills.

Paragraph 3590, volume 4, of Hinds' Precedents, reads as follows:

The mere appropriation for a salary does not thereby create an office so as to justify appropriations in succeeding years. On February 7, 1902, the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union were considering the legislative appropriation bill, when the Clerk read the following paragraph:

"For Rural Free-Delivery Service: Superintendent, \$3,000; supervisor, \$2,750; chief of board of examiners of rural carriers, \$2,250; 3 clerks of class 4; 6 clerks of class 3; 25 clerks of class 2; 40 clerks of class 1; 50 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 115 clerks, at \$900 each; 3 messengers; 10 assistant messengers; 5 laborers; 1 female laborer, \$540; 3 female laborers, at \$500 each; two charwomen; in all, \$275,040."

Mr. THETUS W. SIMS, of Tennessee, made the point of order that these offices were not authorized by law.

Mr. James A. Hemenway, of Indiana, quoted section 169 of the Revised Statutes:

"Each head of a department is authorized to employ in his department such number of clerks of the several classes recognized by law and such messengers, assistant messengers, copyists, watchmen, laborers, and other employees, and at such rate of compensation, respectively, as may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year."

It was argued that the words "and other employees" sanctioned the creation of such offices outside the classified service as were provided for in the paragraph of the bill before the committee. It was also urged that the offices had been appropriated for in the last appropriation act and therefore were established by law.

The Chairman said:

"The Chair will ask the gentleman if he were drawing this statute if he would lay as much stress on the words "and other employees" coming, as they do, after "watchmen" and "laborers" as the gentleman seems to? Was that intended to include three and four thousand dollar employees? If the gentleman had been drawing the statute, would he have not placed that first? * * * The Chair would hold

that an appropriation bill may contain anything in relation to employees enumerated in these several sections; that is, clerks of classes 1, 2, 3, and 4 may be employed, as well as messengers, assistant messengers, watchmen, and laborers, to such number as the Appropriations Committee may see fit to provide for."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from New York a question. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] contends, as I understand, that these offices appropriated for in this amendment have been created specifically by law?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, they are not created, and they never have been created. They do not exist. He bases his whole argument that the authority for these places is given in section 169 of the Revised Statutes, and under the repeated rulings when a gentleman offers a provision he must show the authority for the provision in order to have it in order upon the bill. It is incumbent upon him to point out the law which authorizes these places for which he proposes to make provision.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. The gentleman is right in part and wrong in part. It is true we rely mainly upon this section 169 of the Revised Statutes, but as a matter of fact in 1910 the Supervising Architect's Office was given an appropriation of \$1,100,000, and in 1912, I believe it was, it only carried six hundred and fifty-odd thousand dollars, and in the decrease of that appropriation there were practically 80 of these different employees who were thrown out and the law which created them was never repealed. The fact was there was just a failure to appropriate for them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The fact that an office is carried in an appropriation bill does not create an office, and if it is dropped out it can not be restored at any time unless specific authority be pointed out.

Mr. HARRISON. In that connection when these different offices were originally created—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, they never have been created; I can not concede that.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, they had the clerks, laborers, and all these employees. Now, did not they get their appropriation under this section 169 of the Revised Statutes?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No, they did not. Certainly they did not; they could not, because the law specifically provides what can be employed under section 169, employees or clerks of the different classes, messengers, assistant messengers, and other employees. But to continue the statement of the Chair:

The Chair has no difficulty whatever in disposing of the strongest contention of the gentleman from Indiana that these offices are authorized by law. They are authorized by law for that year, that is for the life of the appropriation bill, and as has been decided time and again by the courts, nothing contained in an appropriation bill can live beyond the life of the bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these places are not offices carried in the appropriation bill for the current fiscal year or for the last current year. No authority exists in law for them. I have rulings, if the Chair desires them, pointing out that the words "other employees" refer only to employees of a grade not above that of laborer, the lowest employee enumerated in section 169 and the ruling is based upon the well-known rule of construction that specific items followed by general language are not enlarged by the recital of the general language. Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that is sufficient to dispose of the question of order because the gentleman must, before he can have his amendment considered, present the law which authorizes these employees. I have several other grounds to urge against the employment of these persons which are quite good, but I do not wish to unduly occupy the time of the committee if the Chair is satisfied on that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. There is no law authorizing these offices unless it is contained in the words "and other employees," and the Chair does not believe that it was the intent of the framers of the law in using the words to go to the extent the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] contends; indeed, if his contention is correct, a point of order could hardly be sustained against the creation of any office in an appropriation bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, there has already been appropriated by Congress two and a half million dollars to be used in the construction of these 47 propositions—

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman will permit me to make a statement, perhaps I can correct a misapprehension that exists in the minds of many Members.

Mr. AUSTIN. I just took it from the hearings and the testimony of the Supervising Architect.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman will permit me to make this statement, then he can proceed. Mr. Chairman, a number of Members are interested in public-building items. For the current fiscal year there is appropriated for the Supervising Architect's Office \$760,920. There is no item for payment under the Tarsney Act for outside architects, and if there were carried items of appropriations under the Tarsney Act, which is repealed, commensurate with the appropriations for the last two or three years, the appropriations for the current fiscal year would aggregate \$915,920. This is \$34,920 in excess of the appropriation for 1910, which, including fees for architects under the Tarsney Act, amounted to \$881,000. Prior to 1910 the services of experts and others in connection with public buildings were paid out of the appropriations for the buildings, and Congress enacted a provision prohibiting the use of such appropriations and requiring appropriations to be specifically made for such services. The last year under which appropriations were made under the old form the amount expended for this service was \$481,000.

For the current year the amount available is \$760,920, an increase of almost 100 per cent, and yet the output of the office is practically the same to-day as it was in 1910. Requests were made to increase the force in the Supervising Architect's Office at this time by nearly 100 per cent for the current fiscal year. The appropriations made at the last session of Congress were \$71,000,000 in excess of the appropriations made at any session of Congress since the beginning of the Government, and a deficit of \$25,000,000, regardless of any changes or falling off due to the tariff, is anticipated by those who have impartially investigated the conditions. With the fact before the committee that the Supervising Architect's Office was engaged in an attempt to coerce Congress into increasing this force improperly, they did not believe under the circumstances they were justified in increasing the force.

There were 47 projects for which appropriations were made, given places in chronological order, and work delayed on them for one reason or another, and in the last public-building bill legislation was enacted which enabled these projects to be taken up. When Members interested in these projects went to the Supervising Architect he stated he could not take them up for two or three years unless Congress appropriated \$180,000 for which he had requested an appropriation, and that amount was only for six months of this year and would necessitate about \$150,000 additional for the balance of the fiscal year. When questioned about this matter, he said they had outlined a program for three years, and because he had stated to some Member of Congress that the buildings authorized some time ago would be ready for the market three years from now he could not take up a matter that was not in that line, no matter how important, no matter how urgent, nor how necessary it might be. Inquiry was made, and it was ascertained that the employees in the Supervising Architect's office are employed seven hours a day. In every other department of the Government at Washington they are employed seven and one-half hours a day. If the time of these employees was lengthened a half hour or an hour, these 47 items would quickly be cleared up.

Section 7, of the act of March 15, 1898, is as follows:

Hereafter it shall be the duty of the head of each executive department to require monthly reports to be made to him as to the condition of the public business in the several bureaus or offices of his department at Washington; and in each case where such reports disclose that the public business is in arrears, the head of the department in which such arrears exist shall require, as provided herein, an extension of the hours of service of such clerks or employees as may be necessary to bring up such arrears of the public business.

In this office of the Government, in which employees work less hours than in any other, if the work is in arrears, they should be required to bring it up. There is one other reason which convinces the committee that this whole propaganda was a scheme to mislead Congress and to coerce it into enlarging unnecessarily the force in the Supervising Architect's office.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DORMUS] came before the committee and called attention to the fact that authority had been given to make certain alterations and repairs in the post office at Detroit, to cost \$70,000. He pointed out that the conditions there were such that it was imperative that they should be remedied, and he was informed by the Supervising Architect that unless Congress appropriated \$180,000 to increase its force it would be impossible to do that work inside of two years. That was the statement made to Members of Congress interested in different projects. If that be the rule, it should be applied impartially, not only to Members of Congress but to the heads of departments. But the Secretary of the Treasury called the

attention of the committee to the fact that for \$40,000 alterations could be made in the old building of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing which would enable him to place in that building all of the auditors of his department with the exception of the Auditor for the Post Office Department, accommodate them from the 1st of July, and save \$35,000 in rent. If an appropriation of \$40,000 were made at this time, so that the work could be begun on the 1st of January, it could be ended on the 30th of June and that building be made available for occupancy. The committee suggested that the Secretary of the Treasury submit an estimate for that purpose, and the Supervising Architect was present when the suggestion was made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HAY). Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The estimate was submitted, of \$40,000, to do the work, and not a dollar was requested nor a word is contained in that estimate for the technical services required to turn out the plans to do the work. So that it demonstrates that this statement, that these emergency projects can not be taken up, is not one that is strictly adhered to in the Supervising Architect's Office. It depends upon whether a Member of Congress or the head of a department is interested in it whether it will be adhered to.

The Secretary of the Treasury, after the Supervising Architect and the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in charge of the public building items had been heard, was requested to appear before the committee, and he was asked to state what the policy of this administration is to be regarding the construction of public buildings. Last year \$20,000,000 was expended upon construction work, and it is conceded that if this increase in force were granted by Congress it would mean an increase in the amount expended for construction work by \$5,000,000 annually.

The Secretary said that at the time these estimates had been submitted his attention had not been called to the fact that in the last public building bill, approved on the 4th of March last, a commission had been created, consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, the Attorney General, and two members of each of the Committees on Public Buildings and Grounds of the two Houses, to take up the entire question of the construction of public buildings and report a definite plan to be pursued. He expressed the belief that as that commission had organized since the estimates had been submitted, and as they could take the matter up and make a report at the next session of Congress, in his opinion it would be better to wait until the next session of Congress before pressing the estimates.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARNER. What remedy does the gentleman suggest to the Members who are interested in these 47 buildings?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to point out a remedy, but I am prepared to call the attention of the House to some very important facts in reference to public buildings. From 1903 to 1914, a period of 12 years, the appropriations for the construction of public buildings amounted to over \$154,000,000. That is an average of \$12,800,000 a year. During the preceding 12 years, from 1891 to 1902, the appropriations aggregated \$51,000,000, an average of \$4,300,000 a year. From the beginning of the Government up to June 6, 1902, all public buildings authorized, including sites, numbered 460, and their cost amounted to \$160,499,000. Since the 6th of June, 1902, including the bill that was approved on that day, there have been authorized in six acts, including sites, 1,003 buildings, and at a total limit of \$113,139,000.

Mr. BURNETT. Since when?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Since the 6th of June, 1902. That is nearly three times as many buildings and sites as were authorized from the beginning of the Government up to that date and 67 per cent of their cost. The five bills from June 6, 1902, to June 25, 1910, authorized 699 buildings, including sites, at an aggregate cost of \$80,000,000.

With this information before the committee having some responsibility to the House and to the country with respect to recommendations for appropriations, the committee was unable to recommend increasing by 50 per cent the force in the Office of the Supervising Architect.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In a moment. In justice to members of the subcommittee, after the hearings were completed I invited the Democratic members of the Committee on Appropriations to meet, and I laid before them fairly and accurately a complete statement of the matter affecting the public buildings, and suggested the advisability of the members of the committee, before the subcommittee attempted to make any recommendations, expressing their views as to what the policy of the committee should be. I did that so that nobody might charge that my personal views may have affected this matter one way or the other; and the subcommittee unanimously agreed upon the policy which the subcommittee carried out in reporting the bill to the full committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. AUSTIN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] is recognized.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, the Supervising Architect's Office deserves the attention and consideration of this House. We are constantly increasing the number of public-building projects in the omnibus public-buildings bills and at the same time failing to give the Treasury Department an increase in the force of its Supervising Architect's Office. Mr. MacVeagh, the predecessor of Mr. McAdoo, in order to reduce expenses under the Taft administration on the eve of the approaching elections, and to make a record for economy, had the Sixty-first Congress reduce this force 70 clerks, and hold down the annual appropriation on public buildings and grounds to \$12,000,000 a year.

The gentleman speaks about the amount of money appropriated for the administration of that office. I have the figures here, taken from the records of the Treasury Department, showing that there were paid in salaries in 1910, \$85,900; in 1911, \$84,400; in 1912, \$97,500; in 1913, \$83,850; and in 1914, \$235,920. There was only an increase of \$20,000 in 1914, and the balance of the increase results from a transfer of certain employees carried under the head of "General expenses."

The total number of buildings carried in the public-buildings act of 1908 was 234; in the public-buildings act of June, 1910, 251; in the public-buildings act of March, 1913, 327.

There are 209 public buildings authorized prior to the last public-buildings bill that are not under contract and the plans for which are not under preparation.

Under the present limited force of the Supervising Architect's Office 75 building plans per year are turned out, as against 125 public-building plans prior to the reduction of the force caused by failing to appropriate for the salaries of 70 clerks and assistants in that office. It will require the Supervising Architect's Office three years to complete the plans and specifications on every building authorized prior to the last public-buildings act, passed in March of this year. It will require until 1916, to complete these plans before any of the plans under the last public-buildings bill are taken up. Without an increase of the present force it will require until 1920 to complete all of the plans carried in the public-buildings bills heretofore authorized by Congress. So I want to say for the information of the new Members and the old Members that there will be no chance for the preparation of new public-building plans for seven years unless Congress increases the clerical force of the Supervising Architect's Office.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman has put before us very forcibly this program of the Supervising Architect's Office. But does not the gentleman know or believe that for all the smaller buildings, up to \$50,000, a uniform set of plans could be adopted by the Supervising Architect's Office, and that with slight changes of specifications they could be adapted to a great many cities of from 10,000 to 20,000 inhabitants, which would obviate the necessity for this elaborate three-year plan.

Mr. AUSTIN. I want to say to the gentleman that the present Supervising Architect is doing all in his power to standardize public buildings of a certain kind and character.

Mr. BORLAND. Will not that reduce the estimate of seven years that the gentleman has made?

Mr. AUSTIN. Not to any considerable extent, because already the department is standardizing the plans wherever they can be standardized.

Mr. BORLAND. I will say to the gentleman that a Member of Congress came before the committee—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HAY). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. I will call attention to this fact: That a Member of Congress came before our committee and said he had been to see the Supervising Architect in regard to one of these buildings, and had been told that this elaborate program would take three years to carry out. He said, "Mr. Supervising Architect, give me the same plans that were drawn for the post office at Billville and put them through for the post office at Jimville," and they did it, and he had his post-office plans inside of 60 days.

Mr. AUSTIN. I know that the Supervising Architect's Office is doing everything possible to standardize public buildings.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. That is an awfully general expression. Will the gentleman tell us something he has done?

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman knows that in five minutes I can not explain the work of the Supervising Architect's Office.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. We will give you more time if you will give us some explanation.

Mr. AUSTIN. I want to say that the Supervising Architect's force will never be increased by the Committee on Appropriations, because that committee are opposed to increasing the amount of money annually expended for the construction of public buildings and grounds. While the gentleman says we expended \$20,000,000 last year, my recollection is that the hearings show that we expended \$14,000,000 last year, and if this program recommended by the Supervising Architect was adopted then the amount would be increased from \$14,000,000 to \$20,000,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The average expenditure which the estimates of the Supervising Architect's Office has been based upon is about fourteen millions a year. Last year there was expended twenty millions. That was due to the fact that the work was speeded up, and an increase of its force will increase the expenditure \$5,000,000. I have no desire to do anything except to state accurately the facts.

Mr. AUSTIN. The truth is, Congress in its public-buildings bills is authorizing more money for public buildings than the Treasury Department has estimated for that purpose. The Treasury Department is not increasing that amount—will not do it until the force in the Supervising Architect's Office is increased.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. Is it not a fact also that the Treasury Department examines usually the amount of money that it wants to expend, and in consultation with the Appropriations Committee determines the amount regardless of what the wishes of Congress may be?

Mr. AUSTIN. We are absolutely in the power of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Committee on Appropriations in this matter, which concerns every Member of this House. We will not be free, we will not be able to satisfy the wishes of our constituents and do our full duty until we take hold of this matter and vote to increase the force in the Supervising Architect's Office.

I want to say, in answer to the criticism by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that the present Supervising Architect is efficient, conscientious, and the best equipped man that ever held that position, and I have had an acquaintance with that office for many years.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not said anything to the contrary.

Mr. AUSTIN. In one of the first talks I had with the new Secretary of the Treasury we discussed this congested condition of the Supervising Architect's Office. Mr. McAdoo, a live, wide-awake, public man, a successful business man, stated that it was his earnest desire to clean up the congested condition in that office and bring the work up to date; and he asked the Committee on Appropriations for an appropriation and submitted an estimate of \$1,353,000, and then, after the hearing, in order to meet what he supposed were the wishes of that committee, he reduced that estimate to \$974,770, and the committee cut it to \$378,891, carrying in this bill for the Supervising Architect's Office \$603,891, when he had revised and cut his estimate down to \$974,770. We have in the person of the Secretary of the Treasury a man that can fill that position and will fill it with honor and credit to his party, to himself, and to the country, and I submit, with this subject in charge and control of this House, that when this new Secretary comes here with his first estimate to Congress in an earnest, honest endeavor to put that office, especially the bureau presided over by the Super-

vising Architect of the Treasury, in a first-class, businesslike condition, with up-to-date methods, you ought not to say no; you ought to uphold his hands and sustain and help him. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] is in error when he states that force in the Supervising Architect's Office has been reduced.

Mr. AUSTIN. In the Sixty-first Congress, I stated.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. We have constantly increased the force at the disposal of the Supervising Architect. The trouble with the gentleman's figures arises from the fact that he is not familiar with the appropriation bills. Some of the force in the Supervising Architect's Office has been provided for in the sundry civil bill, some in the legislative bill, and at one time some of it was paid for under the appropriation for public buildings.

But I want to say to the House that we have endeavored to bring all the force into the legislative bill, and when the gentleman read the figures for 1914, exceeding \$200,000, he thought it must be a mistake. It is not a mistake, but we have simply brought into the legislative bill the force that had been provided for in other bills. There has been absolutely no reduction in the force, but there has been a constant increase.

Mr. MacVeagh did reduce the force in the department by more than 500 persons during his four years, but most of that reduction was in the Auditor's office for the Post Office Department, and no part of the reduction was in the Supervising Architect's Office.

Mr. AUSTIN. My authority is the Supervising Architect himself.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Well, I know more about it than he does.

Mr. AUSTIN. And his further statement was that the force was reduced 70 officials in that department by the Sixty-first Congress, and the last Congress gave him an increase of \$20,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I know more about it than the Supervising Architect, because I am on the committee that makes up the bills, and he is a new man up there.

I think it far more important that Congress should consider a question of policy than that it should consider a question of increasing this particular item in an appropriation bill. One reason why those of you who are interested in public buildings are required to wait from three to five years after Congress has authorized their construction is that the policy of the Supervising Architect's Office has been to make a separate plan for each building.

There may be to-day authorized not less than 75 buildings in the United States at a cost of \$60,000 each. Those buildings are located in every State in the Union. The Supervising Architect believes that he ought to make a separate plan for each one of those buildings. That costs about \$3,000 for each one. Do you believe that there is a business man in the United States who, if he were going to build 60 houses, whether warehouses or stores or apartment buildings, in 60 different cities of the United States, to cost exactly the same amount of money, would employ architects to make 60 different sets of plans? Travel throughout the country over a railway, and as you pass from station to station you see the railway company has standardized its depots. For towns of 5,000 people they have a certain style and a certain size. For towns of 10,000 people you find they have a certain size and a certain style, and so it is in all the railways and in all the great enterprises of the country. The cotton mills that build hundreds and thousands of houses adopt a certain plan, and in the building of those houses they follow those plans.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I believe that we ought to go at this in a businesslike way. We ought to standardize these buildings. If the \$60,000 building which they designed for my town is artistic in South Carolina and good for the eye to look upon, then it would be artistic in Minnesota or Wisconsin or Maine. No two citizens of the United States in all probability would ever see these two buildings, one of which might be located in the State of Washington and the other in North Carolina. There is absolutely no reason why the Government should not go at it in a businesslike way, and if you will do that you will not have to wait for five years for your buildings.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say to the gentleman that I thoroughly agree with the idea of standardization in a practical way. I am a member of the committee or the commission which now has that matter in charge, but I want to ask the gentleman if he does not realize that climatic conditions have something to do with building operations? In other words, does the gentleman believe a building that would do for South Carolina would, without any change, answer for Minnesota?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in reply to that I would say that the climatic conditions might affect the material out of which it was built, but it could not affect the style, the size of the house, and the general outlines of the plans.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I know several post-office buildings in South Carolina costing the same amount, and yet there was a separate plan for each building.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, what is pending before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The motion of the gentleman from Tennessee, to strike out the last word.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MANN. Can we not reach some conclusion as to how long this is going to run?

Mr. SISSON. As far as I am concerned it will not run very long.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized in opposition to that motion.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] in his statement in reference to the Supervising Architect having done all he could to standardize buildings in this country has not stated it just exactly as I understand from the Supervising Architect himself. When he was before the Subcommittee on Appropriations I endeavored to get him to state if he was standardizing, and he did not answer positively that he was, but proceeded to show how difficult it was to standardize. I endeavored to get the Secretary of the Treasury to state what effort had been made to standardize since his term, and he said that his other duties had engrossed his time and that very little had been done. During that examination the Secretary of the Treasury himself stated that he had made these estimates without knowing the conditions in the architect's office, because his duties were so multifarious and there were so many departments under him that he had not gone into the matter fully. He finally told the subcommittee that he desired that this whole matter, except those absolute deficiencies, should go over until he, with the chairmen of the two committees of the two Houses and the other two members of the commission, could work out a plan whereby they would be able to save to the Government a great deal of money and work out a good plan of standardization. On page 697 of the hearings Mr. McAdoo said:

We are going very carefully into all of these questions, and I very much hope that the commission will be able to submit at the next session of Congress a very definite recommendation as to the policy to be pursued with respect to public buildings in all particulars, as well as to present a cohesive, consistent, and concrete plan for dealing with many of the questions which I think are in your mind. I think, therefore, if I may be permitted to say it, that we are indulging in a fruitless discussion now.

Why, because he was not then able to say in answer to my question that there was any plan of standardization, notwithstanding the fact that the law requires the standardization.

I want to say this in reference to the architect's office, that if spending, as they do, an average of 6 per cent, which is 1 per cent more than is charged by the commercial architects, they are getting the poorest results for the greatest amount of money that is possible for a bunch of men to get, we had better dispense with these skilled architects and get seven or eight unlettered farmers and put them in charge of the business, because down in my country, where the county supervisors, who are plain farmers, build a court house, and across the street you build a post office, you will find the court house costing \$40,000 to complete, seating about 500 or 600 people, with offices downstairs, with all the conveniences upstairs, built of St. Louis pressed brick, while in the same district you will find a \$55,000 one-story post-office building that is built of the ordinary brick of the country, and the only stone you will find in it is in the steps leading into the building, and the ordinary on-looker will know that the people are not getting the worth of their money out of the Supervising Architect's Office. If that is the result which these architects are getting, it is the highest

duty of every Member of this Congress to look into these matters suggested by the Secretary of the Treasury and know what is going on with the people's money. I am willing that these buildings may be constructed, but I am unwilling that they should be constructed until we ascertain whether or not the Supervising Architect's Office has done its full and its complete duty.

Now, as to the standardization, I want to say when you make a plan—and I have talked with many private architects, I have talked with many builders about this, and they will tell you that your plans ought to take into consideration the building material in the section in which it is to be located, but you may standardize a building and make a type for a \$50,000 building in the State of Alabama and use it in the State of Mississippi. You can use it in Georgia. You can standardize a building in Vermont and use it in all New England. You can standardize a building in Oregon and Washington and use the material there in that neighborhood and use it for that section. You can standardize a building out West. But what is the trouble? The trouble is that when that is done then every honest builder gets an opportunity to put in an honest bid, because he can know what he is doing.

The man who built the State capitol in my own State, Mr. Barnes—and there was not the slightest tinge of a suspicion, the slightest suggestion that the people did not get value received for the money for the State capitol. Yet a man like this could not and would not bid upon the plans and specifications handed out by this department because they were not standardized and the terms used were different in different plans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SISSON. Now, you take the standard steel. They keep it on the shelves, as it were, in the great steel concerns, and when you order a piece of structural steel, it is a standard as much as a four-by-four post in an ordinary frame building. You find windows that are standards in size, and window frames of certain size, having a certain number of lights in them—a standard article—and yet in these post-office buildings they use terms making it necessary to use material of different sizes. He can use terms for windows which are off size. And for this reason, in many instances, on the larger contracts, men are unwilling to compete. And for that reason if for no other, they ought to have these buildings standardized and the terms standard, because every honest contractor and every honest builder could go and look at the type of the building, and when he put in his bid he would know when he complied with the terms of the contract for that type of building.

Now, I have a building in this bill which I think, like all the other Members, is being delayed. I have another which is authorized, and perhaps I will not get it in three years. But I am unwilling to have it erected until I shall know, or have reason to know, that the people of the United States are getting value received for it, until I know that every honest contractor, who submitted plans and specifications, may go over those plans and specifications, and know whether or not he is authorized, according to his construction, to put in a certain bid on it. Therefore I shall not hurry this matter until we get a complete report.

I have confidence in the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], who is the chairman of the committee of this House, and his second, my good friend from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], although I do not know whether he is on the commission or not, and in Senator SWANSON; and I also have confidence in the Secretary of the Treasury, and all these other gentlemen.

My friend says that the Secretary asked this. Yes; but he now especially repudiated the asking when he told us the facts. On the contrary, he asked that this building program go over until this commission could make a full and complete investigation and submit a plan to Congress, when Congress and the country would know in the future the people were getting value received for their money. There is something wrong in the Supervising Architect's Office. The private architect is willing to do the work for 5 per cent and supervise. It costs these gentlemen 6 per cent, with their office and all the material furnished. They have their office furnished and all their material furnished them; they have all their equipment there. They do not have to travel around over the country and hunt up jobs. They do not have to pay hotel bills while hanging around courthouses in order to ascertain whether or not they are going to get contracts let to them for courthouses and on other buildings to be constructed. The private architects have to go out into

the world and compete on bids; and yet the private architects make money on a 5 per cent basis, while the United States Government now is spending 6 per cent in this architect's office. Is there anything wrong? I do not know whether there is anything dishonest about it or not, but I do say that on its face it shows gross inefficiency, which ought to be investigated before men go further with this building program in the United States. And for that reason I stand with the subcommittee, I stand with the full committee, I stand with the Secretary of the Treasury in his recommendation that the law be carried out—that this matter be investigated before we go further.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FITZGERALD. How much time does the gentleman from Texas want?

Mr. GARNER. I want only two or three minutes.

Mr. BURNETT. I want five minutes.

Mr. HARRISON. I would like five minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I would like three minutes.

Mr. COX. Give me three.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, quite a number of Members want to speak on the matter. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this question close at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FLOOD of Virginia). The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph under consideration close at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes.

Mr. COX. That ought to be divided up.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to apologize to the committee for consuming five minutes on the proposition of striking out the last two words; but this question here is one that is at least six or seven years old. Those of us who have been here that length of time will recall the fact that at each session of Congress this identical question comes up and the Committee on Appropriations takes the same position each time; that is, it draws an indictment against the Supervising Architect's Office and says, "You do not need any more money, for we are not going to let you have more than a certain number of buildings each year."

That intimation was made clear this morning by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT], when he drew an indictment against the Congress itself for making appropriations for public buildings at places where he thought the buildings ought not to exist. The same idea now comes from the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], when he indicts the Congress for making the authorizations of buildings when those buildings can not possibly be expected to be constructed for four or five years.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Massachusetts and their conclusions. I do not believe these authorizations ought to be made unless you intend in good faith to construct the buildings. But I beg leave to suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts and to the gentleman from New York that the Congress is larger than the Committee on Appropriations; that when this Congress has spoken and declared that it is the policy of this Government to construct these buildings you and your associates ought not to stand in the way and prevent Congress from constructing these buildings. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GARNER. I will.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman says I am standing in the way. I am not standing in the way.

Mr. GARNER. Oh, yes; the gentleman says he is not standing in the way of constructing these buildings, and yet every time the Secretary of the Treasury prepares to make an estimate, he knows what the estimates are, but he prevents the Secretary of the Treasury from making an estimate, because he can not draw the plans and specifications.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Texas is mistaken. The Secretary of the Treasury estimated for the force that he required in his office.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I have only five minutes. I submit to the gentleman from New York this proposition: If he will put in this bill an item of \$150,000 for an increase of the force of the Supervising Architect's Office, will not the Secretary of the Treasury submit an amendment for \$5,000,000 more in his next estimate? Will not the Secretary of the Treasury do that?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I guess he will.

Mr. GARNER. I guess he will, too. Then you prevent him from submitting the estimate.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There was nothing to prevent him from submitting an estimate for this additional force when the law required him to complete the buildings.

Mr. GARNER. We imagined when we put these 47 buildings on the top of the docket that you would take the whole of it. You will be delayed five or six months on your building that is now in process of construction, because these 47 buildings must be planned first. The plans and specifications must first be drawn.

The gentleman from New York has brought an indictment against the Supervising Architect which will either compel him to take up these 47 buildings or else the Secretary of the Treasury ought to be impeached.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I think we should do the thing that ought to be done now and let what should be done three years from now take care of itself at that time.

Mr. GARNER. I agree with the gentleman; but if you will give the Supervising Architect's Office this \$150,000, he will draw plans and specifications and go right along with this program that has been outlined. But the gentleman from New York is not willing to do that. Why? Because it will involve the expenditure of \$5,000,000 later. For what purpose? For a purpose that he thinks ought not to have been authorized in the beginning.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Texas is mistaken. Along with the gentleman from Texas I belong to a party that made certain promises, and I believe we ought to keep those promises and not attempt to bunko the people.

Mr. GARNER. Oh, the gentleman says we belong to a party that made certain promises and we ought to keep them. I agree with him in that. I voted with the gentleman from New York and with the gentleman from Massachusetts and others not to bring in these authorizations of public buildings. But when this Congress has deliberately spoken the gentleman from New York and his associates on the Committee on Appropriations have no right to hold us up and say, "We will put the veto on this House, and therefore we will not permit you to make it possible for the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare these estimates."

Mr. FITZGERALD. We have no power to do that.

Mr. GARNER. If you give us this money for this increase of force, we shall get some more estimates, shall we not? That, Mr. Chairman, answers the whole question. If you will give us the money for the force necessary to prepare the plans for the construction of these 47 buildings as an emergency, we will get an additional estimate of \$5,000,000 with which to construct the buildings. If you do not furnish this extra force, we can not get the estimates. Who is stopping it? Let the gentleman answer that question. Who is preventing these buildings from being constructed? The Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with every word that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] has said when he drew his indictment against the Supervising Architect's Office. The work of that office ought to be standardized. I have no criticism to make of the gentleman's indictment. I am in full accord with the Committee on Appropriations and with the theory which they hold, that some of these buildings in small towns ought not to have been authorized. But I do say that after I have been outvoted in this House and after the House has declared a policy, I have no right to stand in the way of it; neither has the Committee on Appropriations that right. [Applause.]

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman's time expired?

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

Mr. SISSON. I wanted to ask the gentleman one question about the extra hour.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say only a word or two on this subject of standardization. I happen to be a member of the commission charged with the duty of undertaking to devise some plan of standardization which will expedite the construction of Government buildings and largely be a measure of economy to the people of this country.

Mr. Chairman, no man in this House is more attached to the standardization of buildings than I am. I believe that the Government can save millions of dollars by creating a practical system of standardization, but it is a practical question and a great question. It is easy enough to say that a \$50,000 building at one place and a \$50,000 building at another place ought to be exactly the same and that the plans and specifications ought to be exactly alike, but if gentlemen will confer with architects and with builders they will find out that climatic conditions have a great deal to do with the construction of buildings. They will find that the topography of the country has a great

deal to do with the construction of buildings. I believe that in these smaller towns where the Government has no activity other than that of the post office there can be a practical standardization, but in order to do that I believe you will find that you must group the States together with reference to climatic conditions.

For instance, New England would make one group, the Rocky Mountain States another, the Southeastern States would make one, the Southwestern States another, and the Middle West, and so forth; but when you come to the construction of buildings where various activities of the Government are to be housed—the post office, the Federal courts, the customhouse, the land office, and all that—I do not believe that you can ever find a plan of standardization that will cover that class of buildings. We can make it apply to the smaller ones if you will group the States as I have suggested, where there is nothing but the Post Office Department to be provided for.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Certainly.

Mr. SISSON. I agree with the gentleman about the division; but with reference to the last buildings the gentleman speaks of, does he not believe that they can use a standard with reference to the materials that shall go into the buildings?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; that may be true. But at the same time you ought to take into consideration the character of building material in the vicinity where the building is to be constructed.

Mr. SISSON. That is true.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Take it in Minnesota, where it is cold, or in Dakota. They desire a building constructed entirely different from what we would in Florida. There we want air, and we want verandas, and we want shade.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. With pleasure.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am the daddy of this idea of standardization of buildings. I have fought for it for 15 years, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida what has the climate to do with the shape and dimensions of these buildings?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. A great deal.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How can it have anything to do with it?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. In the State of Florida if you could get a perfectly round building with plenty of verandas, it would be more comfortable, because we need the breeze, and you could get it from every side and source.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is mere detail. Is it not true that pressed brick and terra cotta and steel, the three materials out of which you would build a forty or fifty thousand dollar building, are the best materials and are practically indestructible in any climate—especially terra cotta and pressed brick?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; if you use brick very much in a damp climate you will have the walls covered with moss that is going to make it damp nearly all the time, and extremely unhealthy for those people that dwell within the building.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. I want to say that that is exactly the experience that we have had in Augusta, Ga. We have a building of brick and it is extremely unhealthy.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to ask the gentleman from Florida one further question. Has the committee been considering the question of laying down fixed conditions on which a town shall have a building at all, and the building of a certain price, so that the Secretary of the Treasury, when these conditions are performed can automatically order a certain building to be completed in that town?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; that has been considered, but, of course, Mr. Chairman, we have reached no conclusion.

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I do not want more than a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks that the time of the gentleman from Florida be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as I said, I do not want more than a minute. So far as I am individually concerned, I shall oppose hereafter the construction of a public

building in any town where the interest upon the money invested is greater than the expense of the Government in renting suitable quarters therefor. [Applause.]

I believe that we have reached the time when the construction of public buildings at the expense of the Government in little 2-by-4 towns ought to cease. [Applause.] I think that business ought to be conducted upon a practical, common-sense basis. If, therefore, we can secure quarters in a town for the post office which are suitable, ample, and safe for less money than would be the interest at Government rate on the cost of a suitable building, then the Government, in my opinion, should not construct a building in such town. I believe this should be the general rule for our guidance, but of course there may be peculiar conditions which would create exceptions and take some cities or towns out of this general rule.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he means his statement to apply to towns where they have a Federal court and all other United States offices?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, no. I think every court in this land ought to be housed by the Government, and if the town is important enough to have a Federal court you will generally find that the interest upon the amount invested will be much less than the rentals that have to be paid by the Government for suitable quarters.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I have a town of that kind in my district.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, in the time allotted to me I do not know that I can improve by a more extended discussion the sentiment expressed in a rather surprising statement made by the gentleman from Florida during the last 2 minutes of his speech. I think he said more to the point in the last 2 minutes of his extended time than he had previously said in 10 minutes.

It seems to me, gentlemen, that we have been losing sight of the main object, and that it has been covered up in a mass of verbiage which would be delightful if we had the time to hear it, but which is not profitable.

I agree with much that has been said about standardizing these public buildings; but the basic proposition, if we would get anywhere at all in bringing about economy, is to draw the line on these appropriations, so that, as the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. FITZGERALD] has informed us, instead of multiplying the amount of this appropriation during the past 12 years to twelve times what it was in the previous 12 years, we could permanently stop that bungle through which the public money flows so rapidly.

A dozen or 15 years ago many of our own party, who were then on the outside, criticized the extravagance of Congress because, as they said, it was a billion-dollar Congress. The reply was made by a distinguished Republican leader at that time that that was not a material objection, because this was a billion-dollar country. I submit, as a matter of correct logic, that if it was true that we had a billion-dollar Congress covering a period of 2 years 12 years ago because we had a billion-dollar country, we now have progressed to a most wonderful extent, because in that short time we have come to be a \$2,000,000,000 country, for we are now making appropriations aggregating a billion dollars or more each year.

During the time I have been a Member of this Congress, I have on a number of occasions raised my voice in protest against the unwarranted extravagance of this body in spending the public money, especially as it has to do with the Federal building appropriation. It has only been within the last two years, when we commenced to carry out the reform preached by our party for the last 30 years of lowering tariff duties, that we have been met with the correlative proposition that if we are going to thereby lose revenue we must meet our rapidly growing expenses by providing other sources of income. So we resorted then to reviving the old wartime income tax, from which we expect to get \$100,000,000 or more annually. I am heartily in favor of it. I believe it ought to come to pass. In its consideration, however, the question of its absolute necessity was quite as prominent as its justice. Then we levied a corporation excise tax, from which we are getting annually \$30,000,000 or so. I believe in that; but I want to warn my colleagues that the next move will be the inauguration of a Federal inheritance tax and the doubling of internal-revenue duties. You will remember that former President Taft proposed the first. He was at once confronted with the fact that we already have that burden imposed in not less than 36 of our States, and it would look like, and would indeed be, a very grievous burden to pile on top of the existing tax another equally burdensome levied by the National Government. That proposition had to be abandoned. But we can not go ahead spending public money in the way we are now doing and keep

free from a deficit without further increasing a grievous burden of taxation. If I had my way, not as it concerns this particular bill, but upon the construction of Federal buildings, I would inaugurate a very different policy. But I can not have my way about it. There are too many pieces of fat pork in this barrel. I do not say this offensively. It is the common designation of this kind of an appropriation. The appropriations for rivers and harbors go with it, and in many instances are equally censurable. But we have too many selfish interests at stake, and it would be hard to pass the kind of a law that I would propose.

If I had my way, I would have no Federal building constructed in any town unless the receipts of the post office of that town were at least \$50,000 a year and it had at least 10,000 inhabitants.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. SHARP. Just for one question.

Mr. STEENERSON. Has the gentleman ever inquired into the buildings that are in use as substations in the large cities like Chicago and one or two in Washington, where they are constructed by private capital and then rented for a period of 10 years or more at a very low rental? It seems to me that that would solve the problem that the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. SHARP. That might do so; but may I say one further word in respect to the gentleman from Florida?

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

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], in closing his remarks, laid down a rule. He is a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and on this account his views on this question are important. If the rule or criterion referred to by the gentleman had been in effect—that is, no public building where the Government could rent a suitable private property for less than the annual fixed charges, including a low rate of interest and maintenance of a Federal building if constructed—then, I dare say, that out of the 1,200 post-office propositions mentioned by the chairman of the committee [Mr. FITZGERALD] the Government would not have had to construct more than one-third of those buildings at public expense. Even at this late day the inauguration of such a policy would annually save to the people of the United States fully \$10,000,000.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I shall only say one or two words in regard to the question of standardization. Gentlemen may theorize upon that just as long as they desire, but there is a practical common-sense side to that question. There is no such thing as standardization on the question of cost. The distinguished speaker has referred to his paternity of that proposition, and yet I would like to see him or anybody else standardize as to cost. They may standardize upon the style of architecture, and yet when they come to the question of construction it depends not only upon climatic conditions, but also on the proximity to material, on freight rates, and many other things. We have a case in point before our Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds now. A bill was introduced by a gentleman from Kansas asking an additional appropriation because of the fact that the \$50,000 appropriated, which would construct a building in some States, on account of climatic conditions in Kansas will not construct a building there. Reference has been made to terra cotta. This gentleman has stated to our committee that on account of those climatic conditions in his State terra cotta can not be used as well as something else that is better adapted to the climate. Hence when it comes to the question of standardization it is practically a common-sense question.

When Mr. SHEPPARD was chairman of the committee, and after he left the House and I was the acting chairman of the committee, we always insisted upon the Supervising Architect—and he has to a very great extent acquiesced—reducing to a standard these buildings as much as possible, and great progress was made along that line; but when gentlemen think there can be standardization so as to apply to all of the States of the country they are absolutely mistaken.

Mr. Chairman, what I rose for was to reply to some criticisms of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] made yesterday in regard to this Democratic Congress and the Committee on Public Buildings. Here is one of the contributions of the gentleman. He says:

Personally, I do not believe that it is economy or that it is wise for this Government to put up a building in any place of less than 100,000 inhabitants, certainly not in a town of less than 50,000.

The gentleman would certainly object to and repudiate a charge of unwisdom on his part, and yet the gentleman himself in the last public buildings bill secured an appropriation—first asking for \$50,000 and then finally allowed \$80,000—for a building to be constructed in Amherst, Mass., the population of which is only 5,112. Mr. Chairman, when you find a gentleman who is always jumping on the Public Buildings Committee you generally find one who very quietly is insisting that he ought to be made an exception to that particular rule. Here is the gentleman seriously saying that it would be unwise for Congress to do a certain thing, and yet he comes up and in the town of 5,112 asks for \$50,000 in money and finally gets \$80,000 and then criticizes the Democratic Congress. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that the \$45,000,000 of which he speaks was not put on entirely by the House of Representatives, but much of it by a Republican Senate, and one of the troubles about these gentlemen who criticize the committee is that they generally do not know what they are talking about. I want to quote another statement that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] made. He says:

Now, of these 120 sites that are authorized over 100 are in towns which do not have annual postal receipts of \$10,000.

That is incorrect. The gentleman never took time; he makes a charge against the Democratic Party and a Democratic House, and he never took the time, Mr. Chairman, to look into the facts, but he makes the general broad assertion that 100 of the 120 sites did not have \$10,000 postal receipts. He goes on—

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman state how many are under?

Mr. BURNETT. Less than 100, not more than 60 of them, I think, and many of these put on by a Republican Senate. Much of the increase in the bill was put on by a Republican Senate at the end of the last session of Congress when we had to accept it, Mr. Chairman, or the bill would have been lost. Now, to show again that the gentleman does not know what he is talking about, but is going off half cocked, as these Republicans usually do, he makes this kind of statement. He said:

Up to this present Democratic economical administration it was the rule that no place which had less than 1,000 inhabitants and \$10,000 of postal receipts should have a public building.

Nobody ever heard of that 1,000 inhabitants except when it was conjured up in the fertile imagination of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GILLETT. Was not that corrected in the very next sentence?

Mr. BURNETT. That is sought to be corrected by a Democrat, who got it wrong, too, and I will show you what he said.

Mr. LLOYD. The gentleman will permit, the rule was 10,000 inhabitants or \$10,000 of postal receipts.

That is not correct. I remember, Mr. Chairman, that the town of Demopolis, in my State, got an appropriation during the last Republican Congress of \$50,000 or \$60,000 where it had considerably less than \$10,000 receipts, and I will show nearly 20 cases in the public buildings bill, headed by Mr. BARTHOLOMEW and gentlemen on the other side, a Republican House, and a Republican Senate, where either sites or buildings were authorized in towns that had less than \$10,000 of receipts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. Gentlemen ought to know, they ought to be conscientious enough to know, what they are talking about before indicting the committee or a Democratic Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired; all time has expired, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Has debate expired by order of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. It has, at 3.30.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, after line 20, insert "Everett, Wash., \$50,000."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on this paragraph has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is not an amendment to the paragraph, but it is a new paragraph.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I sent up the wrong amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I picked up the wrong piece of paper. The one I sent up is not correctly written, and I ask to withdraw the other and substitute this, in which the language is a little different.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington withdraws his amendment and offers the following amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, after line 20, insert "Everett, Wash., for completion of building under present limit, \$50,000."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order or will make it unless the gentleman desires to be heard. My point of order is—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not think it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MANN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. BARTLETT. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. MANN. But what is the point of order?

Mr. BARTLETT. The point of order, Mr. Chairman, is that appropriations for public buildings, although they may be authorized, are not in order upon this, being a deficiency bill, this amendment not being for a deficiency. I will reserve the point of order if the gentleman desires.

Mr. MANN. No; let us settle it. Here is a public building that is authorized by law.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will read the Chair my authority. On page 373, section 3562, fourth volume of Hinds' Parliamentary Precedents:

Appropriations for the continuation of work on a public building, not to supply any actual deficiency, belong to the sundry civil bill and not to the general deficiency.

This is an urgent deficiency bill.

On March 17, 1880, the House was in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union considering the deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. Benjamin Butterworth, of Ohio, offered the following amendment:

For completing the customhouse and post-office building at Cincinnati, Ohio, \$150,000, said appropriation to be immediately available.

Against this amendment Mr. Joseph C. S. Blackburn, of Kentucky, made the point of order under Rule XXI.

The Chairman ruled:

Although the bill under consideration is not, technically speaking, a general appropriation bill, yet rule 120 of the old series was always held to apply to bills of this character, as well as to original appropriation bills. The difficulty with the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Butterworth] seems to be that it does not come from any committee having any jurisdiction of the subject. The right of individuals upon their own responsibility to offer amendments to appropriation bills has been very much restricted by the third clause of Rule XXI of the new rules. Without commenting upon that clause, the Chair holds that the amendment is not in order coming from an individual Member of the House and not from a committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter.

Now, in section 3746, page 499 of the same volume, it says:

On June 18, 1902, while the general deficiency appropriation bill was under consideration in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. George W. Steele, of Indiana, offered the following amendment:

On page 26, after line 21, insert:

"Marion Branch, at Marion, Ind.: For quartermaster and commissary storehouse and repairing old storehouse and constructing fire-proof vaults therein for offices, \$30,000."

Mr. CHARLES L. BARTLETT, of Georgia, made the point of order that there was no legislation authorizing the appropriation; and Mr. Leonidas F. Livingston, of Georgia, raised the further point that the appropriation was not in order on this bill.

After debate the Chairman said:

"The Chair held in a former Congress, in reference to Annapolis Academy, that an amendment providing for an additional building there was in order. The Chair stated at the time that he so held in deference to former decisions, not because he would have so held had it originally come before the present occupant of the chair. If there was no other question involved now than the question of the enlargement of the plant, the necessary enlargement, the Chair would be inclined to hold that it was in order, following the precedent established in the Naval Academy case and the cases upon which it was based. But the Chair is inclined to think that the suggestion and point made by the gentleman from Georgia that it is not in order on a general deficiency bill is well taken."

Those are the two precedents, Mr. Chairman, and I know of none to the contrary.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations has jurisdiction over both the sundry civil bill and the deficiency bill. The cases cited by the gentleman, I think, are not in point. My recollection is they are not cases where the limit of cost is fixed by Congress in the public-building bill. It would not be in order to offer an appropriation here to increase the limit of cost.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt about the correctness of my position, but I am not disposed to make the point of order, and I withdraw it in deference to a suggestion from the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I introduced this amendment for the purpose of calling attention to the condition we find ourselves in view of the attitude which the

committee has taken. The city of Everett, in Washington, has a population of over 25,000, or about 30,000 people. In 10 years it grew from 7,000 to 26,000. We have had authorized the construction of a public building there now for over five years, and if the statements made in the hearing are true, it will be delayed for three years more. In other words, that city of 30,000 people, under the action now taken by the committee, can not have a public building for three years, and in all it will be open to a delay of over eight years. Now, I am glad to hear the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds say that hereafter he is going to have some policy. I listened to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] a few moments ago, when in his remarks he resented the criticisms upon that committee. But that committee, so far as I could discover, had no policy whatever, except to give a public building to somebody that had influence enough to get it, or who happened to be upon that committee. While the city of Everett has been waiting for five years for sufficient money with which to complete its building, the committee refused to give the amount necessary, and we had to go to the Senate in order to secure it, although all over this country there were appropriations made for buildings in cities some of which did not contain 1,000 inhabitants. And although the postal receipts of the city of Everett last year were \$62,645, this committee, criticism of which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] resents so quickly, refused to make any appropriation whatever to complete this building, but they did make appropriations for buildings in many small towns of 2,000 population or less.

And what was the excuse that was given? Because there must not be more than one appropriation to each congressional district, unless, of course, you were a member of the committee. I understand that some of the members of the committee succeeded in getting three. If ever there was a pure pork-barrel proposition it was this last public buildings bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for just a minute?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will.

Mr. MURDOCK. I know about Everett, and how rapidly it is growing, and I realize how important it is to get quick action on this item. In the report of the committee I find that the preparation of drawings was held up at the request of the former Congressman representing the district, so that it does not seem to be the fault of Congress, but the fault of the individual Congressman.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman is partially right. What I have said is not in relation to anything that happened before the last Congress. It was prior to that Congress, and because the city had grown so rapidly I requested further funds for this building and this was urged by the Treasury Department. It was one of the strongest letters that came before that committee. But we could make no headway there. We had to go to the Senate to get it.

This illustrious and virtuous Democratic committee would not permit it because there was another building proposed at Seattle, in that same district, and they absolutely drew the line and declared that because they had made an appropriation for Seattle they would not grant this increase for the building at Everett. This left them money to give to a lot of country villages, and to such gentlemen as happened to be so fortunate as to be members of the committee, at least some of them got as many as three buildings each inside of their districts.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to show the situation and to illustrate the downright unfairness to which we have been subjected by the committee which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] has so highly eulogized, I ask leave to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the statement made in the hearings upon this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the statement he has indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. MURDOCK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if that is the statement of the department recommending this as a special project?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; on page 130 of the hearings had before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. This is the statement:

NO. 4.—EVERETT (WASH.) POST OFFICE AND CUSTOMHOUSE.

Population: 1910, 24,814; 1900, 7,838; 1890, ———. Postal receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, were \$62,645.40.

Estimate to Congress, of January 22, 1908, on H. R. 4802, estimated for a two-story and basement building having 8,000 square feet of ground area, to cost \$230,000, including site.

Act of Congress of May 30, 1908, provides for a site and building at limit of cost of \$130,000. Site was purchased at a cost of \$12,000, leaving \$118,000 available for the building.

Preparation of drawings was held up pending further legislation by Congress increasing the appropriation at the request of the Congressman.

Estimate to Congress of January 18, 1912, on H. R. 16670, estimated for a two-story and basement building of 8,000 square feet ground area, to cost \$168,000 if of fireproof construction.

Act of March 4, 1913, authorizes increase limit of cost \$50,000. Amount available for the building at present, \$168,000.

Although the present amount available for the building is less than the department estimate of January 22, 1908, plans and specifications will be prepared in accordance with the new limit and bids solicited.

Inasmuch as this project was originally authorized in the act of 1908, should it not be taken up now it must be deferred for approximately three years, as it will be placed at the end of the act of 1910. The department therefore desires to consider it as a special project.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, in regard to the amendment requesting the appropriation of \$50,000 for the completion of the building at Everett, Wash., I want to say that if the appropriation were made it would not bring the building any nearer to completion, and not a dollar could be used. Ninety-five thousand dollars have been appropriated and are now to the credit of this public building. The addition of \$50,000 would not help the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] at all.

I hardly think it fair for the gentleman from Washington to criticize the Democratic Congress for the situation in which the town of Everett finds itself with respect to this building. In 1908 the gentleman, or whoever represented the district, introduced a bill to authorize a site and building to cost \$230,000. A report was made on it from the Supervising Architect's Office, and in 1908 a Republican Congress, with all the information before it that could be obtained in such a manner, authorized the building and site, to cost \$130,000. If the amount fixed was insufficient, the gentleman should criticize the Republican Congress and his own lack of influence with his own party colleagues for his failure to convince them that in his Republican State \$130,000 was inadequate for the construction of a building at that place. Ninety-five thousand dollars has been appropriated; \$12,000 was expended for a site, and that left \$118,000 available for the building—\$118,000 for a building two stories high.

For some reason or other they were not satisfied with a building to cost \$118,000, and the Representative of the district, the gentleman himself, apparently delayed the construction of this two-story building in Everett and held it up from 1910 until 1913, when he was able to obtain an increase in the limit of cost for his building.

It comes with poor grace for him to criticize a Democratic House for refusing to do what a Republican House refused to do for him, or to try to exculpate himself for the delay occasioned by his own action by blaming a Democratic House. In this deficiency bill is carried every dollar that the department requested in order to carry on work in progress, the appropriations amounting to over \$650,000. The committee did not recommend a futile appropriation of \$50,000, which would have been made uselessly, in order to mislead the people of Everett into believing that thereby something was being done to accelerate the construction of the building; and that is all that would be done if this amendment had been adopted. It would simply mislead the people into the belief that something had been done toward advancing the project, when nothing had been done.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. The statement the gentleman has just made seems to contradict the report from the department.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It does not.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the gentleman will permit, I will just read four lines here:

Inasmuch as this project was originally authorized in the act of 1908, should it not be taken up now it must be deferred for approximately three years, as it will be placed at the end of the act of 1910. The department therefore desires to consider it as a special project.

Does not that contradict the gentleman?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. That does not ask for money to use on the building. That was one of the excuses they gave to have Congress increase the force in the Supervising Architect's Office by practically 50 per cent. They did not want any money for the building, and if the plan for that building should be taken up now there is no reason why the department, with \$767,000 appropriated for the services of the Supervising Architect's Office, should not give it attention.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman intimates that I was making this criticism because I did not get this increase sooner.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. I say the gentleman should not criticize a Democratic House for not doing what a Republican House refused to do for him.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I should like to know whether a Republican House had an opportunity to make this increase?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why, yes. The gentleman introduced a bill in January, 1908, H. R. 4802, providing for the erection of a two-story-and-basement building, to cost \$230,000, including the site. On May 30, 1908, a Republican Congress included a provision for a site and building for Everett, Wash., at a cost of \$130,000. That was in the public-building act. If the gentleman could have persuaded a Republican committee that he ought to have \$230,000, doubtless he would have got it then.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I should like to ask the gentleman from New York a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. In 1908 I introduced a bill, and the amount then asked was refused; but after that came the census returns, showing a tremendous growth and increase in population, and then the increased amount was asked; and unless I am very much mistaken there has not been a public-building bill since that time until the one we now have.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The mere fact that the population of the town had increased would not be a sufficient justification for an increase of the appropriation. It would depend entirely upon the amount of business done, and those figures are available all the time.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The amount of business increased too.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There was a public-building act in 1910.

Mr. DONOVAN. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] to the fact that some Members of this House are very careless when they talk about money. If there is any one State in the Union that has had its share out of the "pork barrel," it is the State of Washington. The State of Washington and the State of Connecticut, from which I hail, are about equal in population and in wealth, according to the books. The last Congress gave the State of Washington \$3,836,000, and it gave Connecticut a beggarly \$400,000. The people of the Northwest were very eager when they put their hands into the Public Treasury, getting nearly half a million dollars for public buildings in four towns with populations of less than 10,000. Now they are growling because they did not get more.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman has made a statement that I want to correct.

Mr. DONOVAN. I will yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. How much did the gentleman say had been the appropriation for buildings in the State of Washington?

Mr. DONOVAN. The State of Washington, which is about the same in population and in wealth as the State of Connecticut, received \$3,836,000, and the State of Connecticut received only \$419,000. In other words, the State of Washington received nine times as much as the State of Connecticut.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman state how much Connecticut received from the Government before the State of Washington was admitted into the Union?

Mr. DONOVAN. I will not state, for I do not know.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. How many cities has the gentleman in his State with over 10,000 inhabitants?

Mr. DONOVAN. I will not say, for I do not know. The moment your people got into the trough the question of the "pork barrel" was over, for you took it all. Again I repeat that in that part of the United States, as in no other part of the United States, nearly half a million dollars was contributed to four towns for public buildings, with a total population in the four towns of less than 10,000 people.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama criticized me because I declared, and I hold to that firmly now, that if I had my way appropriations should be limited to cities of 100,000 or 50,000 population, while I had introduced in the last Congress a bill for the town of Amherst with only 5,000 inhabitants. That is one of those charges of personal inconsistency, which seem for the moment effective, which catch momentary attention, but which when you reflect turn out to be fallacious and worthless. It might catch a momentary applause, but I am sure would make no lasting impression. The facts are these:

I found that the whole House, every Member of the House, was getting a bill for a public building. Although I thought there ought not to be any public-buildings bill in that session.

I did not propose that my district should be the only one left out because I suggested no town. Was there any inconsistency in that? I vote every year against the appropriation for garden seeds. I think it is an unwise and selfish appropriation of the public money, but I send out my quota of seeds, for I do not think my district ought to lose them and every other district have them.

In the same way I am sure the membership of the House will recognize that there was no inconsistency or impropriety on my part in taking a public building for a town in my district when every other district was getting one, just because I thought it was bad policy to authorize the great majority of the buildings, including my own. I was opposed to the bill, but if I could not succeed in defeating it I did not want my district to suffer for my opinions.

What are the facts? I supposed when the Democratic Congress was organized, as it was said to be organized in the interest of economy, that there would be no public-building bill in that Congress, and for a long time I put in no proposition. But I found toward the end of the Congress that everyone was putting one in and that a report was soon to be made. So I prepared and offered a bill. Remembering that we were told by Mr. PALMER that the committees had been organized with a special aim at economy, that the Democratic Party was trying to make a record for economy, I supposed that the standard cost for buildings would be at least as low as in the Republican Congresses and so I put in a bill for the town of Amherst for a building to cost \$50,000. That town had over 5,000 inhabitants, with postal receipts of \$24,000. That economical Democratic committee thought I was too modest and that my suggestion of \$50,000 was too small and increased it to \$80,000. Now, I do not think that is any abandonment of the principle which I believe in, that no appropriation at all should be made for any cities or towns except large ones. I will vote and work for any such limitation. I will try to defeat any bill without it, whether I have an appropriation in it or not; but if a bill goes through despite my opposition, and I can not prevent it, I do not want my district to be the only one discriminated against.

I was pleased to hear the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, say that in the future he would oppose any appropriation for a building the interest on the cost of which would exceed the existing annual expenditure for the office. If that had been put in effect in the bill which was passed at the last Congress, if the gentleman from Florida had acted then on the principle which he now says he stands upon, I think more than half of the propositions in that bill would have been eliminated. I fear, too, all its popularity would have been lost.

But if the gentleman from Florida really believes in that principle, let me suggest that it is not too late for him to act upon it now. There have been no appropriations for the last public buildings act, and it still rests with this House to say whether we shall appropriate for them or not. If the gentleman from Florida is really sincere, and his committee is with him, if the Democratic House wishes economy, there is still ample time to act on the principle which he proclaims; and I hope when the proposition comes before this House to appropriate for any of the hundreds of buildings authorized in towns where the annual expense does not begin to equal the interest on the cost of the public building, I hope that we shall see the gentleman from Florida oppose that appropriation and stand by the very sensible rule which he has announced.

I will gladly join with him. That is an evidence of progress. It indicates that the monstrous extravagance of the last bill has aroused reflection and hesitation and reconsideration. Despite your protestations of economy, I think everyone who investigates that bill will admit it was the most indefensible and extravagant public-buildings bill that has ever passed Congress.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. I quite agree with the gentleman, but does he not think the Senate made it even worse?

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh, yes. Of course the Senate made it worse.

Mr. BURNETT. And it was a Republican Senate?

Mr. GILLETTE. Why certainly; but gentlemen seem to forget that that Democratic House started in with the battle cry of economy—that this committee was since organized in the interest of economy, and yet even the bill presented by this House was an indefensible one. Nobody ever claimed that economy was a senatorial attribute.

The gentleman says that I was entirely mistaken in my facts when I said that there were over 100 appropriations in that bill for towns with less than \$10,000 of postal receipts. I told my secretary to figure up the postal receipts of the various

places and he assured me that there were over 100 of that character. I may be wrong. The gentleman from Alabama may be correct, but I back the statement of my clerk against the offhand statement of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETTE] has referred, and several other gentlemen have referred, to the public-buildings bill passed in the last Congress. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] was more apt in his designation of the bill, because he referred to it as a bill approved by the President on the 3d of March. The fact is that the public-buildings bill of the last Congress was never legally passed. It passed the House, went to the Senate, had a large number of amendments agreed to in the Senate, and was sent to conference. The conference report on the Senate amendments, with the exception of 4 out of 200, was never acted upon by the House. It was never presented to the House. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], who made quite a gallant fight against that bill at the last session, might possibly accomplish his purpose if he could proceed, which I do not think he is required to do, through some court and attack that bill. It is true that the Committee on Enrolled Bills certified to the Speaker that the bill had been truly enrolled. It is true that the Speaker signed the bill and that the Vice President signed the bill and that as an enrolled bill it was transmitted to the President and that the President put his approval upon it, but it is also true that so far as the action of the House of Representatives is concerned the Journal of the House showed that it has just as much effect as a public law as though the Committee on Enrolled Bills had cited Hinds' Precedents as the law and had the Speaker certify it had passed the House and the President approves it.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. Would it not be the duty of the Attorney General under these circumstances—

Mr. MANN. Oh, I do not intend to say what the duty of the Attorney General is.

Mr. SIMS. I do not mean exactly that, but in other words, some of these buildings are public buildings. Some of them are to be constructed in the District of Columbia, where they have no Member of Congress, and there is a project which was authorized by the Senate to buy all of the unsalable stuff between the Potomac River and the Soldiers' Home. I would like mighty well to contest the validity of that provision of the bill. I have a site for a building in the bill, and I think I would be doing a good work to lose that site if I could stop the Washington project.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General is better qualified to tell what his duties are than I. I have a great deal of confidence in the Attorney General. I do not believe that any bill after it has been erroneously certified to by a committee of the House and certified to by the Speaker under error and approved by the President under error ought to be permitted to stand as a law, because that stultifies the proceedings of the House, and unless the House or Congress or some other official takes action it shows that we do not hold sacred the proceedings of the House.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman, of course, knows while in a court they would accept as a verity the Journal of the House, yet the court, I apprehend, would not accept as a verity something which the House Journal did not show to be the truth.

Mr. MANN. The Journal of the House shows that the conference report upon over 200 of these Senate amendments was never acted upon by the House, and that the only conference report on this bill that was acted upon was a conference report involving four amendments.

Mr. BARTLETT. That being so, then the mere fact the enrolling clerk certified it to the presiding officer would not prevent anyone from attacking the fact of its being passed by the House, because the courts, while they will not permit the Journal to be attacked, certainly would not hold where the Journal failed to show that the act passed that that fact could not be shown, I apprehend.

Mr. MANN. I have not undertaken to look up the law upon that subject, but I have undertaken to look up the facts.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am afraid the gentleman can not answer my question. I was of the opinion that the certificate of the Speaker and of the President of the Senate to the President, sending the bill to him, probably would control if that were tested in a court of law.

Mr. MANN. I had supposed there must be some way, as very frequently there is some way about State legislatures, of testing questions by the journal. It would certainly seem, if the Speaker through error or design should certify that a bill had

passed the House that had never been introduced and signed by himself, and the Vice President or the Presiding Officer of the Senate should do the same, that there was no way to correct it except by repeal. Of course the gentleman understands I am not making any criticism of the Speaker for signing the bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. I know that.

Mr. MANN. Nor the Committee on Enrolled Bills.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am just taking the gentleman's argument a little further. Suppose the journal were doctored, too, and that might happen—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, just a moment to make this statement. In Clark against Field, I think it is reported in One hundred and forty-third United States Supreme Court, in an opinion handed down by Mr. Justice Harlan, he held that the court would not go behind the certificate of the Vice President and the Speaker on a bill.

Mr. MANN. I think, if the gentleman will pardon me—

Mr. FITZGERALD. That case arose, if the gentleman will pardon me, from litigation in connection with the McKinley Tariff Act. A concurrent resolution was passed authorizing the conferees to insert in the bill a provision which had not been in it. The question raised was that the provision had never passed the two Houses of Congress as required by the Constitution. The United States Supreme Court took the very broad position that it would not go behind the certificate of the two presiding officers.

Mr. MANN. I should assume that a bill passed and certified to and approved by the President was not subject to a collateral attack. It was a collateral attack made in that case, but certainly would be subject to direct attack.

Mr. HARDWICK. The gentleman means of course if somebody should enjoin the Treasury Department from paying out money under the provisions of the bill, or something like that.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the discussion of this amendment has taken a very wide range—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. We lose sight of what is before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Does that mean that Members will be prohibited from offering an amendment?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; it is simply on the pending paragraph.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is that debate on the pending amendment be closed in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the debate on the pending amendment has not been confined exactly to the amendment, I am going to ask the indulgence of the committee for five minutes to talk on the question of standardization of buildings.

I come from a city with 196 square miles of area and a population of 2,500,000 people, with the greatest post office in America, having more receipts than the post office in New York City and having 6,750 men employed in that great institution. The central post-office building not only contains the courts and the marshal's office and the collector of customs' office, but we have for the conduct of the postal business of the city of Chicago 50 subpostal stations, located in various sections. The Government of the United States never presumes to erect these buildings. Private individuals build them and rent them to the Government for post-office purposes.

The man who constructs the building enters into a lease with the Post Office authorities for a period of 10 years, and the Post-Office authorities direct the character of building to be constructed. The owner of the building then furnishes not only the building but the heat and the light and all the furniture that is required in the conduct of the postal business. All of the furniture and all of the buildings are of standard design.

The work in every one of these buildings is done on a single floor. It is done with greater economy than a like business is done anywhere else in the United States. We have receipts amounting to \$26,000,000 a year, and we run the office on the basis of 28 per cent of the receipts. These expenses have been reduced within the last two or three years under the present postal management of the city of Chicago from 35 to 28 per cent.

There is one way by which the Government of the United States could be saved a lot of money and have the business of the Post Office Department conducted along economical, scientific business lines. In the rural districts of the United States—for

example, in an agricultural county—a post-office building can be erected in the county seat and a postmaster appointed, a man of high-class executive ability, in that place, and all the towns of the county outside of the county seat could be made sub-postal stations, superintended and directed by the postmaster at the county seat. You could get somebody in the town to erect a standard building, to furnish the heat and the light, and to furnish the furniture, and in this way the rent the Government would be called upon to pay for the use of the building would not exceed 10 per cent of the cost to the Government under the present method.

If you want standardization, if you want economy, if you want business practice, if you want to conduct the post office along scientific business lines, here is an outline of a suggestion for you. The Democrats are in control. They go before the people on the theory that they want economy. This is a suggestion for economy.

The chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings says that you can standardize. Well, you can standardize buildings of a certain class above the ground, but nobody can standardize the foundation of a building, because every foundation of every building is put in under different conditions. You can not standardize a building where the foundation is laid in rock; you can not standardize a building where the foundation is laid in quicksand. The two conditions are totally different. You can standardize the superstructure of a plain, soap-box form of building, and that is all.

But the way to standardize is for the Government to discontinue investing its money in public buildings and get somebody in every town where a public building for a post office is required, to put up a building of a standard class, situated so that you will get a light from the roof, so that the men can see without artificial light every hour of the day, no matter how cloudy the day may be.

We have reached the climax, the acme, I may say, of perfection in the construction of our subpostal stations in our great city. I had the honor of visiting these stations within the last three or four weeks, and I was amazed to see the facility with which business there is conducted; and I recommend this to every city, to every village, and every county all over the Nation. If you adopt it, you will gain the commendation of the people everywhere, you will save the public money, and you will facilitate the movement of the mails. You will do a thing that will gain for you the reputation for business wisdom which a good many people now think you have not got.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate has closed. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, after line 20, insert as a new paragraph the following: "Everett, Wash.: For completion of building under present limit, \$50,000."

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected. Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, after line 20, add as a new paragraph the following: "For preparing plans, specifications, and drawings for post-office building at Laurel, Miss., the sum of \$4,000, to be paid out of any appropriation heretofore appropriated for the construction of said post-office building."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it changes existing law. The act of 1908 prohibits the payment of any services for the preparation of plans out of the appropriation made for the building, and I insist upon the point of order. I refer the Chair to section 6 of the public buildings act of 1908.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order. I thought that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] would be charitable enough not to make it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD].

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 20, on page 4, insert the following: "For completing United States post office and courthouse at Atlanta, Ga., \$22,500."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that. Unless it comes within the limit of cost it is not in order. I have no information on it.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is subject to a point of order. It has been authorized by law. I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] will withhold his point until I can make an explanation about it. Then the Chair can rule on it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] reserves the point of order.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have no criticism to make of the Committee on Appropriations or anybody else. I want to say at the outset that I have the most affectionate regard for everybody who is a Member of this House on this side and a sneaking and affectionate regard for every Member on that side. [Laughter and applause.]

I think the omission of this item in the bill is simply an oversight on the part of this splendid committee. That accounts for their failure to bring in this appropriation.

I represent the next largest city in the world, except New York and Chicago—the city of Atlanta, the most prosperous city in the United States without any exception. We have \$1,256,000 of annual postal receipts. In the year 1905 Congress appropriated a million dollars for the erection of a post-office building in that city. In that building we have the United States court, the United States marshal's office, the internal-revenue collector's office, the different bureaus which the United States Department of Agriculture has established there, and there the immense business of the Atlanta post office is carried on, including that of the Railway Mail Service. They lack sufficient money to complete the fifth floor of that building. They had \$18,750 left. In the last Congress, in connection with the last public building bill, an estimate was sent from the Treasury Department asking for \$22,500 to complete this fifth floor.

Now, I want to make a plain, honest, frank statement to you gentlemen. The people in the district believe that we are entitled to have this building completed. The judge of the United States court has stated to me that even his jury rooms, even portions of his court room and halls, are being used by officers of the Federal Government when his court is not in session. The congestion in that office is a disgrace to the Government of the United States. They have hardly room enough to turn around in. We can go on and save this Government money if you will make immediately available this sum of \$22,500. If you do not do this, you are going to force the people of that office to go outside and rent quarters somewhere else.

Now, it is a pure business proposition. My distinguished and good friend from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] will say that this has not been estimated for by the Treasury Department. A Congressman has got no way to go down and catch the Secretary of the Treasury by the burr of the ear and make him prepare an estimate for anything. If he does not make the estimate, if somebody did not have the influence to make him make the estimate, if the exigencies of the occasion will not permit him to make the estimate, how shall we ever get the money?

Here is a plain proposition that exists. I tell you that there is a great area on the fifth floor of this magnificent building, a great big unfinished hall; that it will take \$22,500 in addition to the \$18,750 that they have left to make that unfinished hall useful and to relieve the congestion in that office, and I can not, as a Representative of my people, get the appropriation of \$22,500. The last Congress authorized that this money be appropriated, but this committee, with the multitude of things that they have to deal with, overlooked bringing in this additional appropriation of \$22,500. But I know they would have brought it in if they had thought of it, and I asked them not to make any strenuous objection to this.

This is a business proposition, I repeat, and I hope that my good friend from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], the chairman of the committee, and my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] will realize the importance of making immediately available this \$22,500, so that the Government can go ahead and complete this building and relieve this congested situation which has existed over four years and a half in the city of Atlanta. The receipts of that post office are such that the post office is entitled to it. We are entitled to the consideration that I have asked at your hands.

I ask you to grant this \$22,500, committee or no committee. I do not do this disrespectfully to the Committee on Appropriations, because I would not offend a hair of the head of any member of that committee for my good right arm in its shoulder

socket. But it is a business proposition, in which this Government is involved.

Mr. ADAMSON. In order to utilize the fifth story, is it only necessary to finish the interior?

Mr. HOWARD. That is all.

Mr. ADAMSON. Do the elevators and staircases run up to the fifth floor?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes. All in the world they have to do is to put in walls and doors, and complete the floors, and do the plastering, and put in electrical fixtures, and \$22,500 will finish it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is mistaken as to the relief he wants. The department has the authority now to do this work, to enter into contracts for it and to do it without the appropriation. It does not want this appropriation. It does not ask for it, and it will not spend it if it gets it.

Mr. HOWARD. If the gentleman will permit an interruption right there, I should like to say that the Supervising Architect himself wrote me a letter in the last session of Congress stating the urgent necessity of having this amount put in. My distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT]—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me finish my statement. I shall not mislead either the gentleman from Georgia or the House. At the last session of Congress the gentleman secured an increase in the authorization for this building, so as to enable this \$40,000 to be expended in the fitting up of this floor. Although there is a balance of \$17,500 on hand, and although authority to contract for work to the amount of \$22,500 additional has been given, the Supervising Architect says that unless the gentleman from Atlanta joins with other Members to secure an appropriation of \$180,000 to increase his force, he will not undertake this work. That is one of the methods to which the architect resorted in order to obtain that money.

Mr. HOWARD. I would not go into that conspiracy with the architect or anybody else, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That makes no difference. The Supervising Architect has stated that, and his statement is in the hearings.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman allow me—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me finish this statement. He has stated in the hearings that unless he gets that \$180,000 to increase his force he can not or will not prepare the plans to fit up that floor.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. If Congress should make this appropriation, would it not be a direction to the Treasury Department to proceed with the expenditure and do this work?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Congress has already made the appropriation in the case of Everett, Wash. It has appropriated \$95,000 for the building, out of a total authorization of \$168,000.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but that appropriation of \$95,000 that the gentleman refers to was not sufficient to construct such a building as the Supervising Architect thought ought to be constructed, which opinion was afterwards confirmed by Congress.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What the committee did about these matters was this: In every instance in which the department asked for money to carry on work authorized, to complete work under way, the committee recommended the amount. Those recommendations amount to something in the neighborhood of \$650,000.

Mr. MANN. But, after all, if Atlanta is short of space and is renting space and has a fourth floor of its public building unutilized, is it not a common-sense business thing to do to provide the money, not a large amount, which will enable it to utilize that space and stop paying rent?

Mr. FITZGERALD. My contention is that the department ought to do it. It has the authority to do it.

Mr. MANN. Where is the authority?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I shall read the authority to the gentleman. They are not renting any buildings in Atlanta at present. The gentleman is mistaken about that. There are no buildings rented.

Mr. MANN. They are short of space down there. If this floor is not completed, they will soon have to rent.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no statement of that character.

Mr. HOWARD. If the gentleman will permit me right there, I made the unequivocal statement that there was a necessity and a congestion, and I do not think the gentleman from New York is justified by anything that is on file in his committee in making the statement that there is no congestion. I know of my own knowledge that there is.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I did not say there was not.

Mr. HOWARD. I have made the statement, and the Supervising Architect so states here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not said there was no congestion.

Mr. HOWARD. I understood the gentleman to make that statement.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I said they were not renting any buildings. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] inadvertently said they were.

Mr. ADAMSON. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me make this statement first.

Mr. ADAMSON. All right.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The public-building act authorizes the Secretary to enter into contracts for the completion of each of said buildings within its respective limit of cost, including sites, and it includes Atlanta, Ga., \$22,500. The contracts could have been let, the work could have been done, and probably finished by this time if the department so wished. The statement is made that it will not do the work. The gentleman need not misunderstand me. I have never had any desire to oppose appropriations for public buildings under way or to refuse the money necessary to carry them on.

The Committee on Appropriations invariably recommend the entire amount which the department states will be needed until the next bill carrying appropriations is passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes in order that he may answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMSON. I gathered from the statement of the gentleman from New York that the Secretary of the Treasury is only willing to do this work on condition that a larger appropriation is allowed for another purpose. I wish to ask if the gentleman thinks it would be proper and desirable to use such language in making this appropriation as would direct and require him to do this particular work?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not think it is necessary to do so. The Supervising Architect and the Secretary of the Treasury made an estimate and asked for an appropriation for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing so that it will be ready for occupancy on the 1st of July. They made no request for any increase of the force in order to do that work. They will have to prepare plans and specifications and do the same things that must be done in order to do this work. In this case they have authority to contract for the work, which they have not in the other. The money would be made available when required.

Mr. ADAMSON. As a great many know, there is a crush of business and great necessity for this work in Atlanta, but I understand that when the Representative of the Atlanta district applies to the Treasury for this specific work he is informed:

It will not be done unless you appropriate \$160,000 for other work.

Mr. FITZGERALD. My contention is that that is a policy that can not be defended; that when the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds increases the limit of cost in certain buildings because of urgent conditions which necessitate increased facilities it is no justification for the department to say that they will not proceed with the work until its force is increased.

Mr. ADAMSON. Could we not remedy the matter by some linguistic formula and say that he is directed and required to complete the fourth story of this building?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not think it is necessary.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. I doubt if I have any more time.

Mr. MANN. This bill carries an appropriation of \$40,000 for refitting the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. The gentleman's statement has been that the Treasury Department would not pay any attention to appropriations made by Congress and would not take up anything out of its order. What, then, is the object of making this appropriation of \$40,000 if it will not be reached for four or five years?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Because the Secretary of the Treasury and the Supervising Architect said if this appropriation were made at this time and in this form the work would be finished by the 30th of June. That shows that they have adopted a different policy, or that they treat this improvement differently from the improvements in which individual Members of Congress are interested. That is the reason I was so heartily in favor of giving them this appropriation, in order to demonstrate that in asking the Congress for an increase of force they

were using methods to force Congress into increasing the force that could not be justified. The item for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing is in the exact form in which it was submitted, and no suggestion was made that any additional help was necessary in order to do the work.

Mr. MANN. Now, the answer of the gentleman from New York is very ingenious, but not as frank as the gentleman from New York usually is in dealing with the House. The Secretary and the Supervising Architect informed the committee that if the appropriation was made it would be expended. They would have informed the committee, if they had been asked, if any appropriation had been made for any building it would be expended.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Illinois is mistaken. In every item submitted the committee asked whether the money was needed, and they indicated in some instances that they could not use it and in other instances that they could.

Mr. MANN. I am not endeavoring to criticize the committee and have no intention of criticizing the committee. I think if I had been on the committee I should have done the same as the committee did; they had to lay down some rule and stick to it, but I do not think the House is bound by the action of the committee. If Congress makes an appropriation in full for the building, the Supervising Architect and the Secretary of the Treasury will proceed to expend the money. In this case, if this appropriation of \$40,000 is made for this work, the inside of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing will be torn out and the change made available for the auditor's office. If the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia prevails, and we appropriate \$22,500, the partitions on the fourth floor of the Federal building will be torn out and the improvements will be made during the fiscal year with the appropriation. No department will refuse to do that amount of work.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield so that the gentleman from Mississippi may ask the gentleman from New York a question.

Mr. SISSON. The question I want to ask is, if about two or three years ago, in 1911, the city of Atlanta did not ask Congress to donate it a certain building and a piece of property down there, upon the ground that they had all of the public buildings they needed, and that Congress then agreed to permit the city of Atlanta to have that building and property there, for which it paid about \$40,000, according to my recollection?

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York permit me to answer that question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I will state my recollection of it. Congress did vote to the city of Atlanta, under certain terms, the old post-office building, but I do not recall the conditions—

Mr. HOWARD. I will state that the city of Atlanta gave the Government—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, let me finish—that it was because of the fact that they had all of the public-building accommodations that they required.

Mr. Chairman, in reference to the gentleman's amendment, the department under the law has complete authority to do this work.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from New York will permit me to answer the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson], because he is trying to prejudice this case.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. HOWARD. The city of Atlanta granted to the United States Government, without the cost of a penny to the United States Government, the entire lot upon which the post-office building was constructed, and when this grant was made from the Government to the city of Atlanta the city of Atlanta paid the Government \$95,000 for the building, which was every penny it was worth.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, it got a very good bargain.

Mr. HOWARD. It got a bargain in that it got an old shack of a building, and the only value in it was the lot, and we gave them the lot in the first place.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, the gentleman ought not to so impugn the capacity of the officials of the city of Atlanta. They just turned over in their anxiety to get that building for a city hall for Atlanta, and they got it at a bargain.

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

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the question that I asked was to show the significance of this situation, that the officials of the city of Atlanta at that time represented that the Government had all of the property it needed, that it had the space it needed, and that the Federal Government did not need

this building and that Atlanta did need it for official purposes. Upon that theory the Government accepted the condition.

Mr. ADAMSON. That will be true when they finish the building which they started.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York insist upon his point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is not subject to the point of order, and I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes in order that I may read a short paragraph from the Treasury Department as to the absolute need for the completion of this building.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. I will read:

The contract for the construction of the building did not include the finishing of the fifth story, and as additional space is very urgently required to accommodate the needs of the public service, a report was submitted to Congress February 4, 1913, on H. R. 28529—

Which was the bill introduced by myself—

for the performance of this work at an increase of \$40,000 in the present limit. Act of Congress, March 4, 1913, authorized an increase of \$22,500. This is essentially a continuation of a preceding authorization. Nevertheless, as far as the current program of the work is concerned, it has no place. It is, so to speak, an additional project. In order to complete the work in connection with which it is a supplemental authorization it is desired to consider this as a special project.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this is not one of those cases where the Government has to go to the expense of drawing plans and specifications. They have already been drawn. All in the world they have to do is to put a force of men to work. The plans and specifications and everything that is essential to the completion of this work are on file in the Supervising Architect's Office, and, if he desires, within 10 days after this \$22,500 is made available he can put a force of hands to work in the Atlanta post office for the completion of this fifth story which we so much need and desire. Now I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OGLESBY. Has the gentleman any assurances that this work will be done if this appropriation is made?

Mr. HOWARD. I absolutely know that it will be done.

Mr. OGLESBY. What assurance has the gentleman?

Mr. HOWARD. I will guarantee that it will be done, even if I have to spend two-thirds of my time in the Supervising Architect's Office until they do get a force of hands to work. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, between lines 20 and 21, insert as a new paragraph the following:

"Oklahoma City, Okla., for the purpose of employing a supervising architect to construct an addition to the post-office building, the sum of \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is not authorized by law.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. I hope the gentleman will withhold his point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, it is subject to the point of order. Does the gentleman desire to speak to his amendment? If so, I will withhold the point of order for five minutes. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order for five minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in behalf of this new paragraph to this bill that I want to reaffirm all that has been said by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] with reference to his city of Atlanta, except I want to add to it that Oklahoma City is the largest city in the world, not excluding Chicago and New York, to its age. In 1907, when Oklahoma adopted a constitution and sent it here for approval by the President, charges were made that it was a sectional constitution, that it did not conform to the Constitution of the United States, and that it did not provide a fair basis of representation in the legislature as between the Democratic and Republican Parties, and President Roosevelt ordered a special census to be taken, at an expense of more than \$50,000, to determine if these charges were true. By that special census the population of Oklahoma City was shown to be a little over 34,000 people. In 1910, when the Federal census was taken, the population of Oklahoma City was shown to be over 65,000, or an increase of nearly 100 per cent in three years. In this good day,

Mr. Chairman, the population of Oklahoma City is 100,000, and I do not think there will be any dissent on this floor or in this country against the statement I make that Oklahoma City is the largest city in the world to its age, and it is likewise one of the very best. Now, Mr. Chairman, there are more than 500 postal employees in Oklahoma City. All railway mail divisions center in Oklahoma City. The internal-revenue district of the State has offices in Oklahoma City, and the Federal court has just now moved its headquarters to Oklahoma City. I was there less than one month ago, and there is absolutely no room in the Federal building in Oklahoma City for these different departments which are moving down to Oklahoma City to make it their headquarters. In addition to this, the parcel post has just been inaugurated, and I am informed that it will be necessary to double the employees of the postal service at that point. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to this fact. Originally there was an appropriation of \$30,000 to acquire a site at Oklahoma City and \$250,000 to erect a building. That was when the population of Oklahoma City was 34,000.

After that and when the population was increased a subsequent appropriation was made of \$130,000, \$100,000 to be used, if necessary, for the purpose of purchasing an additional site, and \$30,000 to make extensions to the building. After that a third appropriation was made of \$150,000 for addition and extension to the present building. That appropriation is now available, but the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department in a conversation that I had with him a few days ago told me that this \$150,000 now appropriated and now available in making the addition and extension to that Oklahoma City building could not be used until there were sufficient funds appropriated by the Congress in order to provide additional architects so that the work of the architect's department could be carried on. Now, Mr. Chairman, it will be about four years until that work can be commenced unless this appropriation is made. This \$150,000 that has already been appropriated can not be expended unless a small sum is appropriated here to provide for an architect to supervise the preparation of plans and specifications for that additional building. I submit it is not fair to the people of that new and growing and splendid city that their service be paralyzed and that they be made to suffer for want of push, and energy, and enterprise on the part of their elder but more sleepy neighbors.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are entitled to this. The \$5,000 will not amount to the rent that it will be necessary to expend on the part of the United States for one year. So I fail to see, Mr. Chairman, how it would be economy on the part of the Government if we fail to appropriate a sufficient sum to provide for this additional expenditure so that the additional work may be done there that was contemplated by the appropriation that has already been made by the Congress. We are not asking for any additional appropriation. All we are asking for is the appropriation for architectural service so that the money already appropriated may be expended.

In the name of justice to the people of that splendid city, in the name of economy for all the people, I ask this small amount that the money already appropriated may be used and the business of the people facilitated. I am asking for right and justice in the name of a great and brave people who have by their energy and their courage built the greatest city in the world of its age.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] insist on his point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMPSON] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred gentlemen are present—a quorum.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. REED] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, after line 20, add, as a new paragraph, the following: "Laconia, N. H.: For post-office building, \$75,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. REED. Does the gentleman make his point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I reserve it. I want to see what it is, first.

Mr. REED. It is for \$75,000 for the Laconia post office.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. REED] is recognized.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I might delay this body for an indefinite period if I desired to speak upon the different phases of this question that has been entered into here this afternoon. I have no desire, however, to say anything in relation to the subject that has been so ably discussed and so thoroughly covered. I refer to the subject of the architect's office, of which it has been said, and has not been denied, that for every plan and specification that comes from that office it adds 6 per cent to the entire construction cost of the building. It seems to me that that is an outrageous price and a most ridiculous and extravagant proposition, and that it should be taken out of the hands of any department that adds that expense to the cost of any building. This country is fairly teeming with architects who would be glad, I am sure, to do the entire work of furnishing plans and specifications for every public building which will be erected by the United States Government for the next 100 years, if they are furnished with rent, light, heat, and all the paraphernalia to do the work with, for 1 per cent, if permitted to standardize the buildings, and be tickled to death to get the job. But I have no time to discuss that proposition. It has been very thoroughly covered.

I want simply to say to this distinguished body that there are four cities in my State for which appropriations have been authorized for the purpose of building post offices. Laconia, the one place for which I have attempted to amend this bill, was authorized an appropriation in the bill of March 4, 1913, of \$75,000. The city is of the required size, has more than the sufficient number of dollars in postal receipts required by law, but the post office is, notwithstanding, now occupying a rented building. Only recently I received a communication from the postmaster of that city, in which he stated that the lease on the building would expire about September 1; that he had already been served notice by the landlord of the building that if a new lease was desired it could only be had at nearly a 50 per cent increase upon the rent now paid, and would be carried from the date of the expiration of the present lease.

That is the situation that always confronts us when we are forced to occupy a leased building in which to do the post-office or any other business of this country. It is unsatisfactory and is a premium upon graft. No landlord in this country is going to let the United States Government have any building at any place where they are forced to accept a lease without from time to time increasing the rent and taking advantage of the opportunity which is presented thereby of extorting a few dollars or a few hundred dollars out of the United States Government.

I am free to confess that I have no hope of getting an appropriation for this building through at this time, the point of order having been made, although it has been authorized by a previous bill in this body. But I sincerely hope and trust, gentlemen, that you will give this matter your earnest and careful consideration. It is very much needed. It is very much more needed than a number of propositions of this kind that were passed in the same bill in which this appropriation was provided for on March 1, 1913.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SHARP. How large a city is Laconia?

Mr. REED. It is a city of between ten and fifteen thousand inhabitants.

Mr. SHARP. What are the postal receipts?

Mr. REED. That I am not able to answer accurately.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. And it may be added that it is the center of all the surrounding country up there. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. I would like to ask the gentleman to repeat the statement he made to my colleague in language that I was unable to hear.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I said it was the center of all the surrounding country up there.

Mr. REED. No; not quite that yet, although it has that alfalfa country of yours backed off the map.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the building was only authorized at the last session of Congress, and even if the appropriation were made now it would not help the gentleman, because he would not get the building. I make a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 20, after the figures "15,000," add a new paragraph, as follows:

"For the payment of a just share by the United States of the cost of paving, curbing, sewerage, and repair thereof on such parts of the public streets and alleys surrounding property owned by the United States and situated in various cities in the United States, the sum of \$100,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that. It is legislation.

Mr. HULINGS. I hope the gentleman will withhold his point for a moment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is useless to discuss that.

Mr. MANN. Let the gentleman have an opportunity to make a statement. Let him have five minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is legislation. I will ask the gentleman to withdraw his amendment for the present. He can offer it and get time to discuss it a little later on.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] withdraw his amendment?

Mr. HULINGS. I will for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] withdraws his amendment. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

New York (N. Y.) assay office: All unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or rebuilding of the assay office in New York, including balances of appropriations made or available for vaults therefor, after the payment of outstanding liabilities on account thereof, are reappropriated and made available for the erection of a new structure on the site of the present assay office, including vaults, the services of consulting engineers, other specially trained engineers, and draftsmen to be selected by the Secretary of the Treasury at such rates of compensation as he may deem just and reasonable, and for all such other purposes requisite for the complete construction of such building, including the vaults therefor, all within a total limit of cost not exceeding the balances of appropriations hereby reappropriated.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against that. That is new legislation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Authority was given heretofore to alter the old assay office in the city of New York. The Secretary of the Treasury stated that it would be more economical and better, instead of attempting to repair the old building, to tear it down and put a new building in its place for the amount already authorized. There is no increase in the limit of cost, and there is no increase in the appropriation. It is subject to a point of order if anybody desires to make it.

Mr. REED. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To pay amount found due for architects for services performed in connection with special repairs of the Treasury Building, \$540.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I notice in that item, from line 9 to line 11, on page 6, this language is used:

To pay amount found due for architects for services performed in connection with special repairs of the Treasury Building, \$540.

What difference is there between that provision and the one we have asked for with respect to these 47 other projects? Is there any authority of law for this?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is the amount of money found due under a contract entered into under the Tarsney Act. The work has been done. The services of the architects were obtained under the law, and there was a dispute about their compensation. This amount has been finally ascertained as due them.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation (not exceeding in the aggregate \$15,000 and at a monthly compensation not exceeding \$300 each, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury) and traveling expenses of agents to select and recommend sites that have been authorized by law for public buildings, for the fiscal year 1914, \$30,000.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] makes a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. GILLET. It seems it is so clear, Mr. Chairman, that it is not authorized by existing law that there is no necessity of discussing it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will not the gentleman from Massachusetts reserve his point of order?

Mr. GILLET. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], who is a member of this committee, for what purpose is this appropriation intended? Will the gentleman explain? He is a member of the committee,

Mr. GILLETT. Perhaps the chairman of the committee [Mr. FITZGERALD] had better answer. I do not wish to assume to have charge of the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will reserve the point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to discuss the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will yield first to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], who desires to make a statement.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a statement on behalf of the committee. I hope the point of order will not be insisted on.

There are some 300 sites authorized to be acquired for public buildings. The sites have been advertised for under the law, and tenders have been made in the various localities where the sites are to be selected. In some instances two, three, half a dozen, or a dozen tenders have been made of sites to the Treasury Department. The practice heretofore has been to select some employee in the Supervising Architect's Office who for some reason desired to make a trip to the locality where the site was to be purchased and to send him to inspect the various sites and make a recommendation to the department as to the one best suited for the work and which under all the circumstances would be most beneficial and economical for the Government to purchase. In many instances employees desiring to take their leave were detailed upon these trips, and the opinion is that they were neither competent nor sufficiently interested to make the best recommendations on behalf of the Government.

The Treasury Department believes it will be economical and for the best interests of the Government to select half a dozen men of sufficient capacity, to be sent to the various localities in the country, examine the sites tendered, acquire accurate information as to the value of these sites, make an inspection to determine the advisability of locating public buildings upon the sites tendered, and make a report to the department. It is the opinion of those charged with this work that if this is done, sites much more satisfactory from the standpoint of the Government will be selected and prices can be obtained that will result in economy. It is believed that if this practice be followed, all of these 300 sites can be selected within six months, and thereafter the necessary steps taken to purchase them.

At the outset, when the matter was first suggested, I was opposed to the suggestion; but upon careful investigation, upon inquiry from different sources, I came to the conclusion that with some 300 sites to be acquired, involving an expenditure of at least \$3,500,000, affecting the location of more than 300 public buildings for the transaction of the business of the Government, an expenditure of \$15,000 for the compensation of competent men would be not only desirable, but would be more than repaid in the results to be obtained.

I sincerely trust that this item will not be eliminated from the bill. The expenditure for traveling expenses will be incurred regardless of whether the particular persons are employed, and this will merely enable more competent men to be selected to perform this work.

Mr. CLARK of Florida and Mr. HULINGS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] to discuss the point of order.

Mr. HULINGS. I understood the point of order was withdrawn.

Mr. GILLETT. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was reserved. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] will be recognized in due time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal to-day about economy in the matter of these public buildings. The practice heretofore has been to appropriate \$15,000, I believe, to pay the expenses of agents to go about over the country to select these sites. These agents have been selected from among the clerks, stenographers, and other people in the Treasury Department who simply wanted a jaunt over the country.

When I was up at the Treasury Department a few weeks ago one of the Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury told me that one man in that office had been to him two or three times recently asking to be designated as one of the agents to go up into New England to select these sites. It was in the summer time, and it would simply give this man a little outing. If it was in the winter time, he would have requested to be sent to Florida or Louisiana or some other State in the South.

Now that is the character of the agents who have gone out heretofore to select these sites. They have been stenographers and clerks who knew no more about the value of real estate than a Texas jackrabbit would know if you sent him on a similar mission. The result has been that the Government has been required to pay enormously more than the property was worth; and now when we have an opportunity to institute a real reform that means a saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Government, gentlemen make points of order.

It is the intention of the Secretary to select gentlemen for this work from the different localities where sites are to be selected who are acquainted with property values, gentlemen of integrity and high character and knowledge along these lines. Of course the point of order must be sustained if insisted upon; but if my friend from Massachusetts is as true to his declarations of love for economical administration as he hoped to-day I was, and as I believe I shall show him in the future I am, he will withdraw this point of order.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I presume there may be some foundation for the statements made by the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from New York. Very likely employees who want to go to a cooler climate have occasionally requested such an assignment, just as we notice the Secretary of War has just returned from an official trip through the Northwest, and the Secretary of the Navy has been at Newport and other New England resorts.

Mr. MANN. Where is the Secretary of State?

Mr. GILLETT. It all shows that human nature is about the same in the Cabinet and subordinate offices of the Government.

But these personally requested assignments have been rare. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that these men who select the sites have in the main well performed their duty. I have heard in my region little criticism either upon their judgment or their ability. It does not require any great capacity to wisely select a site. It requires good judgment and impartiality and honesty, and that is about all. I believe, Mr. Chairman, we are quite as likely to get that from subordinates in the Treasury Department as they are from men appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury, as he expects, outside of the civil service, because that means that they will not be appointed by the Secretary from the men he knows best fitted for the positions, but they will be appointed because the gentleman from Florida or the gentleman from New York or other influential Democrats wish to get places for their friends. Therefore, I believe the present system is more economical and will bring better results than this desired change, which merely offers more patronage. If the other side of the House wants to take the responsibility of carrying this, they can do it in the Senate, or they can get a rule. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I now make the point of order that this is not authorized by existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect for the present occupant of the chair, I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee appeals from the ruling of the Chair. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the committee?

The question was taken, and the decision of the Chair was sustained.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] has an amendment, which he has sent to the desk, inserting a new paragraph.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, between lines 17 and 18, add a new paragraph, as follows: "For the payment of a just share by the United States of the cost of paving, curbing, sewerage, and repairing thereof on such parts of the public streets and alleys bounding property owned by the United States and situated in boroughs and cities in the United States, the sum of \$100,000."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I only desire a moment to bring to the attention of the House a matter that I think is of importance. I believe that the United States, while it does pay for light and water and heat for its public buildings situated in towns and cities, and for things of that sort, should also pay for the arrangements that are necessary in the way of disposing of sewage and the paving of the streets contiguous to its public buildings. While I understand that this measure has been before the House many times in the past, I have heard no substantial reason advanced why the United States should

not pay its full share of the paving and curbing and sewerage and the improvements of its real estate in like manner as any private owner of abutting property on the street is compelled to pay under the law.

The department has refused to make contributions for these purposes on the ground that there is no appropriation for it. It is a matter that is standing in the way of public improvements in many places. While this may be thrown out under a point of order made by some of our parliamentary sharps, still I believe it is a matter that should be brought up and disposed of by Congress, as I can imagine no reason why the Government should insist that private owners of adjoining property should pay for the improvement of Government property.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULINGS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman made any estimate of the amount of money which would be required if Congress should undertake to pave the streets surrounding the public buildings throughout the United States?

Mr. HULINGS. I have not the slightest idea. I believe \$100,000 will be only a drop in the bucket, but it would be enough to inaugurate the system. It is right that the Government should stand in and pay the cost of proper and necessary street improvement, and this powerful Government should not stand at the cost if it is right. It will not cost the Government, which is the aggregate of the people, any more than its fair share. The individuals who are now obliged to pay for the Government's share of these improvements often do so from slender purses, and the refusal of the Government to contribute simply makes it inequitable and often impossible for the people in towns where there are Government buildings to make much-needed public improvements.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, before insisting upon the point of order, I will state that there is a general statute which prohibits the acquisition of any site by the United States in any city unless there is a law in force in the State in which the city is situated which forever makes that property exempt from taxation, and in a case that went to the United States Supreme Court it was held that an assessment for improvements came within the prohibition and the United States could not be made liable for assessments for improvements. That statute was adopted by Congress after careful consideration, and to attempt to change it at this time would not only be a reversal of policy, which has been fixed for years, but it would entail the expenditure of untold millions of dollars.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that I will not resist the point of order if it is made, but I have already presented to this House a bill which covers the same subject, and the purpose of offering this amendment at this time is more to bring the matter to the attention of Members of Congress in order that they may consider it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman should get the attention of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, because that committee has legislative authority over the subject and can provide for the introduction of such a provision.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Government property stop at the sidewalk in every instance?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It depends entirely upon the way in which they acquire title. If the Government acquires title to the center of the street, they have that title.

Mr. MURDOCK. As a matter of fact, they do not acquire title to the center of the street, and what I want to get out of the gentleman is this: Do they require, as a rule, sidewalk space?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not sufficiently informed to answer the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have been informed that in New York City—I think it is in the case of the customhouse—the Government pays rental to the city of New York for space used under the sidewalk.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is a different matter. Under a city ordinance in the city of New York no one is permitted to put a vault outside of the building line except upon obtaining a permit from the city authorities and the payment of an annual fee based upon the amount of space that is used. Even the owner of the property can not do so.

Mr. MURDOCK. Even if the title is in the private individual, he must pay for the space used under the sidewalk?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman know whether the Government does that in New York in any instance?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know. I doubt it, because there is no appropriation with which I am familiar out of which it could be paid, unless perhaps it may be paid out of the customs appropriation. My doubt is emphasized by this fact, that in the city of New York a franchise was granted to the Government to lay a pneumatic tube from the customhouse to the appraisers' stores, and I think legislation was obtained to make it in perpetuity.

Mr. MADDEN. But they would not need any legislation. The Government would have a right to lay that pneumatic tube without any authority from the city.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; it would not.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes. The Government has a right to take any street in any city in the United States upon which to lay its pneumatic tubes, without any authority from the city.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is mistaken. The United States would have to condemn a right under the provisions of the Constitution, authorizing it to acquire property rights by the exercise of eminent domain. This was granted without any such proceedings. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

To supply a deficiency in the appropriation for expenses of the Revenue-Cutter Service, including all objects of expenditure authorized in said appropriation for the fiscal year 1913, \$4,857.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of suggesting that in the ordinary course of events—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I suggest we get down to line 15 on the next page. The gentleman from Oklahoma desires to offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN. What is it about?

Mr. FITZGERALD. He wants to make a few remarks.

Mr. MANN. What about?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I want to discuss the Revenue-Cutter Service.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not want to discuss the Revenue-Cutter Service. Coming from the part of the country he does, he does not know anything about that service.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox], at my request, waited until this time to submit some remarks on the public-buildings matter, along the line of those already submitted, and he desires to have them appear in the Record with those already made, and I hope the gentleman will withhold his point.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, the House will doubtless understand the difficulty I have in discussing a subject not directly in connection with this bill and yet conform to the rule, so that I may not be taken off the floor by a point of order. This paragraph relates to the Revenue-Cutter Service, whose duties, I am informed by the committee, will be to see that the revenues are collected; incidentally, of course, it will have to do with contraband goods.

Mr. MANN. Well, they do not have anything to do with the collection of the revenue. I said the gentleman did not know.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I will accept the gentleman's information on that point. Incidentally they would have to do with the embargo against certain goods. This Nation has never, except in two instances, entered upon a system of embargo. First, in 1807 Mr. Jefferson, with an idea that the country could exist without any military force, conceived the notion that by retaliation and by exclusion of commerce war could be prevented. It was first favored by the agricultural States, but they later demanded its repeal when they suffered for a market. Jefferson lived to regret it, and it is the only policy that he advocated that he ever had cause to regret.

In after years he said, speaking of the Shay rebellion:

God forbid we should ever be 20 years without such. * * * What signify a few lives lost in a century or two? The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants. It is its natural manure. (Jefferson's Works, vol. 2, p. 267.)

Jefferson's own party repudiated the embargo doctrine. In 1809 Congress, fresh from the people, or at the behest of the people, repudiated that act of embargo. The President plead with Congress not to repeal it until the 1st of June, but in February they made the act take effect on the 1st of March. Now we have come to the proposition of an embargo upon a certain kind of goods that may be used in war, and that embargo is fixed under a resolution of Congress and declared by President Taft and still continues. If this is intended to continue I am opposed to it. The doctrine of neutrality in every nation, and especially of this, has been that a neutral power is not called

upon to cause any of its citizens to sacrifice any of their rights to trade with the world.

Mr. Jefferson, when Secretary of State, so stated to the British minister, and it was stated by every Secretary of State since when the question arose; and yet we say that because there is a war in Mexico, or rebellion, that firearms and ammunition and everything that may be used in war shall be prohibited from being shipped across the border, and so absurd is that doctrine and so unjust in its application that in El Paso a retail merchant stands indicted and under bond for selling cartridges to a Mexican in his retail business. The only limitation we can exact of a merchant is that if the goods should be sold and one of the belligerent parties gets possession of them he can not ask his Government for compensation for their destruction. I had hoped that since the experience of this country in the embargo act of 1807 to 1809 we would never engage in this policy again.

Now, the President says he holds to Taft's order because he is opposed to Huerta. In that opposition I think he is wise, but inadvertently he is assisting Huerta, because the latter has the ports where they collect the Mexican revenue, and guns may be shipped through those ports to the Huerta government unless we close them.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Let me finish this sentence, and then I will close.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I will say to the gentleman, if he proceeds along these lines again after he finishes the sentence I will make a point of order against it.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I am discussing this question.

Mr. MANN. I will leave that to the Chair.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Let me finish this sentence.

Mr. MANN. All right. I do not think that side of the House ought to discuss the Mexican situation and ask this side to keep still.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent for an extension of a minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. The patrol on the land border of Mexico by the United States Regulars cuts the insurgents off from getting arms, and thereby instead of making a balance between the two it creates a situation which aids Huerta to the detriment of the insurgents. The only way to insure fair play is to follow the international law. Situated as we are, let American merchants sell their goods anywhere in the world under the international law, and give the contending Mexican bands equality. That would not aid Huerta but would put them both on the same basis. I cordially approve of the President in his opposition against Huerta; but I oppose such unjust restriction against American commerce, without which agriculture will suffer, as it did in the embargo act of 1807, which caused its repeal.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] is recognized.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I will not consume time this evening if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] wants to adjourn.

Mr. MANN. I am not raising any question. I always love to listen to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. COX. I do not want over three minutes.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield to let the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] make a request?

Mr. COX. I will.

Mr. HINDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] is recognized.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I only want to make a statement in connection with the arguments made this evening, pro and con, by some of the Members as to an appropriation of \$150,000 for the purpose of enlarging the Supervising Architect's Office.

I do not believe that enough of importance is attached to the statute read by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] which provides that whenever a department finds itself in arrears, it can exact longer hours of service of its employees. I understand the employees of the Supervising Architect's Office work only seven hours per day. Now, to the point.

Two years ago this summer, my committee, the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, investigated to some extent the Supervising Architect's Office, and I found it to be

true that some of the employees in the Supervising Architect's Office, after working seven hours a day, went out and employed themselves with private architects.

Now, the query occurs to my mind why this statute is not being enforced. If there is a congestion in the Supervising Architect's Office, under the statute which is now in force and which gives the Secretary of the Treasury the power, I would like to know why he does not exact of these employees a few longer hours each day so as to work out the congestion there? If that statute be enforced, these employees could well afford to work a few extra hours each day for the Government instead of, following their day's work, employing the remainder of their time, three or four or five hours, with outsiders, that work could soon be caught up, and then every Member of this House who is insisting on public buildings would not be required to ask Congress to appropriate \$150,000, or any other sum of money, to work out that congestion.

Now, I am not saying, Mr. Chairman, that the present Secretary of the Treasury has failed to look into that matter, but I do believe it to be the part of wisdom for the Secretary of the Treasury to look into it and see whether or not the employees of the architect's office after working seven hours per day are employing the remainder of the day and selling the remainder of their time to private enterprise.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I agree with what the gentleman from Indiana says with respect to the employees working seven hours a day in the Supervising Architect's Office. It should be remedied. There is no reason why they should not work eight hours as they do in other departments of the Government. But I do not believe all the criticism that has been heaped upon the Supervising Architect this afternoon has been just. Neither do I believe that the Secretary of the Treasury has been placed in the proper light in all that has been said about him.

I saw some of the economical spirit that pervades the Committee on Appropriations manifested a few moments ago. There was an item that carried \$30,000 appropriation in order to send out agents through the country to select sites for some buildings that can not be started for over three years yet. That is economy. And a few moments before I saw the chairman of the committee and his colleagues on the committee fight against an appropriation of \$150,000 that I asked consideration of in order to carry out the plans that had been recommended by the Supervising Architect and the Secretary of the Treasury to make it possible to expend two and one-half million dollars that had already been appropriated for.

I submit to any fair-minded Member here that it is more proper and more economical to appropriate \$150,000, as we have asked for, in order to carry on these 47 projects which the Secretary of the Treasury has recommended, and which in most cases have been held up for one or two years, and which have been appropriated for, and everything ready for erecting the building except lack of funds to draw and prepare the plans and specifications, rather than to expend \$30,000 to send out some agents to select some sites that can not be built upon for over three years yet. [Applause.]

I understand that there is a sentiment here now, since the point of order has been made against this \$30,000 appropriation, in favor of bringing in a rule whereby this item will be put back. I submit to the fairness of the Committee on Appropriations, and I appeal to the high-mindedness of every Representative here, that when that rule is reported a like rule should be reported to the effect that an appropriation of \$150,000 for these 47 sidetracked projects that have been recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury should be included also.

I say I believe the Secretary of the Treasury has been erroneously quoted, because the hearings show that he went before the Committee on Appropriations and pleaded before that committee and backed up the Supervising Architect on this proposition for increased force, saying that this proposed expenditure of \$150,000 was a just expenditure and was needed in order to carry on the work on those buildings that had been sidetracked last year and previous years. In some cases the appropriations had been made as far back as 1908, and the first appropriation in some of those cases was made as far back as 1906, and have been held up for different reasons.

The Secretary of the Treasury asked the committee to make this appropriation, and I read in those hearings where my distinguished colleague [Mr. Sisson], together with the distinguished chairman of this committee [Mr. FITZGERALD], and my friend from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], began to pop questions at him and examined him as they would examine an adverse

witness on the witness stand; and, finally, after my friend there, the chairman, had submitted many questions to him, he said:

Why, Mr. McAdoo, don't you know that President Taft last year said that there would be a \$25,000,000 deficit in the Treasury, and do you want to pile up another expenditure in view of that fact?

And when the chairman of the committee put that question to him in that way, the Secretary said:

Maybe this matter can be carried over to the next appropriation bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Did he not put it a little differently?

Mr. HARRISON. Not until the gentleman put it in that light.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Did he not say that when these estimates were submitted his attention had not been called to the fact that the commission of which he was the head had been organized to take up the entire subject of the construction of public buildings and report a definite plan to be pursued, and then expressed the belief that inasmuch as that commission had organized since the estimates were submitted, they could take the matter up and make report at the next session of Congress, and therefore in his opinion it would be better to defer until the next session the transmission of the estimates?

Mr. HARRISON. He did not put it in just that way. The gentleman has depicted it in his own words.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Read what the Secretary said.

Mr. HARRISON. I shall be glad to read it. This question was asked by my colleague [Mr. Sisson] after the Secretary of the Treasury had been under examination for some time.

Speaking of the standardizing of public buildings, Mr. Sisson said:

Do you mean to convey the idea, then, that the Supervising Architect's Office can not standardize the buildings which shall cost, say, \$50,000, and that they can not standardize another class that will cost, say, \$75,000, so that when an authorization is made for a building at a cost of \$50,000 or \$75,000 or \$100,000 it can not be constructed in accordance with standards fixed for such buildings?

Secretary McAdoo. I mean to say that you can, but, of course, it is not a building that will cost only \$75,000, but it is a building which must meet a local situation; it is a building which must be adapted to the lot on which it is to be placed, and, again, it is a building to meet the requirements of that particular locality—

And so on. Then the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson], following up the question, said:

Then the Supervising Architect's Office has deliberately determined that they will not carry out that plan?

Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] want to hear that?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. I was present.

Mr. HARRISON. I will read. Mr. McAdoo, answering, said:

I think that statement is wholly wrong.

Mr. Sisson. The Supervising Architect has deliberately disregarded the intention of Congress in that respect.

Secretary McAdoo. I think that is an altogether wrong inference. Let me say this: I was going on to say that since these estimates were submitted the Public Buildings Commission which was authorized by the act of March 3, 1913, has been organized, and the Secretary of the Treasury is the chairman of that commission. We are going very carefully into all of these questions, and I very much hope that the commission will be able to submit at the next session of Congress a very definite recommendation as to the policy to be pursued with respect to public buildings in all particulars—

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

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, may I have a few minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. That was in answer to the questions about standardizing the public buildings of this country.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Read on.

Mr. HARRISON. He says:

As well as to present a cohesive, consistent, and concrete plan for dealing with many of the questions which I think are in your mind. I think, therefore, if I may be permitted to say it, that we are indulging in a fruitless discussion now.

That is what he said. Then, farther down, the chairman [Mr. FITZGERALD] put it to him in this way:

The CHAIRMAN. The situation is this: As the chief fiscal officer of the Government, you are required to outline the fiscal policy and make recommendations to Congress. Now, President Taft in his message to Congress of February 26 pointed out that without any change at all in our fiscal arrangements there would be a deficit this year of at least \$25,000,000. There will be a change in our tariff law, and, if the customary results follow, there will probably be a further falling off in revenues. Then the question arises whether the department recommends any appropriations that will increase during this year the output of public buildings.

Secretary McAdoo. The reasons why this estimate was submitted have already been stated. I wish to say, however, in that connection that, since the Public Buildings Commission has been organized and we have been working upon these building matters, I think it would be well to omit from these estimates all of those projects with the exception of the appraiser's stores at Boston.

That is what he said.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. He did not state that he did not know anything about this commission before he made the estimate.

Mr. SISSON. He did state that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; he did.

Mr. HARRISON. I have not seen it in the hearings here.

Mr. SISSON. There are a good many things that were said that do not appear in those hearings.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Whether the gentleman has seen it or not, he made that statement. My statement stands upon its merits.

Mr. HARRISON. I have read what I see there in the hearings, and the gentleman can read into it what he wants to. I understand that a good deal was stricken out of the record about this matter.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know whether it was stricken out or not. The Secretary made the statement in a way that he did not intend to make it, and he may have taken the whole thing out.

Mr. HARRISON. I have not seen in the hearings what the gentleman asserts. He may be right, but I have read carefully the hearings and I did not see that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The transcript of the hearing was sent to the Secretary himself, and it is possible that he did strike it out.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I say it is not fair to the Members of Congress who represent districts wherein these 47 projects are located and which have been held up for different reasons, that they be delayed three years more by the Supervising Architect, because of the action of this Committee on Appropriations in failing to report this appropriation, and I submit that this \$150,000 should be appropriated so that the department may go ahead with these plans, that these towns may get these buildings constructed at an early date for which appropriations have already been made.

Mr. SISSON. I want to state to my friend from Mississippi that he is entirely mistaken about this matter. When the Supervising Architect was before this committee, in the presence of Mr. McAdoo, when we examined the Supervising Architect and examined Mr. McAdoo in reference to this situation, Mr. McAdoo himself specifically stated that he knew nothing about the existence of this commission, and that the moment he knew about the commission and the condition that was prevailing in the architect's office, he without hesitation said it was proper and right that this matter should go over.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] now complains because his matter is not taken up. Let me say to my friend that if there had been no special session of Congress he could not have gotten his building until the regular session. He takes advantage of the fact that there is a deficiency bill here, and there is a systematic campaign on the part of the Supervising Architect's Office, in an endeavor to compel Congress to do something that we do not believe we ought to do. My friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox], stated here a moment ago that when his committee investigated the matter it found that these men, who are working seven hours a day, are going out and doing private outside work.

I did not know that myself when this architect was before us. Gentlemen here think more of these projects in their districts to get money out of the Treasury, and of using the Federal Treasury, if need be, to procure a little money in the nature of a campaign fund on these projects. Why, you can not afford to put the membership of the House upon that basis. If a man's only right to remain depends upon the amount of money he can secure for his district, then statesmanship has gotten to a low ebb.

And there is this other thing about it. When gentlemen talk about the Secretary of the Treasury as if he was not in accord with the position of the committee, I want to say that there is nothing in it, nor has anybody criticized the Secretary of the Treasury. On the contrary, I stand here now and indorse every word that the Secretary of the Treasury said, and say that he is a good business man and wanted this matter to go over until he could thoroughly investigate it.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. No; I can not. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, is here now, a member of that commission, and he wanted that matter investigated so that he could ascertain whether or not things are going on right in the architect's office. The statement was made by the gentleman on the floor that the office down there cost 6 per cent of the cost of the project. When private architects go out and bid for the architect's plans, they will supervise the entire building for 5 per cent.

The statement was made that gentlemen would be glad to take it for 2 per cent, and yet Members are insisting on the Supervising Architect's office force being increased 50 per cent. Every man who has been a Member of Congress any time knows that when you attach a man's name to the roll temporarily you never can get him off the roll. Why? Because some man, some Member, stands in with the architect and will not permit him to take it off. And yet men are willing in order to get a building to increase the Supervising Architect's Office 50 per cent. I am willing that buildings should take the regular course, and, so far as I am concerned, it is immaterial what Members may think about my course and conduct here just so long as I think I am right.

I want to say in regard to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that I have served with him for some time, and he is not only eminently fair, but he is courageous and infinitely more liberal in many of these matters than I would be. I have heard him criticized here because he is endeavoring to stand by a pledge which we made the American people to economize in public expenses. Would to God his critics were as sound as he is.

[The time of Mr. Sisson having expired, by unanimous consent his time was extended one minute.]

It comes with poor grace from a Democrat to criticize the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the committee, who are endeavoring to install and carry out the pledge of the platform. If that criticism came from Republicans, it would be different, but it does not come from them; it comes from Democrats here who in their extravagance make the Republicans look like thoroughbred economists. Ex-Congressman Dickson, of my State, called these Democrats who were of this extravagant type "Chitling Democrats."

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. The gentleman has referred to Democrats as a hungry lot of fellows who have just got their noses up to the trough. I want to ask him if the bill is not filled with all sorts of things that seem to indicate that the committee has had its nose to the trough and excluded every other Democrat? [Laughter.]

Mr. SISSON. I have not a single thing on earth in the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Nor has any other member of the committee.

Mr. SISSON. No member of the committee has anything in the bill.

Mr. REED. But the districts represented by members of the committee have got all they want.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No district represented by any member of the committee has got what it wants, as far as I know.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the gentleman from Mississippi mentioning chitling at this time of day, for we are getting hungry. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if he is in favor of displacing these 47 projects and putting ahead of them these buildings that were way behind them in their chronological order?

Mr. SISSON. Not at all. I want every building taken up in the order in which the authorization was obtained. That is the rule of the office. I would not have my own building taken up out of order one single minute or day. I resent anybody else having theirs taken up.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee determined to rise; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FLOOD, 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. 7898, the urgent deficiency bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. Good, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence indefinitely on account of illness.

COMMERCE WITH PHILIPPINE ISLANDS (H. DOC. NO. 217).

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record. I have here a compilation made by Mr. John B. Worcester of certain statistical matter on the commerce with the Philippine Islands furnished me by Mr. Erving Winslow, which I desire to print in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, how long is it?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is rather difficult for me to say just how much space it will take.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman prefer to have it printed in the Record rather than as a House document?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I think I would prefer the Record.

Mr. MANN. Of course the printing of such things in the Record is in such fine print that no one with any respect for his eyes will read it.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think the gentleman should not ask to have it printed as a House document until we can see what the Committee on Printing will say about it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will ask unanimous consent to print it as a House document.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee changes his request and asks to have it printed as a House document. Is there objection?

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore reserved the right to object until we could have some estimate of the cost or send it to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. MANN. Oh, it will not cost very much.

Mr. HARDWICK. Very well, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. FITZGERALD (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, September 5, 1913, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of Shell Creek, De Soto County, Fla., from Hickman to Bermond (H. Doc. No. 216), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 7926) to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete the work of preparing final citizenship rolls of each of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, and to distribute the estates of said tribes among the beneficiaries entitled to share therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 7927) to provide for second homestead and desert-land entries; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 7928) for the erection of a Federal building at Winnfield, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7929) to authorize a survey of Cane River from Grand Ecure, La., to Colfax, La.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 7934) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as heretofore amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 243) making certain portions of H. R. 7898 in order during the consideration of same; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KENT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 127) proposing the establishment of a monopoly for the manufacture of explosives by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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. 7930) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Laughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 7931) granting an increase of pension to Amasa J. T. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 7932) for the relief of Ellen V. Orme, administratrix of the estate of William Pope; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 7933) granting an increase of pension to Eugene M. Smith; 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. GARRETT of Tennessee: Papers to accompany a bill granting an increase of pension to Amasa J. T. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of Ambrosius Mænnerchor, Elsass Lothringer Fortschrittsverein, and Harugari Liedertafel, opposing the placing of duty of 15 per cent on importation of books printed in German or any other foreign language; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Petition of G. A. Bading, mayor of Milwaukee, Wis., and other citizens of that place and Chicago, protesting against the proposed 15 per cent tariff duty on books printed in foreign languages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George W. Wartenberg, acting chairman committee on Slavic Federation, and others of Milwaukee, Wis., requesting the President to arrange for a conference to settle the Balkan controversies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 7925) granting a pension to William H. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, September 5, 1913.

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

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 8) providing for the distribution of 50,000 copies of House Document No. 1458, Sixty-second Congress, being "Prayers offered at the opening of the sessions of the Sixty-second Congress of the United States," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

MEMORIAL.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial of sundry citizens of North Dakota, engaged in the pursuit of farming, remonstrating against free trade on farm products, which was ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 3085) to amend section 20 of chapter 1 of the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and as heretofore amended, by fixing the limitation within which actions may be brought on bills of lading; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 3086) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Stockman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 3087) providing for the relief of settlers on unsurveyed railroad lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3088) for the relief of Edward Gaynor; and

A bill (S. 3089) for the relief of John L. Gruber; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3090) granting an increase of pension to Bernhardt R. Britton; to the Committee on Pensions.

COMMERCE WITH CANADA.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the contiguity of the United States with Canada and the inevitable enactment of the pending tariff bill have for months been a source of great and continued apprehension upon the part of its opponents, who have filled the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during that time with many dismal forebodings. One of the consequences of its passage is said to be the inevitable commercial invasion by that country of our own, that their superior competitive genius will overwhelm our industries and practically destroy them, reducing us to our original pursuits of agriculture, limited and controlled by the farm productions of the great Northwest, whose strong competition we can not meet or avoid.

I have no expectation that anything which can be said or written upon the subject will in any degree serve to remove this ap-

prehension of coming disaster from the minds of Senators, but I am in possession of a short article which may put a silver lining upon the cloud which now broods so ominously over the horizon of the immediate future, if we are to believe and credit the prophecies to which I have referred, so that others may see and be encouraged by it.

I refer to an article from the Washington Post of the 2d instant, concerning the growth of our commerce with Canada, which I ask unanimous consent to have read from the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the Washington Post, September 2, 1913.]

"HOLLAND" TELLS OF GREAT GROWTH OF OUR COMMERCE WITH CANADA.
NEW YORK, September 1.

In one of his rare visits in recent years to the United States James Stillman, chairman of the board, National City Bank, spoke to some of his friends about the inconceivably great opportunity which South America offers to the United States for commerce, trade, and the investment of capital for development of natural resources of all kinds. American bankers who also hold the view expressed by Mr. Stillman have been sending competent representatives to South America so that reliable information can be obtained respecting banking opportunities or other openings for the investment of American capital. These bankers, when they speak with this subject in mind, always refer to the effect upon North and South American commerce which is sure to be created by the opening of the Panama Canal.

Attention has been directed since the recent publication of the statistics of our international trade and commerce, which came from the Department of Commerce in Washington, to the fact that, although the eyes of bankers are turned toward South America and the attention of capital is being directed to the opportunities the southern continent offers, little or nothing is heard of our commercial and trade relations with Canada. Nobody seems to have thought of sending agents into Canada for the purpose of learning what opportunities for trade and expansion may be found there. And yet the information furnished by the Department of Commerce shows that we are likely to find for years to come our greatest customer in Canada, and more likely to establish our greatest American international commerce with Canada than with South America, no matter what the effect of the opening of the Panama Canal to navigation may be.

The leading men of finance of Europe have now become familiar with an American phenomenon, which a few years ago they would have deemed impossible, namely, a record-making advance upon foreign markets by American manufacturers within the past 10 years. But it rarely happens when our own men of business meet their friends who conduct large affairs in Europe that any reference is made to a phenomenon quite as startling as is that associated with the sudden growth of our exportation of manufactured commodities.

CANADA OUR BEST CUSTOMER.

In 1908 the money value of the entire commerce back and forth with Canada was, in round numbers, \$225,000,000. The Department of Commerce at Washington is now able to report that the commerce between the United States and Canada both ways was in the fiscal year which ended on June 30 somewhat in excess of \$500,000,000. We have therefore increased our reciprocal commerce with our neighbor on the north so greatly in five years that it has doubled, and, as a whole, reflects almost the largest commerce we have had with any nation. In fact, were it not that the cotton fields of the South contributed enormously to the aggregate of our foreign commerce with Great Britain, the commercial relations between the United States and Canada would in money value be actually greater than our commercial relations with Great Britain.

A SILENT GROWTH.

This growth has been steady, unsensational, and reflects a perfectly normal increase of trade relations between the Dominion of Canada and the United States. It has been secured without any flourish of trumpets and apparently by no other influence than the common recognition on both sides of the boundary line of the advantages of reciprocal trade relations. This growth is now spoken of in this city since these statistics were published as, with the single exception of our increase in exportation of manufactured products, the most significant and impressive phenomenon in the history of the international commerce carried on by the United States with other countries. We are exporting to Canada now commodities of approximately the money value of \$400,000,000 a year, and we are buying in Canada and bringing to this country commodities approximately of the money value of \$120,000,000.

THE PROMISE OF GROWTH.

As this increase has been steadily maintained since 1908, there is no reason to suspect that it was merely an ephemeral trade condition. All of the factors and features of this commerce point to continued increase in our commercial relations with Canada. From this point of view there can be good understanding of what President Mellen, of the New Haven system, had in view when he planned organic unity of the New England Railroad, and what the late President C. M. Hays, of the Grand Trunk Railway Co., also had in view when he planned an expansion into New England of the single-railroad system in New England which his company owns, the one stretching from Portland, Me., to Montreal, and the Central Vermont system, which his company controls by a long lease. President Hays is reported to have said a year or two before his untimely death, when the *Titanic* went down, that the New England States as a section of the United States offered the most tempting transportation opportunities to be found in any section of the Union, certainly for a railroad chiefly operated in the Canadian Dominion.

President Mellen wanted to get a good share of the traffic originating in or terminating in New England which represented Canadian industry and agriculture and Canada's demand for New England's manufactured commodities.

A GREAT DOMINION.

A country which is able, as is the Dominion of Canada at the present time, to carry on an international trade with one other country aggregating \$500,000,000 a year and at the present rate of increase likely to be twice that amount within the next 20 years is said here