

controlling it through fear, but what I complain of is the American Senate standing and admitting that with all our strength and resources we can not devise a remedy for an evil except to adopt the remedy dictated by the evil from which we seek to flee. It is illogical and unnatural, and when the American people come to understand it I do not believe they will approve it.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, would the Senator object to a question?

Mr. CLAPP. Not at all.

Mr. OWEN. Does not the Senator know that the plan of popular ownership of this stock was presented first in a vigorous way and taken under advisement by certain members of the committee because of the argument submitted by Mr. Vanderlip, of the National City Bank of New York, the Rockefeller bank?

Mr. CLAPP. I do not know what moved the minds of the committee; but long before Mr. Vanderlip ever appeared before the committee, possibly before he ever entered a bank as an officer, the American people were discussing, thinking, and looking forward to the day when the American people would have a direct voice in the finances of this country.

If the suggestion of the Senator is true, then what becomes of the argument advanced here time and time again by those defending the Senator's bill that they had to adopt this plan of letting the banks control the regional banks in order to placate the banks themselves?

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the value of the suggestion was that "We do fear the Greeks when they come bearing gifts."

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I echo that—"We do fear the Greeks when they come bearing gifts." When men who for years have been recognized as the champions of the people in this country come here with a bill of this character, proposing to consolidate the reserves instead of separating and dividing them, and then place the consolidated reserves in the hands of the banks themselves, I echo the sentiment of the Senator from Oklahoma: "Beware the Greeks when they come bearing gifts."

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. CLAPP. Certainly.

Mr. WEEKS. The question asked by the Senator from Oklahoma conveyed, I think, an impression which is hardly justified. It seemed to convey to the Senator from Minnesota the impression that the first suggestion that the stock of the regional banks and the control of the regional banks should be in the hands of the people—the Government—rather than the banks, came from Mr. Vanderlip, the president of the National City Bank.

Mr. CLAPP. I beg the Senator's pardon. It did not make that impression on my mind, because I advocated it for years before I ever heard of Mr. Vanderlip.

Mr. WEEKS. I did not want to have it make that impression, because the very first day the committee gave hearings, long before the tariff bill passed, Mr. Festus J. Wade, president of the Merchants' Trust Co. of St. Louis, was a witness before the committee, and was asked by one of the members of the committee about popular ownership of the stock, and he said that he would be very glad, so far as he was concerned—and he was selected to represent the Chicago conference—to have the stock offered to the public; that the banks did not want it.

Mr. CLAPP. Then there is nothing in the claim of our Democratic friends that they have to do this in order to placate the banks. Is that so?

Mr. WEEKS. There never was anything in it.

Mr. CLAPP. Then what excuse is there for it? That is the only reason I have heard assigned for it.

Mr. OWEN. Only this, if the Senator please—only this: At present the credit system is in the hands of these great institutions. Unless we can establish a system that will give independence to the small banks through Government supervision of the reserves and the control of this system, then the banks not coming in the old system will go on and the opportunity to create a market for stocks and bonds, the opportunity to create a panic in New York under the old system, will still remain as a means by which to profit.

Mr. CLAPP. I can not allow that remark to pass unchallenged, and there is only a moment left. The Senator has suggested in that remark that you are freeing the banks and putting them under a Government-supervised control—

Mr. OWEN. Yes.

Mr. CLAPP. When the very feature of the measure which the Senator champions, and which we are fighting, does not put it under Government control, but puts it in the hands of a

board consisting of three Government appointees and six bank appointees.

Mr. OWEN. With the right to remove every one of the directors in the hands of the Federal reserve board—

Mr. CLAPP. Then who appoints their successors, except the banks themselves?

Mr. OWEN (continuing). With the right to fix the rate of interest, and with the right to control the issuance of elastic currency. Having the right to remove every one of the six directors, and having three representatives of the Government on guard at all times at every board meeting, in the management of the bank, there is every reason to believe that the Government will exercise a wise supervisory control.

Mr. CLAPP. Just one moment more, while I point to that charming picture of three controlling six. [Applause.]

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Before the Senator takes his seat, I desire to inform him that some three or four months before Mr. Vanderlip visited Washington with his suggestion—to be specific, on the 26th day of June of the present year—the Senator from Oklahoma, himself also a director in a national bank, made this suggestion:

If the subscription by the banks is made merely permissive, then the stock books should be opened to the public, and I believe this would be a wise adjustment of the objection and would popularize the Federal reserve system.

Mr. OWEN. But the subscription is not made permissive. It is made compulsory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 11 o'clock having arrived the Senate stands adjourned until 10 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The Senate thereupon (at 11 o'clock p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 16, 1913, at 10 o'clock a. m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, December 15, 1913.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou, who hast been our dwelling place in all generations, a very present help in trouble, continue Thy ministrations unto us; clarify our vision, strengthen our hearts, and make straight our paths, that we may be true lovers of our homes and our country, since the life of the one depends on the life of the other. He who loves and serves his home best loves and serves his country best. Fit us for every new condition and make us alive to every policy which promises the betterment of mankind, that as progressive beings we may follow on to larger life and nobler service. In His Spirit. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 12, 1913, was read and approved.

### CHANGE OF REFERENCE—HARLEM SHIP CANAL.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H. R. 9828) for the cession to the State of New York, in exchange for the lands required for the project approved by Congress March 4, 1913, of certain lands in the bed of the Harlem Ship Canal, heretofore ceded to the United States, free of cost, and now to be abandoned for the more direct channel, appears on the face of the title to be a public-land bill, whereas in fact it is not. The bill should go to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I therefore ask unanimous consent that reference of the bill be changed from the Committee on the Public Lands to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma, chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands, asks unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 9828 be taken from the Committee on the Public Lands and referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

### RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 11, 1913.

HON. CHAMF CLARK,  
Speaker House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and respectfully request the acceptance of the same to take effect immediately.

Very respectfully,

JOHN H. STEPHENS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

## CALENDAR FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

## QUARANTINE FACILITIES AT PORTLAND, ME.

The first business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 4618) to increase the limit of cost for increase of quarantine facilities at the port of Portland, Me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve the right to object.

Mr. HINDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object for a few minutes, until we may have some information in respect to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois reserves the right to object, and the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the limit of cost for increased quarantine facilities at the port of Portland, Me., authorized by the act approved August 24, 1912, is hereby increased by the additional sum of \$23,020.

Mr. HINDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have read the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be read.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, July 14, 1913.  
CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,  
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have to make the following reply to your letter of July 7, transmitting, with request for the views of the department, a copy of bill H. R. 4618, "To increase the limit of cost for increased quarantine facilities at the port of Portland, Me."

The department is cognizant of the fact that the amount specified in this bill is intended to supplement the appropriation of \$43,880, which was made by Congress in the deficiency act of August 26, 1912, to provide detention barracks at the Portland (Me.) quarantine station. The last-named amount contemplated the construction of ordinary or nonfireproof buildings, the additional amount specified in bill H. R. 4618 being for the purpose of rendering these detention barracks fireproof.

The department approves of increasing the appropriation for the barracks at the Portland quarantine station, for the reason that fireproof buildings are not only desirable for humanitarian purposes, but are economical in the long run in that it is believed they will last much longer and require far less expenditure for repairs than would be the case with nonfireproof structures.

Respectfully,

W. G. McADOO,  
Secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, what I would like to know with reference to this bill is this: As I read the bill it is proposed to construct for \$43,000 a building 130 feet long by 37 feet wide, with a wing 30 feet by 40 feet, for the accommodation of 500 immigrants who may be unfortunately quarantined at that port. I thought possibly the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] or the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] would be able to give us some information as to the kind of building it is proposed to construct with the \$43,000 which has now been appropriated and what addition it is proposed to make with the additional amount. I observe that the department heads speak of the necessity for accommodations for a good many of these immigrants, sometimes as high as 1,600 having been landed there or being on vessels that have stopped there on which there were cases of quarantinable diseases.

This additional appropriation does not furnish any additional space, as I understand, but it is giving some additional money for what they say is to make this a near fireproof building. Now, I would like to know what changes are proposed to be made in the building as authorized now and in the future if this appropriation is allowed?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH], who reported the bill, to reply to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, this appropriation is for the purpose of constructing an additional building. The capacity of the present building is, I think, only for 42 immigrants and is wholly inadequate in consequence of the importance of this port. The original or preliminary plan, on which the original appropriation of \$43,000 was based, contemplated a nonfireproof construction, a building with a basement and one story in the dimensions that the gentleman from Illinois has given already. It is found that such a building could have been built for the original appropriation of \$43,000, as given in the deficiency act of August, 1912, but the department finds that it would be more advisable to make it of concrete construction, so as to fireproof it. The fact that 500 people must be housed there and that the exigencies of business might require that number to be housed caused the department to send this recommendation to us. The fact is that this building is to be built on a small, rocky island

3 miles away from the city of Portland, so that there can be no fire protection from the city itself; hence the necessity of making this building fireproof in the first instance; and they say that if fireproofed it will ultimately lead to an economy in the upkeep.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, what material is it proposed to build this building out of without this additional appropriation?

Mr. ESCH. Without the additional appropriation it will be a frame structure. It is to be built upon the solid rock, and they will have to blast the foundation; possibly the foundation itself will be made of stone and the superstructure of some form of concrete. The gentleman is an expert in matters medical and sanitary and knows that a fireproof structure built of concrete or stone can be kept in a sanitary condition much more readily and easily than the ordinary frame structure.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what I was getting at. This report does not give the information.

Mr. ESCH. That is the fact.

Mr. FOSTER. Whether it be a frame building there or other character of building, this does not increase the size of the building as I understand?

Mr. ESCH. No; it does not. The additional appropriation does not go to increase the size of the structure, but to make it fireproof.

Mr. FOSTER. Only with this additional amount they would build it of concrete?

Mr. ESCH. Exactly; and in that way it will ultimately prove an economy, not to say anything about increasing the safety to the immigrants. There is necessity for these quarantine barracks to be constructed because of the increased importance of Portland as a port of entry for five or six of the great trans-Atlantic lines. Only last year there were 26,000 immigrants who were investigated.

Mr. FOSTER. I agree with the gentleman that a superstructure of this kind where they are liable to have patients who are confined to their beds ought to have some fireproof protection in the way of a building.

Mr. ESCH. All they have now in the way of a hospital equipment is a small building with seven beds.

Mr. FOSTER. They only have one with seven beds?

Mr. ESCH. Yes; so it is absolutely necessary to do something in this regard which will ultimately lead to economy on the part of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw any objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] asks unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

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

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 10081. An act to make the tenure of the office of the major general commandant of the Marine Corps for a term of four years.

## ANCHORAGE IN NAVIGABLE WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 7212) relating to the anchorage of vessels in navigable waters of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7212) relating to the anchorage of vessels in navigable waters of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask to have the bill and amendments reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill and amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7212) relating to the anchorage of vessels in navigable waters of the United States.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to define and establish anchorage grounds for vessels in harbors, rivers, bays, and other navigable waters of the United States, wherever maritime and commercial interests shall show to the satisfaction of said Secretary that such anchorage grounds are required for safe navigation, and to adopt suitable rules and regulations in relation thereto, and to take all necessary measures for the proper enforcement of such rules and regulations.



SEC. 2. That in the event of the violation of any such rules and regulations by the owner, master, or person in charge of any vessel, such owner, master, or person in charge of such vessel shall be liable to a penalty of \$100; and the said vessel may be held for the payment of such penalty and may be seized and proceeded against summarily by libel for the recovery of the same in any United States district court for the district within which such vessel may be and in the name of the officer designated by the Secretary of Commerce.

Also, the following committee amendments were read:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "in," insert the word "improved."  
 Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "rivers" and insert the word "and."  
 Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "and other navigable waters."  
 Page 1, line 6, after the words "United States," insert the words "except as otherwise provided by law."  
 Page 1, line 7, after the word "shall," insert the words "request action by said Secretary, and."  
 Page 1, line 7, strike out the word "the" and insert in lieu thereof the word "his."  
 Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "of said Secretary."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read a portion of the report, as follows:

Report to accompany H. R. 7212.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7212) relating to anchorage of vessels in navigable waters of the United States, having considered the same, report thereon with amendments and as so amended recommend that it pass.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman in charge of the bill ask to have the report read?

Mr. ADAMSON. I did not.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was of the opinion that the gentleman from Illinois asked it.

Mr. MANN. That is what I thought.

The SPEAKER. We will omit the further reading of the report. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it the gentleman's intention to ask the House to agree to the committee amendment?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Under the existing laws the Secretary has this authority in New York Harbor and in the Chicago Harbor.

Mr. ADAMSON. There are several local laws on the subject, and the object is to pass a general law that can be applied without an act of Congress whenever, on application of the maritime and commercial interests at the several ports, the Secretary may, in his discretion, deem it wise to do so.

Mr. MANN. Of course it now requires a special law in each case, according to the rules and regulations.

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman any idea whether this law would be availed of soon if it should pass?

Mr. ADAMSON. I have been advised that in one or two places there is difficulty. One is down at Hampton Roads. I do not remember all the others, but there are two or three of them. In places where navigation is liable to be congested it may be desirable to take this action, and it merely saves coming to Congress each time.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think it would be sufficient if the law authorized the Secretary of Commerce, in his discretion, to define these anchorage grounds? Suppose an application is made to the Secretary, and he thinks there is no justification for establishing anchorage grounds in some place, and that while the establishment of the anchorage ground would, in fact, possibly be a convenience, navigation would be inconvenienced generally, and would it not be sufficient to leave it to his discretion to establish such anchorage grounds?

Mr. ADAMSON. Does not the gentleman think the effect of this language would leave it in his discretion? They must show to his satisfaction before he is directed to do it. The language of the bill provides—

Mr. MANN. It does not leave it to his discretion. It says if it is to the interest of the navigation interests. There might be only one vessel that came into port, and to establish anchorage grounds might be very inconvenient for the rest of the people.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I confess that the idea the gentleman is expressing is exactly what was in the mind of the committee, and it does seem to me the language of the bill leaves the subject in about that situation. If they show to his satisfaction that it ought to be done, he is directed to do it.

Mr. MANN. It would be that way if the bill read "authorized and empowered," without authorizing, empowering, and directing him.

Mr. ADAMSON. Then you would like to eliminate the word "directed"?

Mr. MANN. I think it would be safer to do that.

Mr. ADAMSON. I am perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand, under the proposed authority, the Secretary of Commerce would have power to regulate the anchorage of vessels in inner harbors?

I am thinking of the harbor at my home city, Milwaukee. We have a roadstead there in the inner harbor, where vessels are anchored in the winter season in large numbers. The local municipal government takes charge of the regulation of the anchorage of these vessels, and I do not see any reason why we should delegate that authority to the National Government. I am asking the question with the purpose of inquiring whether, under the phraseology as suggested by the committee, the words "improved harbors" would include improved inner harbors?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, answering the inquiry of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], I think it is sufficiently clear that the Secretary can not do it at all unless he is requested so to do by the local authorities.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, there may be some local association composed of two or three members that would request it, and yet it might be contrary to the maritime interest of Milwaukee or other cities, and I do not think it is wise to have so large a power vested in the Secretary down here without reference to local conditions. We control them there without impediment to local navigation. I am seeking to inquire whether this legislation would extend to improved inner harbors.

Mr. ADAMSON. The gentleman will note that we have stricken out the word "rivers." We do not propose to deal with rivers on the idea that they are inland. I think the purpose of the bill is to cover the ocean and its arms—the harbors that are frequented by commerce; harbors and bays that are improved by the Government.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman a question right there? Did not the committee have this in mind—

Mr. ADAMSON. I was going to ask the gentleman to let me finish my statement. The suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is that a few persons might make an application at variance with the general wish and interest of the community. I do not think we could assume that the Secretary of the Department of Commerce would be misled in a case of that sort. He would surely find out what were the maritime and commercial interests of that place before he would act. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Did not the committee have this in mind, that wherever the United States has made expenditures for the benefit of commerce in such cases; wherever the local authorities, commercial or municipal, or whatever they may be, think that the United States should control and regulate the anchorage in places improved by our own Government, in such cases the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make regulations?

Mr. ADAMSON. I think undoubtedly that was the purpose of the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the National Government has authority over the harbor at Milwaukee and other interior waters that are navigable, even if the Government has not expended any money whatever for their improvement.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will read the bill he will notice that that has been stricken out by the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have read the bill; and even taking it as it stands, the language "improved rivers and harbors," when construed by the courts, will be construed as it now stands and not as originally framed by the committee, and I am asking the chairman whether, under the phraseology "improved rivers and harbors and bays," it will be subject to the construction I have instanced?

Mr. ADAMSON. If the gentleman will tell me what connection his inner harbor has I may be able to answer more clearly.

Mr. STAFFORD. The inner harbor is a landlocked harbor adjacent to Lake Michigan, only a quarter of a mile from the harbor entrance; a large roadstead formed by the washing up of sand dunes years ago forming an island, and it is a favorable anchorage for large lake steamers that go into winter quarters there. It is largely utilized in winter by these steamers and there might be some that would complain as to the anchorage of these vessels, whereas the local authorities are absolutely content with the existing conditions.

Mr. ADAMSON. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman need have no apprehension in view of the amendment I am going to offer, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], that the Secretary will not be directed at all, but only empowered to act whenever the local commercial and maritime interests request him to do it.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the gentleman one more question, if I may.

Mr. ADAMSON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. How will these orders be enforced, if made? I know theoretically how they will be enforced. The collector of customs will do it with revenue-cutter vessels. But this is not preliminary, is it, to asking for an appropriation for additional revenue cutters for the enforcement of these regulations?

Mr. ADAMSON. No; it is not preliminary to that. Whatever request has been made for that has been made for some time past, and the vessels to be authorized and built will be used for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. ADAMSON. Certainly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This function has been performed heretofore by the Secretary of War, has it not?

Mr. ADAMSON. No, sir. The Secretary of War is empowered by special act to fix harbor lines in special cases.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand. I think in some instances the Secretary of War has been authorized. I think at one time he was authorized by the river and harbor bill.

Mr. ADAMSON. There is no conflict between departments about this. It is mainly in the interest of vessels of commerce.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not disposed to question the right of the Secretary of Commerce to do this work, because the Secretary of War probably has nothing to do with anything except the improvement of a river or a harbor.

Mr. ADAMSON. We have thrown the necessary safeguards around this. It only applies where you have spent money for the improvement of harbors.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Another question. In many States—possibly in all the maritime States—we have harbor masters who have control of the anchoring of vessels in harbors, in the inner harbor and very likely in the outer harbor, within the jurisdiction of the States; and all the harbors are within the jurisdiction of the States. Would not this interfere with the functions and duties of the harbor master under existing law?

Mr. ADAMSON. I think not. These grounds are only fixed on the request of the local authorities and interests, and they do nothing but fix the limits; and, as I understand it, fixing anchorage limits means providing a place to put vessels out of the way of commerce while they are waiting, riding at anchor. It has nothing to do with the other management and superintendence of the vessels themselves, but simply fixes the lines of the harbor waters.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That duty, however, has been performed by the harbor masters in my State, and I suppose in all the States.

Mr. ADAMSON. Nothing can be done under the provisions of this bill except upon an application from those people. It can not be done arbitrarily.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It seems to me it is not definite as to what local interest shall make this request. It says:

Except as otherwise provided by law, wherever maritime and commercial interests shall request action by said Secretary and show to his satisfaction that such anchorage grounds are required for safe navigation.

Now, there are commercial interests and "commercial interests" in all harbors, and a few of those interests might desire it and the majority might not desire it. And yet, unless you limit that in some way or prescribe the extent of these interests that shall make this request, it seems to me you are going to enact a law here that will infringe very considerably upon the powers and duties of these harbor masters.

Mr. ADAMSON. I will say to the gentleman that I do not think an application from partial interests or from conflicting interests would come within the purview of this condition, that the Secretary of Commerce can only act at all upon the request of the maritime and commercial interests, which words are to be given their general and usual signification. This would mean that the commercial and maritime interests of a particular port requested that these grounds be fixed. When that is done, then this bill, as we propose to amend it, will give him discretion to act and fix these lines, and not otherwise.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The amendment you suggest, by giving discretionary power to the Secretary of Commerce—

Mr. ADAMSON. He can not act at all until requested.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That will not necessarily infringe upon the powers and duties of these officials in every case. Still I am afraid it might in some cases.

Mr. ADAMSON. He can not do anything at all until they request it.

Mr. DRISCOLL. The words "anchorage grounds" would not apply to a short channel. They would be two different and separate items.

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not think he would ever fix an anchorage ground in a short channel.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I am thinking of my home town, where the anchorage ground is probably within 400 or 500 feet of a channel where all the commerce passes, and at the present time there is litigation going on over the widening of that channel. Now, if they should construe that to mean mooring or tying of boats and anchorage at the same time, that would leave it to the Secretary of War to make that improvement without going to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. ADAMSON. He does not make any improvement at all.

Mr. DRISCOLL. He orders—

Mr. ADAMSON. The Secretary of War and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has jurisdiction of making all improvements.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. This bill does not authorize the Secretary of Commerce to take jurisdiction at all until the maritime and commercial interests at a port request him to do it. Then he uses his discretion as to whether he will do it or not.

Mr. DRISCOLL. He has that power if this bill passes.

Mr. ADAMSON. If it is asked for, and not unless they request it and show to his satisfaction that it should be done.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill for amendment.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the committee amendments be considered in gross.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were considered and agreed to.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I now move that in line 4, page 1, the words "and directed" be stricken out and the word "and" inserted in line 3 after the word "authorized."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, line 4, page 1, by striking out the words "and directed" and insert after the word "authorized," in line 3, the word "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6827) to amend an act entitled "An act to change the name of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service to the Public Health Service, to increase the pay of officers of said service, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1912.

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia if he will not ask to have this bill passed over, as I want to make some examination in relation to it?

Mr. ADAMSON. I will if it is the desire of the gentleman from Illinois. Does the gentleman wish to have it passed for the day?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed for the day without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed for the day without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### DISPOSITION OF EFFECTS OF DECEASED PATIENTS OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6202) providing for the disposition of effects of deceased patients of the Public Health Service and of certain deceased officers and men connected with the Army.



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

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia if under this bill the United States, through the Auditor of the Treasury, is to become the administrator of estates of certain deceased persons?

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not think such an inference is logical from the language of the bill. The department has an accumulation of large quantities of the effects of these people who die, and the effects are going to waste. They can not be properly preserved. Nobody claims them. The department would be glad to turn them over to a duly constituted administrator, or persons entitled to them, but they fill up much space and deteriorate in value. The proposition is that after a certain length of time they shall be sold and the money kept in lieu of the property to answer any legal claims that may be made by the interested parties.

Mr. STAFFORD. The bill says:

The proceeds of such sales, together with any money effects of the deceased, shall be deposited in the Treasury in trust for the legal claimants, to be paid to them on the certificate of the Auditor for the Treasury Department, who shall act as conservator of these estates, with authority to indorse all bills of exchange, promissory notes, and other evidences of indebtedness due to such estates, and to take such steps as may be necessary for their collection.

That language, while clear, gave to me a somewhat ambiguous idea as to the powers of the auditor under the provision.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Gladly.

Mr. MANN. The bill only applies to cases where there are unclaimed effects. The local authorities have the right to appoint an administrator under the bill to claim the effects; but if no one does, and the effects are not claimed, then they are turned over, under this bill, to the auditor, and if there are promissory notes or bills of exchange he collects them. But there is no interference with the authorities as to the appointment of an administrator.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman explain what the auditor would do under this language authorizing him to indorse bills of exchange and promissory notes?

Mr. MANN. An officer or enlisted man who dies might have a promissory note or a bill of exchange in his possession. They may not desire to have an administrator appointed. There may be no one who makes the application to be appointed administrator, or asks for administration. In those cases these effects are turned over to the War Department. Of course the language was put in out of excess of precaution, for probably a case of that kind would not arise once in a thousand times.

Mr. ADAMSON. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that that can only refer to such paper as may incidentally be connected with the effects in question. There is no purpose to go into general administration.

Mr. STAFFORD. But under the reading of the bill the auditor would act as administrator of the deceased estate. It might be inconsequential, but the auditor would act as administrator where the public administrator would not see fit to take jurisdiction of the effects of the deceased.

Mr. MANN. Of course the language of the bill says "conservator," but in fact it would amount to acting as administrator as to the effects turned over to the auditor.

Mr. ADAMSON. Does it not merely amount to making him a trustee?

Mr. MANN. That is undoubtedly what it amounts to.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, what is done with these effects after they are turned over to the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. MANN. What is done with them now?

Mr. COX. What has been done with them in the past?

Mr. MANN. There are a lot of them up there in the Treasury Building now, and there have been for years. They have not been disposed of.

Mr. COX. That is what I want to know. Is there any law now which fixes the time when estates of this kind revert back to the Treasury of the United States and become public funds, or are the effects always held in trust for the heirs?

Mr. MANN. I think there is no law on the subject.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman understand that up to this time whatever estates may be there are held in trust permanently, forever, for the heirs that may come up?

Mr. MANN. Until somebody calls for them.

Mr. ADAMSON. If the gentleman from Illinois will permit, this bill has no reference to estates. It has reference to effects which are in the possession and custody of the department, and merely permits the conversion of those effects into cash, because the cash is more readily and safely held for the owner than the effects.

Mr. COX. I think the gentleman is clearly right, but I wanted to get information on whether or not there would ever come a time when this money, in the event it was not claimed by the representatives of the deceased person, would revert to the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not believe the Government will ever plead the statute of limitation on a thing of that sort. If it does, I shall leave the country and reside elsewhere.

Mr. COX. I do not think it ought to myself, but I wanted to know.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman that there is always a legal claimant. If there is no personal representative, the property would escheat to the State of which the deceased was a resident.

Mr. COX. That is the rule in the States, but whether it is the rule in the United States, I do not know.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to invite the attention of the chairman of the committee to the language used in lines 3, 4, and 5 of the bill:

That unclaimed effects of deceased patients of the Public Health Service, seamen of merchant vessels of the United States, consisting of jewelry or other articles, etc.

As the gentleman well knows, there are patients cared for by the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service who are not seamen of merchant vessels. Does the gentleman think this bill, if passed, will be limited in its application to the seamen of merchant vessels, or will it take in all of the patients of the Marine-Hospital Service?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, the bill, I will state to the gentleman, was drawn not with reference to the patients, but to the effects which were troubling the department. We wrote the bill to cover what we had in hand.

Mr. WILLIS. Let me state a specific case. We understand that under certain circumstances sailors from the naval vessels of the United States may be cared for in this service. Suppose one of those sailors should die, leaving unclaimed effects, will this bill apply to those effects or not?

Mr. ADAMSON. I will answer that, like all we Yankees answer questions, by asking another. If the gentleman knows of sufficient cases of that sort actually existing to make it necessary to include them in this bill, it is up to the gentleman to offer an amendment to include them.

Mr. WILLIS. I do know, as the gentleman knows, that there are many cases where there are sailors from the naval vessels of the United States—

Mr. ADAMSON. But that is not the question. The question is, Is there any property up here in the departments that has been left by them?

Mr. WILLIS. We have no right to assume there will never be any property belonging to such persons.

Mr. ADAMSON. We hardly ever anticipate trouble and legislate in advance of what is indicated by the actual facts, unless we may reasonably apprehend it to be necessary.

Mr. WILLIS. I understood that was the purpose of this legislation—to care for those cases, not only as they exist now, but as they shall come up hereafter. We do not want to make a special law to apply to cases that now exist, and leave it to future legislation to care for the cases that may arise to-morrow.

I suggest to the gentleman whether it would not be advisable to strike out the language in line 4, "seamen of merchant vessels of the United States," and that will make it general and apply to all patients.

Mr. ADAMSON. I will say to the gentleman the main purpose of this bill, and the moving purpose, is to dispose of the effects that are now on hand in the way that ought to be preserved, and while doing that it is reasonable to provide for what is likely to happen like that in the future. If the gentleman makes the motion he suggests, I will not oppose it.

Mr. WILLIS. I will make it.

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

Mr. ADAMSON. I will.

Mr. CULLOP. Is there any provision in this bill specifying the period which shall elapse between the death of the party and the sale made by the Government? If not, there should be, in order to prevent abuse of the authority vested by it.

Mr. ADAMSON. I think it is two years.

Mr. CULLOP. I have looked over the bill, and I have not observed anything of that kind; if not, I suggest an amendment of that kind be made to it so that the sale would not take place immediately, but give the claimants an opportunity to present their claims for the effects and to prevent sacrifice of property.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAMSON. Certainly.

Mr. FOWLER. On the point just raised by the gentleman from Indiana, I have been making inquiry as to section 2 and as to the extent of provisions made—

Mr. ADAMSON. If the gentleman from Illinois will allow me to complete my answer to the gentleman from Indiana—

Mr. FOWLER. Certainly.

Mr. ADAMSON. The gentleman will find the proviso at the top of page 2:

*Provided*, That application for the effects shall not have been made by the legal claimants within two years after their receipt.

Mr. FOWLER. Section 2 provides for property of another class.

Mr. ADAMSON. What line?

Mr. FOWLER. Line 11.

That unclaimed effects of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army and civilians employed in connection with the Army or under the War Department which they have heretofore or may hereafter be received at the Treasury Department may be sold by order of the Secretary of the Treasury and the expenses of such sale paid out of the proceeds thereof.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman read a little further?

Mr. FOWLER (reading):

*Provided*, That application for the effects shall not have been made by the legal claimants within two years after their receipt.

Mr. ADAMSON. The provision is made in both cases.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it intended no sale shall be made in either one of the cases until after the expiration of two years?

Mr. ADAMSON. From the time the property is received by the department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That unclaimed effects of deceased patients of the Public Health Service, seamen of merchant vessels of the United States, consisting of jewelry or other articles, shall be delivered to a collector or surveyor of customs of the district in which the death of the patient occurred, and for the protection of the estates of these persons the Secretary of the Treasury may order such effects to be sold and pay the expenses of such sale out of the proceeds: *Provided*, That application for the effects shall not have been made by the legal claimants within two years after their receipt. The proceeds of such sales, together with any money effects of the deceased, shall be deposited in the Treasury in trust for the legal claimants, to be paid to them on the certificate of the Auditor for the Treasury Department, who shall act as conservator of these estates, with authority to indorse all bills of exchange, promissory notes, and other evidences of indebtedness due to such estates, and to take such steps as may be necessary for their collection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WILLIS. Will not the gentleman move to make that amendment in lines 4 and 5? It seems to me that the language "seamen of merchant vessels of the United States, consisting of jewelry and other articles" ought to be stricken out to accomplish the purpose the gentleman has in mind. There is no reason why jewelry should be mentioned especially.

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not think it will hurt the bill at all to strike it out.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman make the motion?

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman from Ohio make it?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by striking out, in lines 4 and 5, the words:

Seamen of merchant vessels of the United States, consisting of jewelry or other articles.

So that it will read:

That unclaimed effects of deceased patients of the Public Health Service shall be delivered to a collector—

And so forth.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? As I understand the purpose of this bill, it is to limit it to persons employed by the Government in two different branches of the service.

Mr. ADAMSON. I think so. The Public Health Service is a very important branch of the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman does not want to extend the provisions of this bill to persons who are outside of the Government service?

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not think it treats of any of them. Our law prescribes what patients may be admitted.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will accomplish that.

Mr. WILLIS. Not at all. The effect of the amendment will not accomplish what the gentleman suggests, because these people who are treated at this hospital are seamen upon merchant vessels and in certain cases sailors from the regular naval vessels of the United States, and it does not apply to

the general public at all. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin it will not change the meaning of this bill as he fears it will.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be permitted to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] a question.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes.

Mr. GORMAN. From my very hurried reading of this bill, I do not see anything as to the administrator taking charge of the effects. In the gentleman's opinion, will the passage of this bill interfere with the rights of the administrator?

Mr. ADAMSON. Not in the least. It will convert the effects of the person into cash and will hold it for the administrator, executor, or what not.

Mr. CULLOP. That only applies to the unclaimed effects of such man?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes.

Mr. CULLOP. In such a case as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois this bill would not operate in that case. It would in such a case have no application, but the personal representatives or legal heirs would have the right to take the property and administer upon it.

Mr. ADAMSON. The gentleman is correct about that. If there is a contest for the ownership, of course, the trustee would continue his trust until the contest was decided.

Mr. CULLOP. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "seamen of merchant vessels of the United States, consisting of jewelry and other articles."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill, as follows:

Sec. 2. That unclaimed effects of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army and civilian employees of the War Department which have heretofore or may hereafter be received at the Treasury Department may be sold by order of the Secretary of the Treasury and the expenses of such sale paid out of the proceeds thereof: *Provided*, That application for the effects shall not have been made by the legal claimants within two years after their receipt. The net proceeds of such sales, together with any money effects of the deceased, shall be deposited in the Treasury in trust for the legal claimants, to be paid to them on the certificate of the Auditor for the War Department, who shall act as conservator of these estates, with authority to indorse all checks, notes, bills of exchange, and other evidences of indebtedness due to such estates, and to take such steps as may be necessary for their collection.

The following committee amendment was read:

Page 2, lines 12 and 13, strike out the words "civilian employees of" and insert the words "civilians employed in connection with the Army or under," so that the lines will read:

"That unclaimed effects of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army and civilians employed in connection with the Army or under the War Department," etc.

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AIDS TO NAVIGATION, LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 7206) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] explain the necessity for the increased limit of cost?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in answer to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], that the report, which gives the letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, be read. They clearly set out the necessity for this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Report to accompany H. R. 7206.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7206) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse



Service, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913, having considered the same, report thereon with amendments, and as so amended recommend that it pass.

The bill as amended has the approval of the Department of Commerce, as will appear by the letter attached, and which is made a part of this report.

Amend the bill as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "for."

Amend the title so as to read:

"To amend an act entitled 'An act to authorize aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes,' approved March 4, 1913."

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, August 9, 1913.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 5, inclosing, with request for the views of this department thereon, a copy of House bill 7206, Sixty-third Congress, first session, "To amend an act entitled 'An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes,' approved March 4, 1913."

The act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat., 1017), authorized the construction of a tender for general lighthouse service at \$250,000, but a more seaworthy vessel with greater carrying capacity is now deemed necessary for the desired service. No appropriation for this object has as yet been made. A full statement setting forth the necessity for providing this tender at a cost of \$325,000 is printed at page 27 of House Document 88, Sixty-third Congress, first session (Supplemental Estimates), to which attention is invited.

It is recommended that the bill submitted be amended as follows:

Line 2 of title, and line 5, page 1, strike out the word "for"; line 7, page 1, strike out the words "and Labor."

Subject to these three amendments it is recommended that the bill be passed.

Very truly, yours,

ALBERT LEE THURMAN,  
Acting Secretary.

Hon. W. C. ADAMSON,  
Chairman Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,  
House of Representatives.

The statement referred to in the above letter is herewith attached.

Total amount to be appropriated under each head of appropriation.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

LIGHTHOUSE ESTABLISHMENT.

[Lighthouses, beacons, fog signals, light vessels, and other works under the Lighthouse Service.]

Lighthouse tender, general service: For constructing and equipping a lighthouse tender for general service, and the amount authorized for this purpose by the act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat., 1017), is hereby increased by the sum of \$75,000 (act Mar. 4, 1913, vol. 37, p. 1017, sec. 1), \$325,000.

NOTE: On May 20, 1912, the lighthouse tender *Armeria* struck a rock off Cape Hinchinbrook, Alaska, and was totally lost. This tender was the largest in the Lighthouse Service and the only one regularly assigned for service in Alaskan waters. The loss of this tender has seriously crippled the available tender force, and a new tender should take its place as soon as possible. The lighthouse work is constantly increasing on account of the increase of shipping and demand for aids to navigation. It is proposed to use the new tender for general lighthouse service as required, and also for the purpose of transporting supplies to the Pribilof Islands in Bering Sea for use in the Alaska sealing industry and for use in Alaskan waters in connection with the work of other branches of the Government, as far as may be desirable and practicable. A large seaworthy vessel is essential for this work because the vessel must carry supplies to distant points and must be able to make voyages of considerable length across portions of the north Pacific Ocean. The vessel must be of slightly greater draft and carrying capacity than the tender *Armeria*, which was lost, in order to transport the necessary quantities of coal, supplies, and construction materials. It is important that the proposed vessel should be so designed as to be protected against loss.

For the past three years and also this year the department has been compelled to charter an appropriate vessel to carry supplies to the Pribilof Islands for the use of the native inhabitants there who are wards of the Government, and bring back sealskins. The charter of a suitable vessel, exclusive of the coal used on the vessel, amounts to \$150 a day, and including the coal has caused an annual charge on appropriations of this department of from \$20,000 to \$23,000 per annum.

If the lighthouse tender authorized to be constructed under the act of March 4, 1913, above referred to, can be enlarged so as to provide the cargo space necessary to carry the supplies, which enlargement can be made if the amount to be expended for the tender is increased by \$75,000, that vessel could be used for the purpose of transporting the supplies to the islands, at a considerable saving to the Government.

Calculating the increased cost of operating a larger vessel over the cost of operation of the vessel originally proposed to be constructed, which it is estimated will be about \$7,000 per annum, there remains a net saving of approximately \$13,000 per annum, or 17 per cent on the investment of \$75,000 necessary to carry out this plan. However, the larger tender will not be used during the entire year, and probably a saving of \$2,000 per annum will be made in operating costs during the time the tender is laid up during the winter months. This will increase the profit to the Government on the investment of the additional \$75,000 to approximately 20 per cent. Since the department has been administering the fur-seal service on the Pribilof Islands there has been but one vessel on the Pacific coast which was available for charter for the taking of the supplies to the islands. Should the vessel receive an annual charter or get a charter at more favorable terms during the time the department would have to use it, difficulty might be experienced in engaging a suitable vessel, or the department might be compelled to expend for charter a sum in excess of the amount which could be spared under the limited appropriations made for the Alaskan service.

Another very potent argument in favor of providing a governmental vessel for the purpose of transporting the supplies to the native inhabitants is that during the entire time the shipment of supplies and the return of the fur sealskins would be under the direct control of the United States Government.

The vessel, if constructed now, would be able to take care of the growth in the Lighthouse Service for some years to come and could render valuable service in connection with the work of this department in Alaska, which necessarily will increase in volume for several years, especially under the closed requirements of the existing treaty referring to the fur-seal herds on the Pribilof Islands in Alaska.

Cost of charter of steamer *Homer* for use in transporting supplies to the fur-seal islands:

Year.	Charter.		
	Day rate.	Days.	Amount.
1910.....	\$142.50	104½	\$14,877.55
1911.....	142.50	117	16,567.75
1912.....	150.00	133	20,025.00

#### DETAILED ESTIMATE.

Navy tugs built on Pacific coast under 10-hour day cost \$198.35 per ton, and two new revenue cutters built under 8-hour law cost \$215.51 per ton. On account of the additional hull required for cargo space, without any appreciable increase in machinery, it is believed the cost of the proposed vessel may be estimated at \$150 per ton. The maximum displacement of the *Armeria* was about 1,800 tons, which in the proposed vessel is to be increased to about 2,000 tons.

2,000 tons, at \$150.....	\$300,000
Wireless outfit.....	5,000
Machine-shop outfit.....	5,000
Derrick.....	9,000
Windlass.....	6,000

Total..... 325,000

The act of March 4, 1913 (Public, No. 453), authorized the construction of a tender for general service at \$250,000, but a more seaworthy vessel with greater carrying capacity, as explained above, is now deemed necessary for the desired service. No appropriation for this object has as yet been made.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] if the reading answers his question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That gives me the information I desire, and I will say to the gentleman that if after his investigation he is convinced that the building of this larger vessel will result in the economies pointed out by the Secretary of Commerce, I should be very glad to see the economies put into effect and that amount of money saved.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, the idea that controlled the committee was that it would be greatly to the advantage of the Government in point of economy to enlarge this authorization, not only because it could be utilized to carry all its supplies into that far-away country, but it would dispense with chartering vessels, and besides we would not encounter the difficulty often met with of not being able to secure any vessel at all. Very often on the Pacific coast we can not get the kind of vessel we want, and in the long run the cost of chartering the vessel would amply repay for this additional authorization for building this seaworthy ship. It would answer all purposes, and a smaller ship will not.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ADAMSON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, there are just two reasons given for the larger vessel. One of them is in order that we may have a transport for supplies to the Pribilof Islands and the second is in order to have a transport for fur seals from the Pribilof Islands.

Mr. ADAMSON. I did not state the first reason because I thought it was self-evident that we would need for that service a stronger and larger vessel.

Mr. MANN. Are there any other reasons than those stated for a larger vessel—to transfer supplies to and fur seals from the islands?

Mr. ADAMSON. We need it for general purposes. In a general way, a strong, seaworthy vessel is needed.

Mr. MANN. You already have an authorization for the construction of a \$250,000 vessel for that purpose.

Mr. ADAMSON. That is right.

Mr. MANN. As I understand this recommendation, a larger vessel is needed in order to transfer fur seals from the Pribilof Islands and supplies to the islands. Is there any other work that a larger vessel is needed for?

Mr. ADAMSON. It is thought that a larger and stronger vessel would be better for the service required in those waters.

Mr. MANN. Does the department say that anywhere?

Mr. ADAMSON. I think it does.

Mr. MANN. I have not been able to find it in the recommendations of the department.

Mr. ADAMSON. I think it is either in that report or somewhere else.

Mr. MANN. I have read it carefully and do not find it.

Mr. ADAMSON. Sometimes I read other things and get my authorities mixed; but I have read it somewhere, coming from a competent authority.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman has read somewhere that this vessel is needed in order to transport coal and seals. Now, in view of the fact that Congress has passed a law prohibiting

the killing of any seals on the islands except for meat for food for the natives—

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not think it is intended that this vessel shall be used in killing seals.

Mr. MANN. It is to transport furs, if the gentleman will permit. They do not need this vessel for the transportation of furs for several years to come. The sealskins will not have to be transported.

Now, the gentleman is aware also of the fact that on Wednesday next we have before us as the unfinished business of the House a bill to authorize the construction of a railroad in Alaska for the purpose of providing railroad transportation from the Pacific coast to the Yukon River, passing through the Alaskan coal fields. Will there be any need for this vessel to transport coal from California or Washington or Oregon after we have tapped the Alaskan coal fields by means of this railroad that will take the coal to the Yukon River, so that from the Yukon River it can be carried down conveniently to the Pribilof Islands?

Mr. ADAMSON. I have read in the Bible that some time the world is going to end and some of us will go to heaven. But we do not desire to defer the improvement of the Lighthouse Service for that event. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. It is to be hoped not, and it is not a great strain on the imagination to think that some time my friend from Georgia will reach that haven of rest, and I would not have him act here so as that he would never get the chance. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMSON. I would be greatly disappointed and the peace and immortal pleasure I would enjoy there would be less joyful to me if I did not see the gentleman from Illinois there also and hear him occasionally, even though he might object to the heavenly proceedings. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether the gentleman will see me there or not, but I hope he will not arrive first.

Mr. ADAMSON. I have traveled with the gentleman for many years and would like for us to enter the portals of glory together.

Mr. MANN. And I have enjoyed traveling with the gentleman. But I repeat that if this railroad in Alaska is built coal can be supplied to the Pribilof Islands from the Alaskan coal fields, and a vessel of this large size will not be necessary.

Mr. ADAMSON. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to make a little further answer to his question. I am not prophet enough to know what this House will do with the bill the gentleman mentions, or what will be done with it after that, or how long it will take to build that proposed railroad if the bill ever becomes a law. But my opinion is that we can make good use of a lighthouse vessel for many years before the realization he describes is had, and if it is to be done we shall need aids to navigation more after we get that railroad than we have needed them before. It is to be hoped that this ship, when built, will last until we get that railroad.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] objects, and the bill will be stricken from the Calendar for Unanimous Consent. The Clerk will report the next one.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 10523) making appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed. (H. Rept. 136.)

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice at this time that on to-morrow I shall move to take up the bill for consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] reports the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which is ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and he further notifies the House that on to-morrow, as early as possible, he will call it up for consideration. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserves all points of order.

#### LABORATORIES FOR BUREAU OF MINES, PITTSBURGH, PA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 2689) amending an act entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion

of public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913.

The bill was read by title.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 26 of the act approved March 4, 1913, which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into a contract or contracts for the erection of fireproof laboratories for the Bureau of Mines in the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., etc., is hereby amended so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to accept and expend, in addition to the limit of cost therein fixed, such funds as may be received by contribution from the State of Pennsylvania, or from other sources, for the purpose of enlarging, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, and improving the site authorized to be acquired for said Bureau of Mines, or for other work contemplated by said legislation: *Provided,* That the acceptance of such contributions and the improvements made therewith shall involve the United States in no expenditure in excess of the limit of cost heretofore fixed.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I understand that this bill imposes no additional expense on the Government of the United States.

Mr. ASHBROOK. None whatever.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

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

#### LAUNCH FOR CUSTOMS SERVICE, LOS ANGELES, CAL.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 24) for the purchase or construction of a launch for the customs service at and in the vicinity of Los Angeles, Cal.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to purchase or have constructed for the customs service a suitable launch, of such motive power as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, for the use at and in the vicinity of Los Angeles, Cal., and the cost thereof shall not exceed the sum of \$10,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "of" insert "the port of." Strike out all after "\$10,000," in line 8, page 1, and insert: "Provided, That the Secretary of the Treasury may use said launch at any other customs port in the United States as the exigencies of the service may require."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question. My recollection is that under the law the Treasury Department has authority to build customs launches costing not more than \$5,000 each.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS], who reported this bill, to take charge of it.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. That is true; but I think this is an exceptional case, which I think can be better described by the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS], so I yield to him to answer that question.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Speaker, this bill or a similar one has been passed on and recommended by the Treasury Department in each of the last four Congresses. It is recommended by the present Secretary of the Treasury, and the bill asks for as much as \$10,000, if the same be found advisable.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, some years ago, when I was a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Treasury Department recommended a steam launch at Galveston, to cost \$25,000, and reiterated the recommendation to the committee. It seemed to me a rather excessive cost. After having a lot of correspondence with the department, I went to the department and asked the assistant secretary who had charge of the matter what the launch would cost. He said, "\$25,000." I said, "You do not know anything about it, of course; send me to the man who does know." And in course of time I reached the man who was supposed to know. He said they had no more need of a customs launch costing \$25,000 there than they had in heaven; and, I believe, finally we appropriated \$10,000 for a customs launch. Since that time they have been asking for \$10,000 customs launches, and they put in that amount as a matter of course.

The fact is, they have authority to build a launch costing not more than \$5,000, which builds a pretty reasonable launch, to be used in reaching vessels. What is the difference between Los



Angeles port and all the other ports on the Pacific coast and on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts in this respect?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Illinois, I want to quote from the letter of the Treasury Department dated March 26, 1909, which says:

The department is of opinion that the service will be greatly benefited if supplied with a vessel or launch such as is provided for in the bill. In fact, the service can not be efficiently administered without such a boat.

I take it that the department would not have continued during four different Congresses to recommend the construction of such a boat if it had believed that a boat to cost \$5,000 would have adequately served the department.

The customs service at Los Angeles has to do with a very considerable coast line. Under the old régime the coast line consisted of about 100 miles, but since July 30 of this year the San Diego district has been merged into the Los Angeles district and the coast line now probably exceeds 200 miles. Indeed, following all its indentations, it may exceed 250 miles.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman understand that this customs launch will travel up and down the coast line?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. They frequently do.

Mr. MANN. For what purpose?

Mr. STEPHENS of California. For the purpose of investigating certain smuggling reports, and for the purpose also of investigating and looking after violations of the navigation laws and regulations by motor boats.

Mr. MANN. I guess the gentleman will find that the customs launch is mainly devoted to the purpose of landing the customs officials on board incoming boats.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. That is one very important use.

Mr. MANN. That is about all they do, and if they do that they can not travel around very much.

Mr. MADDEN. Is it not a fact that this launch only runs from the customhouse dock to the ships to carry papers and messages?

Mr. MANN. I think that is all they are designed for. Sometimes they are used for pleasure excursions.

Mr. MADDEN. They do not have to go to sea.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. It is true that the particular purpose for which the launches are used is to board incoming ships. But it is the intent and purpose that this boat shall also be used to look after the motor regulations that the Government is endeavoring to enforce.

Mr. MANN. For many years customs officers at Chicago and the Treasury Department for a time were very insistent that they should have a large customs launch at Chicago or a small revenue cutter. Now, I have endeavored as best I could, to look after the interests of Chicago on the floor of the House, but I never was able to find out what this launch or revenue cutter would be used for unless it was to take lake excursions. As I had never been invited to participate in anything of the kind I saw no necessity for the boat, and it has never yet been provided. I suppose now there is no demand for it at present. I think you can get along with the \$5,000 launch.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would be satisfied with a \$5,000 launch if the department thought that was all that was needed, but it asks and recommends one that will cost more money. I believe, after having asked for it and recommended it four times, its request now deserves serious consideration. However, if objection is to be made and it is desired to have the bill go over to the regular call of the committee reporting it, there is no use in further arguing the question at this time. If information and argument is desired now rather than later, I will be glad to continue.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have looked into this matter somewhat, and I became convinced that it is an unnecessary expense to authorize a \$10,000 launch, and I object.

#### CLAIMS UNDER THE BOWMAN AND TUCKER ACTS.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion, which I send to the Clerk's desk to be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GREGG moves to suspend the rules, discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8846, entitled "A bill making appropriations for payment of certain claims in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims, reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts, and under the provisions of section No. 151 of the act approved March 3, 1911, commonly known as the 'judicial code,' and pass the bill, with the following amendments:

On page 2, line 4, after the word "claims," insert the following: "except that claimants under this act receiving compensation for use and occupancy of property shall not be barred from further prosecution of claims arising from damage or destruction of the same property."

On page 5 strike out line 25.

On page 6 strike out lines 13 and 14.

On page 7, line 6, strike out the word "Arkaksas" and insert the word "Arkansas."

On page 9, after line 6, insert the following:

"To the legal representatives of Virginia A. Jones, late administratrix of Samuel J. Jones, deceased, late of Jefferson County, \$6,950."

On page 15, after line 4, insert the following:

"To Mary A. Gammon, O. B. Whatley, and D. A. Whitehead, sole surviving heirs of Wilson O. B. Whatley, deceased, late of Polk County, \$1,019."

Also the following:

"To Rosa M. Wyatt, of Bryan County, \$5,015."

On page 22, after line 8, insert the following:

"To Lucy C. Lee, administratrix of the estate of Jane T. Lee, deceased, of Mason County, \$915."

On page 22, after line 10, insert the following:

"To Adelaide B. Lindenberger, of Louisville, \$1,100."

On page 24, line 3, strike out the word "Traughber" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Traugher."

On page 24, after line 13, insert the following:

"To the vestry of Christ Protestant Episcopal Church, of Bowling Green, \$300."

On page 28, after line 7, insert the following:

"To the heirs or succession of Selzer Bass, deceased, late of West Carroll Parish, \$3,407.50, representing his interest in property taken from him and his coowners."

On page 40, after line 16, insert the following:

"To Antonio Q. Lovell, Rosalie Q. Duncan, Fredrica Q. Ogden, Eliza T. Routh, and Louisa Q. Lovell, deceased, and Eva C. Lovell and Alice Q. Lovell, children and heirs of Louisa Q. Lovell, deceased, or to their legal representatives, the sum of \$13,500."

On page 54, after line 12, insert the following:

"To the deacons of First Presbyterian Church of Newbern, \$3,300."

On page 56, after line 13, insert the following:

"To the consistory of the Trinity German Reformed Church, of Gettysburg, \$70."

On page 67, line 18, after the word "Memphis," insert the following:

"Late surviving partner of the firm of Topp & Vance, consisting of Robertson Topp and William L. Vance, the same being partnership property of the said Topp and Vance."

So that the item will read:

"To George T. and Guy P. Vance, executors of the estate of William L. Vance, deceased, of Memphis, late surviving partner of the firm of Topp & Vance, consisting of Robertson Topp and William L. Vance, the same being partnership property of the said Topp and Vance, \$41,667."

On page 68, after line 25, insert the following:

"To the trustees of the First Baptist Church of Chattanooga, \$1,210."

On page 78, after line 20, insert the following:

"To the trustees of Union Presbyterian Church, of Cross Keys, \$100."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. I think the bill has to be read before a second is demanded.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second. I do so for the purpose of asking at this time that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can not demand a second. He is not entitled to a second. He is not opposed to the bill. The gentleman will not have an opportunity to demand a second. Part of a motion to suspend the rules is to read the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has sent out for a precedent.

Mr. MANN. Oh, it is possible to make a motion to pass the bill without reading but that motion has not been made, and I take it it will not be done where it is not absolutely necessary.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Illinois on his point of order.

Mr. MANN. I have not made any point of order. I made a parliamentary inquiry. The Speaker asked whether a second was demanded. The reading of the bill is a part of the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, unless the motion is made to pass it without reading.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is inclined to think at first blush that is correct.

Mr. MANN. I can tell the Speaker what the precedent is, because I drew the motion on two different occasions—in the case of the criminal-code bill and the judicial-title bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman this question: Did he draw the motion when this same bill was passed under suspension of the rules a year or so ago?

Mr. MANN. I prepared the motion in connivance with the gentleman who had charge of the bill.

The SPEAKER. I desire to see that motion.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, this bill has never been read in committee or in the House. The uniform practice has been, except under very extraordinary conditions, not to entertain a motion to suspend the rules for the passage of a bill without the reading of the bill. The practice of the Chair always has been himself to object if the request is made to dispense with the reading of bills which are called up, because if the bill be not even read the House would very quickly fall into habits that would result in things being passed that never should be passed. Some one ought to have a chance to know what is in the bill that is going to be passed.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, I want to state that in the Sixty-first Congress in the motion to suspend the rules and pass this bill there was in it a provision that it be passed without reading,

but I did not include that in this motion. I do not think that a bill of this importance ought to pass the House without being read to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think so either.

Mr. GREGG. I did not include that in the motion at all.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, in the case referred to by the gentleman from Texas the bill had been under consideration for a long time. It had practically been read and a filibuster developed against it, and a motion was made to pass it without reading for that reason.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that it never was passed except by agreement along in the night, after two or three days of filibuster, at 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield, though I have not the floor.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I think the facts were these, that an attempt was made to pass that bill by a motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] in an attempt to overrule the decision of the Chair, and then the Committee on Rules met and reported the rule under which the bill was passed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not recall.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will end the whole matter by stating that, in his judgment, no bill ought to pass this House under any circumstances whatever without being once read, unless the House puts into the motion the same words the gentleman from Illinois talks about. The Chair desires to make this statement in connection with that. This bill was read down to and including page 41 and had been adopted up to that point.

Mr. MANN. I think it will be entirely proper, if the Speaker will permit the interruption, for the gentleman from Texas to ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the bill down to that point.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the bill at this time begin where it was left off the other day in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the reading begin where it was concluded in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] are recognized for 20 minutes each.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama may proceed out of order to discuss some other proposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] may speak on some subject other than the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the Members of this House for the permission that has been granted me to discuss at this time the subject of cotton. There are so many false rumors and inaccuracies and so much misinformation afloat now concerning the cotton crop of 1913 that I wish to submit to the House a few facts and figures that I think will somewhat clear up the atmosphere regarding the cotton situation generally.

Let me in the outset call your attention to the fact that the Bureau of Estimates in the Department of Agriculture has overestimated the cotton crop for the last three years. In 1910 this bureau overestimated the crop 40,000 bales; in 1911, 139,000 bales; and in 1912, 214,000 bales; and in the opinion of many well-informed cotton men it has overestimated the crop this year. But if we should make as much as the bureau has said we would make, 13,677,000 bales, it will not be sufficient to meet the demand.

The cost of cotton production has greatly increased. The mule for which the cotton farmer once paid \$90 and \$100 he now pays \$250 and \$300. The cost of everything else that enters into the production of cotton has greatly increased, and the cotton farmer can not realize a living profit on all his labor and investment in the production of cotton unless he receives 15 cents per pound. You have educated us to the price of \$250

and \$300 for mules and we are going to educate you to 15-cent cotton. [Applause.]

About three or four years ago, when cotton was selling for 15 cents per pound, the Department of Commerce and Labor, in a statement, said:

The rise in the cost of the raw material has been more the result of natural than of artificial causes. There has been a material advance in the prices of practically all commodities, and cotton has shared in this. But—

The statement goes on to say—

In the case of cotton this advance has also been furthered by a constantly broadening demand for this fiber in old as well as in new channels. Cotton is now relied upon in practically all of the textile manufactures, either as a primary or a secondary material, and it is utilized in an increasing number in all other manufacturing industries. The ease and rapidity with which the cotton fiber is transformed into yarn and its adaptability for all forms of woven fabrics are responsible for the manner in which it has outstripped all other fibers and for its extensive and increasing use.

Mr. Speaker, cotton is being put to more uses to-day than ever before in the history of the world. It is used in the manufacture of and substituted for woolen goods, and is substituted for silk and linen. It is being woven into a fabric so resembling silk that it requires the chemical test to tell the difference. Thousands of bales are used in the manufacture of cement sacks, automobile tops and tires, and material for flying machines or aeroplanes.

European cotton mills have gone on making large contracts to deliver cotton goods, and now they find their supply of old cotton exhausted and a world crop smaller than last year.

John H. McFadden, a large cotton dealer, has just returned from England, and he says that the mills abroad had figured on a 16,000,000-bale crop in the United States.

Now that the crop here will be more than 2,000,000 bales short of that, there is no earthly reason why cotton should not bring 15 cents per pound. [Applause.]

The cotton mills of the world have never consumed so much cotton as they did the year ending August 31 this year, and the supply of old cotton has not been so small in a decade.

The world's statistics published by the Bureau of the Census show that the world's estimated production of cotton for the year 1912 was 21,457,000 bales, and that the world's estimated consumption of cotton for the same year up to August 31, 1913, was 21,542,000 bales, 85,000 bales more than the crop of 1912.

The cotton mills of America, constituting about one-fifth of the spindles of the world, consumed 500,000 more bales of cotton for the year ending August 31, 1913, than they did last year, and these same mills bought 525,000 more bales of cotton since September 1 this year than last year. We exported more than 200,000 more bales of cotton during the month of September this year than for the same month last year.

All of these facts tell of the increasing demand and consumption of cotton, of more active spindles, and of the exhausted supply of the old crop. It means that the world will need one and a half millions more bales of American cotton from the crop of 1913 than will ever be produced this year. Last year, according to the report of our Government, there were 140,996,000 active cotton spindles in the world, and this year there are 143,398,000 active cotton spindles in the world, an increase of active cotton spindles for this year over last year of 2,402,000. The cotton crop of this year, practically all of it, has been gathered and ginned. The ginners' reports that have been published have almost, if not quite, accounted for the crop of 1913. The oldest inhabitants of the cotton belt say that never before did cotton mature so early, and never was the bulk of the crop gathered and ginned so soon in the season.

Mr. Speaker, bear gamblers on the exchange took advantage of this unprecedented condition, and because the first ginners' reports were larger than those last year of the same date they sought to induce the public to believe that a big crop was being made, and, while they knew better themselves, they succeeded in deceiving the public into believing their story, and they and their methods of misrepresentations have been the means of robbing the cotton producers on this crop already of \$10 and \$15 per bale. [Applause.]

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. With pleasure.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Is it not a fact that about 65 per cent of our cotton is exported?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Do you think a man is a good American citizen who, on this continent, which has a monopoly of the cotton-raising business, will cry down the price of cotton in this country, where we produce it as a monopoly. In order to benefit the world at large, where they can not produce it?

Mr. HEFLIN. I thank the gentleman for his question, and I quite agree with him.



Mr. Speaker, the fact that cotton matured, opened, and was gathered and ginned earlier than ever before is no evidence of itself that the crop is larger or smaller than usual. So, in order to ascertain approximately what the cotton crop of this year is or will be, as compared with the crop of last year, we must consider the ginners' report of the two crops up to this date, and we must also consider the condition of the cotton fields and compare the amount of cotton remaining in the fields at this time last year with the amount remaining in the fields now.

Let me give you some figures showing how much more rapidly cotton was gathered and ginned early in the season this year than last.

Take, for instance, a half dozen of the principal cotton-producing counties of my own State, Alabama, and you will readily see how much more rapidly cotton has been gathered and ginned throughout the South this year than last year.

Barbour County, in southern part of the State, by December 1, 1913, had ginned 6,000 more bales than to the same date last year:

	Bales.
Lowndes County (southern).....	4,000
Russell County (southern).....	5,000
Calhoun County (northern).....	5,000
Lauderdale County (northern).....	6,000
Madison County (northern).....	7,000

Louisiana had ginned last year up to September 1, 1,700 bales, and this year to September 1, 7,000 bales.

Alabama had ginned to September 1, 1912, 12,000 bales, and to September 1, 1913, 44,000 bales.

Up to September 1, 1912, Georgia had ginned 34,000 bales, and to September 1, 1913, 72,000 bales; and so on.

While these earlier reports are much larger than those for last year, the Government figures show that the total amount of cotton ginned last year in all the States up to November 1 was greater than the total amount ginned this year to the same date. To November 1 last year, 8,869,000 bales; to November 1 this year, 8,830,000 bales. Thirty-nine thousand more bales of the crop of 1912 to that date.

Last year frost was late in many of the Southern States and cotton matured and opened after the 1st of November, and at this season of the year the fields in many sections were white with cotton.

This year the situation is entirely different. Early frost in the cotton-producing States killed the leaves and squares and half-grown bolls and left the stalks bare of foliage, so that the warm sun could reach the bolls, and as a result cotton has opened and has been gathered more rapidly than ever before.

So, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the ginners' report up to December 1 this year shows 200,000 more bales of cotton than to the same date last year must be considered in connection with the further fact that last year at the same time there was a great deal of cotton remaining in the field, whereas the fields are bare now and the cotton has been gathered and ginned. And these facts, considered together, rather indicate a smaller than a larger crop. The indications are that ginners' reports for January and February will be much smaller than last year for the same months.

As late as the 20th of November last year the fields of the South were white with cotton, but by the 20th of November this year the crop had been practically gathered and stock had been turned into the fields. While the cotton crop last year did not mature so early and was not gathered so soon as the crop this year, the Government report shows that even last year by December 13 more than 92 per cent of the entire crop had been ginned. Insect pests of various kinds have injured the crop; too much rain in some sections and too little in other sections have been the means of cutting down the cotton production this year, and early frost in the cotton belt prevented the top crop from maturing. So, Mr. Speaker, all in all, the ginners' reports published to this date have practically told the story of cotton production for the year 1913.

I bring from the cotton fields of Dixie the physical evidence of a gathered crop. Here are stalks bearing bolls that matured several weeks ago. The cotton has been picked and ginned and reported, and cattle are now roaming the fields.

Here at the top are the unmaturing bolls of which I have spoken. These leaves and squares and half-grown bolls were all killed by the frost in October. No more growth after Jack Frost lays his cold hand on the sensitive cotton plant.

Bear gamblers are trying to make the public believe that the cotton stalk is still full of open bolls and the fields are still white with the fleecy staple.

These bare stalks with their empty bolls speak for themselves, and they tell the tale of a crop that is made and gathered. As I look upon them I think of the men who prepared the soil, planted the seed, cultivated the plant, and toiled in the heat of

the day to produce the wherewith to be clothed. [Applause.] I think of those whose busy fingers plucked this snowy staple from hundreds of millions of bolls, and in their name and in the name of justice I plead for the passage of a law that will protect them from the pillage and plunder of a merciless band of bear gamblers on the cotton exchange. [Applause.] Of all places in the cotton business the cotton exchange ought to be the place where accurate information about cotton can be had; where the truth of the cotton situation is ascertained and honest dealing is the order of the day.

But instead it has become the hotbed of misinformation, deception, falsehood, and trickery. Instead of helping the producer and aiding in the distribution of the crop and serving the law of supply and demand, it injures the producer, misrepresents the truth about cotton, and hinders the operation of the law of supply and demand. [Applause.]

And let me say to the cotton exchanges now, that unless they put their houses in order, serve the producer and aid in the distribution of the crop—handle real cotton and deliver real cotton on contracts—their days are numbered. This Congress is going to pass a law regulating the cotton exchanges of the United States. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it is very refreshing to hear the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] complain about the price of cotton, and insist that owing to the high prices of everything else the southern farmer can not afford to exist unless cotton brings 15 cents a pound. The celebrated and world-wide advertised Underwood tariff bill has not, up to date, reduced the cost of living, as was promised, and I believe has not greatly increased the price of cotton.

As long as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] has stated to the House that the cotton mills of the South are running night and day, and that the New England mills are running full time, a fact which will be interesting and surprising when brought to the attention of the representatives from New England, I think I shall take occasion in a few days to call the attention of the House to the present situation in the country, both financial and industrial. I shall not detain the House at this time to do that, except to say that owing to the incapacity of Democratic control and legislation the country is now in the midst of a financial and industrial panic, and all over the country men to-day, both in factories and financial institutions, are nearly scared to death.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD], and I ask that he may proceed without regard to the subject under discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULLOP). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] is recognized for 10 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a few remarks about the resolution reported from the Committee on Education. After due reflection I have concluded that I can not afford to vote for that resolution. I am in favor of the purposes of that resolution, but I find by a casual examination that since 1899 we have had 28 of these commissions, and that the whole amount expended by them has been over \$7,000,000. I think it is time to call a halt on these commissions.

Take the Immigration Commission, which, according to the report given me this morning, spent perhaps between \$800,000 and \$850,000. They brought back a report that could have been obtained by our consuls abroad without the expenditure of a single additional dollar.

I have examined the items of expenditure by that commission. First, I discover that we paid for carriage hire to the House of Lords. Did we expect any emigrants from the hereditary lords of Great Britain?

I find an item for carriage hire to visit Westminster Abbey. Did we expect any emigrants from that abbey, the oldest in the world, where rest the remains of 13 of England's Kings and 4 of her sovereign Queens, and where Henry IV "shuffled off" over 500 years ago, in the Jerusalem corner? Did we expect any emigrants from Westminster Abbey?

Then I find a report of an expenditure for carriage hire to the Catacombs of Rome. Did we expect any emigrants from those subterranean caverns that have been silent in death for over 1,800 years?

Then I find an item, that has been paid, for carriage hire in Constantinople—for joy rides at night in caloric Constantinople. Did they expect any emigrants from there? Did they find any desirable emigrants from the harem of the imperial Sultan? [Laughter.] I find an item for carriage hire from Joppa to Jerusalem, and so on. The Member who had charge of that commission took over with him some 36 of his friends, who

were anxious to make the tour of Europe at the expense of the Government of the United States.

Take your Monetary Commission that spent about \$250,000. It was headed by a very able man, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. Aldrich, but if you examine their report and turn to the Encyclopædia Britannica you can find all the information about the Bank of France, the Bank of England, the Imperial Bank of Germany, and the Bank of Holland that you will find in that report.

Now, we had a debate all through the spring, all through the summer, all through the autumn, and 15 days in the winter, and how many Members on this floor on either side of the Chamber or at either end of the Capitol ever referred to the report of the Monetary Commission upon which we spent \$250,000?

I wish I had time to go through the list. I have called upon the Secretary of the Treasury for the exact cost of the Monetary Commission. The following is a list of the various commissions since 1899:

- Industrial Commission (tariff and trusts).
- Postal Service Commission.
- Canadian Commission.
- International Prison Commission.
- Bering Sea Commission.
- Commission on Grants of Land in New Mexico.
- California Debris Commission.
- Merchant Marine Commission.
- Coal Strike Commission.
- Extension of Capitol Commission.
- International Commission on Navigation.
- Printing Investigation Commission.
- National Monetary Commission.
- Immigration Commission.
- Second-class Mail Commission.
- Commission on Business Methods in Post Office Department.
- Bonding Companies Commission.
- St. Johns River Commission.
- Jamestown Tercentennial Commission.
- National Waterways Commission.
- International Waterways Commission.
- Tariff Board Commission.
- Commission on Change of Methods for Transacting Public Business.
- Fine Arts Commission.
- Lincoln Memorial Commission.
- Isthmian Canal Commission.
- Wood Pulp Commission.
- Canadian Boundary Commission.

I have no doubt the President will appoint a very able commission, if authorized to do so; but he has too much work now. Candidates would be in line for this proposed commission by the hundred—experts in the dead languages; profound students of the pagan classics; scientific economists well up in all matters that have been dead for 10 centuries [laughter]; distinguished students of science and sociology, with Ph. D., LL. D., and D. D.—with as many alphabetical embellishments as there are twirls to a pig's tail. [Laughter.]

Now take the Wood Pulp Commission. I want to call your attention to the fact that that report was carefully and conscientiously prepared and as able a report as ever was prepared by any commission. This commission was authorized on the Republican side, and yet when that report was made to Congress the Ways and Means Committee, as you know, paid no attention to it. Out of the 28 commissions that have been authorized since 1899 only 3 or 4 of the schemes recommended by these commissions have been adopted or enacted into law.

Look over the list of these commissions, generally composed of representative men, and what value has most of them had? I have implicit confidence in our Educational Committee. It is made up of high-class scholars, including my distinguished friend from Ohio, President Fess, who has given this matter large attention. He is a classical scholar and an experienced educator and the head of Antioch College, where I learned the most of what little I know. Let that committee make a report to the Congress and prepare a bill, and this House will give more attention to that report than it will to the report of any outside commission, no matter how able, how scientific, how scholarly that commission may be. [Applause.] I thank the House for its attention and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] for awarding me time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULOP). The gentleman from Illinois has 14 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Texas 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not vote for this bill or for this motion, because it includes a motion that was inserted in Committee of the Whole the other day for the payment of a claim where loyalty was not shown. I think I have proven through the course of a number of years in this House that I have no ill feeling toward the South or men who were in the Confederate Army because of the Civil War. What I say is not on account of a prejudice against the persons who lost their property, but on account of the situation as far as war is concerned. As long as war exists armies will forage on the enemy

where they are able to do it. That was the case in the Civil War to a greater or less extent—undoubtedly greater than any one wishes had to be done. But it has never been openly contemplated that the Government should pay for all the damage caused by the destruction of property in the South by the northern armies.

First, however, we commenced to pay for property which was used by the Army and taken from so-called loyal citizens of the South. In the main, probably they were less entitled to consideration than the people who were disloyal, so far as that is concerned, because the people who were loyal in the main were disloyal to their own States, and I expect were in the main loyal, if they were loyal, not because they loved the flag but because they were disgruntled about something else. But we commenced to pay those claims. Then some one secured—I think, through inadvertence—what I consider a somewhat sloppy opinion from the distinguished Supreme Court of the United States, that while all the members of the congregation of a church may have been disloyal, and all the male members may have been in the Confederate Army, yet the church itself was not a personality and could not be disloyal. Then we commenced to allow claims to churches and to lodges and to counties that had courthouses and cities that had city halls, and hospitals, and every form of public building or semipublic building which was, naturally, used and occupied by an invading army in order that it may not be quartered upon the homes of the citizens, giving the preference to these public and semipublic buildings. We now have a bill that is filled with these claims, and they are still coming.

Then we have presented to us the question as to whether we should pay for property that was destroyed by the invading army, and very few, even on that side of the House, when they are located as far north as Washington, will publicly say they favor the payment of those claims. They probably can not very well avoid making a precedent when it comes to voting on some particular claim, and we shall soon be confronted with a proposition of whether we shall pay for churches which were burned, and buildings which were burned, or property which was destroyed. Then, in connection with that, we are confronted now with the proposition of whether we shall pay these claims to persons who were not loyal. The reason why nations did not in the past admit claims of this sort is because when people go to war they take their chances on brute force. If they win, they succeed; if they lose, they have failed. There is no way of recompensing, and no nation in the world would think for a moment of recompensing the people of another country which it had defeated in war. But technically, here the Confederate States were not a nation, and it has been declared by the United States that those States were never out of the Union. Hence we have a little different situation from what we would have if we had had a war with some other nation. Yet the impossibility of the Government recompensing for all damages inflicted in the South is just as great as would be the impossibility of Germany returning to France compensation for all of the damages inflicted by Germany in France during the Franco-Prussian War.

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

Mr. MANN. I yield for a question.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Is it not a fact that all civilized nations for a hundred years have paid for all property taken for the use of the Army which was private property?

Mr. MANN. It is not the fact.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Did not Wellington do it?

Mr. MANN. I think that if the gentleman were at all familiar with history he would know it is not the fact.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Did not Wellington pay for the private property taken when he invaded France, and did we not have an order demanding that Gen. Scott pay for all private property he took when he invaded Mexico?

Mr. MANN. We did not. It is not the fact. It has never been the fact that the invading army paid for all private property it has either taken or destroyed. Of course I know that an army endeavors to buy property or food to a certain extent in the country which it invades, but it never has been and never will be the case that an invading army or the country behind it will pay for all property which is either taken or destroyed. I have no opposition to this bill, except for the fact that it contains this one amendment, which makes the precedent of doing away with the proof of loyalty. If you gentlemen in charge of Congress desire to set that precedent, you, of course, have the right and the power to do it. Whether you will follow up the precedent I do not know, but it is very certain that all the claim agents—and there are a number of them in Washington—will persistently and continuously for years to come cite this Underwood amendment as the precedent, unless as time goes on they have more recent ones to cite. Therefore I do



not believe that this bill ought to pass with that amendment in it.

Now, if any gentleman wants the balance of my time, I would be very glad to yield it.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield me three minutes?

Mr. MANN. I will. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Four minutes.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman takes his seat I desire to state that there are other sources of demand for the payment of war claims of a kind which the gentleman omitted to mention. In the States that did not secede are those who insist they were entitled to the protection of the General Government, where the Confederates, for lack of this protection, took or destroyed property. Those parties are already making claims that the Government of the United States owed them such protection and did not give it. That case occurs in Chambersburg, Pa.—

Mr. MANN. And one case in Maryland.

Mr. SIMS. And one place in Maryland. And there are bills before the committee to pay for property used for fortification purposes in the State of Kentucky that were destroyed by the Confederate forces. So the gentleman has not enumerated all the claims that may yet come against us.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; and there are also the cases where the local people burned bridges and things of that sort to prevent the Confederate Army advancing.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman uses up all his time and surrenders the floor—I think the time on this side is exhausted—

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, I promised five minutes to my friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. MANN. I will yield the gentleman from Alabama five minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I was going to ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

Mr. HAMLIN. I only wanted two or three minutes.

Mr. GREGG. I only have three minutes outside of the five. If the gentleman will pardon me, I will yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not want to cut the gentleman from Missouri out.

Mr. GREGG. He was not promised time, anyhow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, these claims are either right and ought to be paid, or they are wrong and the Government ought never to have paid a dollar of them. Unfortunately for the claimants many just claims have been waiting around the Halls of the Congress for 50 years to be paid. If they were not just claims and had not been waiting here that long, they would not be in this bill. Most of the claims that are in this bill are here by the unanimous report of a committee that represents every section of the Union and both political parties, and it is too late to raise the question—the purely theoretical question—as to whether the people in the South who lost their property by reason of the Army of the United States should be paid these claims or not. As a matter of fact before the smoke from the battle field had cleared away Mr. Lincoln by Executive order had many of this class of claims paid.

The Executive orders are in the departments to-day, I am informed, in which Mr. Lincoln directed that where there was a claim for property used by the Government, such as the occupation of buildings and lands, that there should be no question raised as to the loyalty of the man who was turned out when it was necessary for the Army to take possession of his property. Now, so far as I am concerned, I have always said, and I say now, that the Congress of the United States is not the tribunal in which these claims should be tried. I think the Government would have saved money and I think justice would have been done to many honest claimants if years ago a general statute had been passed fixing the status of these claims and allowing the Court of Claims or some other tribunal absolute power to try cases and dispose of them finally and take them out of the Congress entirely. I think it would be wise to-day if this class of claims were finally referred to the Court of Claims and full power given to the court to consider and act on them finally and render judgment like they do in other cases. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, it is not often I feel justified in criticizing the attitude of the leader of my party on this floor, but I feel it to be my duty on this occasion to resent his statement in reference to the loyalty of the Union people in the Southern States during the Civil War. He stated they had some

pretext or excuse. I want to say to him that the people of east Tennessee who were loyal to the Union had no pretext or excuse except to preserve the Union and save the flag; and I want to say further that it did not cost much to be loyal to the Union in Chicago, but it did cost something to be loyal to the Union in east Tennessee.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Many of my family were in Kentucky during the entire war, and I know as much about it as the gentleman from Tennessee, but I did not refer to any of those people when I stated—

Mr. AUSTIN. I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that the people in the South who were loyal to the Union were just as true and just as honest and just as sincere in their convictions and their loyalty to the Union as the people of Illinois or Massachusetts or any other State.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt that is the truth, but that is not true of all the people who filed these claims.

Mr. AUSTIN. They had no selfish or ulterior purpose. They had no purpose or thought except that of patriotism, and they proved it not only in fighting for the Union, but they proved it by sacrifices that can not be told and have never been printed.

We lived between both Armies, the Southern Army and the Union Army, and thousands of the men of east Tennessee had to leave their homes at night and follow the north star into Kentucky in order to enlist in the Union Army, and they left behind their wives and children in the heart of the enemy's country. They went through indescribable hardships, and there is not money enough in the Treasury of this rich country of ours to pay the men and women of the South who were loyal for what they suffered and what they endured in that struggle. And if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has any question in his mind about it, let him consult the men who wore the blue and fought through the Southern States. When they were hungry they found Union people ready and willing and anxious to succor them. I represent a constituency on the floor of this House where the people parted with practically all they had in order to feed and succor men from the North who came there to preserve the Union. Thirty-one thousand men in Tennessee regiments alone proved their unselfish devotion and patriotism to this country by fighting, many of them dying, and all through those mountains to-day are men who carry the evidences of their loyalty and their devotion by wounds and injuries, lost arms and lost legs, and wrecked with disease. And ill does it become the leader of my party to question their loyalty to the Union or their unselfish devotion to the flag and to their Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This bill contains 1,158 claims, 390 of them from Northern States and Western States that did not join the Confederacy. Thirty States out of 44 States represented in this bill are not in the South and had no part in the southern Confederacy. What else? A Republican President who was a wise and just man, William H. Taft, wrote this to the American Congress in December, 1910:

I invite the attention of Congress to the great number of claims which, at the instance of Congress, have been considered by the Court of Claims and decided to be valid claims against the Government.

The delay that occurs in the payment of the money due under the claims injures the reputation of the Government as an honest debtor, and I earnestly recommend that those claims which come to the Congress with the judgment and approval of the Court of Claims should be promptly paid.

Something has been said here about a claim put in this bill by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. It ought to be paid, and I say to the House as a Republican and as a son of a Union man who had to leave his home during those troublesome times that that claim is a just obligation against this Government. Those people took the oath of allegiance, and there is no proof that they did not observe it. That property was taken by the National Government after the war had closed and after the conflict had ended. Why should it not be paid? It would be an honest obligation against any individual, and it is an honest obligation against this Government that should be met and paid. [Applause.]

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to quote, in support of the question I asked a moment ago of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the following, taken from the Digest of International Law:

In section 6, page 282, volume 7, Digest of International Law, an order was issued by the Duke of Wellington, July 9, 1813, in which he said:

"The rules, therefore, which have been observed hitherto in requiring and taking and giving receipts for supplies from the country are to

be continued in the villages on the French frontier; and the commissaries attached to each of the armies of the several nations will receive the orders from the commander in chief of the army of their nations respecting the mode and period of paying for such supplies."

On October 26, 1846, Gen. Taylor, acknowledging receipt of instructions of Mr. Marcy, Secretary of War, stated that—

"It had been impossible to sustain the Army by forced contributions. The country between the Rio Grande and the Sierra Madre was poor, furnishing only corn and beef. These articles have been obtained by paying for them. The prompt payment in cash had, besides, neutralized much of the unfriendly feeling with which the Americans were regarded, and have contributed greatly to facilitate their operations. Moreover, if their crops were so taken they would have no inducement to plant again."

And the Government ordered him to continue to pay for the supplies they had had theretofore, and furnished to him the cash in order that he might pay for them on the spot, instead of giving receipts for supplies at the time that might be presented after the conflict was over and settled by the Government.

I wanted to recite this to show that the rules of civilized warfare have been for a hundred years that whenever private property is taken for the use of the Army it has been paid for. I want to state that was the order of this Government when the war began between the North and the South, namely, that private property when it was taken for the use of the Army should be either paid for or receipted for, so that it might be settled for after the conflict was over, as follows:

If the owner has not fled, the commanding officer will cause receipts to be given, which may serve the spoliated owner to obtain indemnity. (Field General Orders No. 100, Apr. 24, 1863; official records, series 3-111-152.)

Private property may be taken by a military commander for public use, in cases of necessity, or to prevent it from falling into the hands of the enemy, but the necessity must be urgent, such as will admit of no delay, or the danger must be immediate and impending. But in such cases the Government is bound to make full compensation to the owner. (Mitchell v. Harmony, 13 How., 115.)

Where private property is impressed into public use during an emergency, such as a war, a contract is implied on the part of the Government to make compensation to the owner. (United States v. Russell, 13 Wall., 623.)

After the war was over Congress put on the statute books of this country the rule that no man could present a claim to this Government for private property taken for the use of the Army during the Civil War, unless he proved loyalty to the Union.

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

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] be given three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] be given three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I shall occupy even that much time. I want to say only this: I voted against the Underwood amendment the other day, not because I did not believe it possessed merit but because I felt that it was a bad precedent to set. I felt that these matters ought to be well considered by the committee and none others considered on the floor of the House, and I believe that I was correct about that.

There is a claim that I have been pressed to present for several months; an old war claim which I thought did not possess sufficient merit, and I refused to introduce a bill for its payment and refused to present it. To-day I received a letter from one of those parties, calling my attention to the fact that he knew now that if I would only do it, I could put it on this bill by amendment, calling my attention to the Underwood amendment, and saying, "Your excuse will no longer go with me." Then he reminded me very forcibly that he had several brothers and friends living in my district, and intimated that if I did not get busy, they would get busy later on. He referred specifically to the Underwood amendment, and said, "Of course, you can do it if you want to." I felt at the time that the Underwood amendment was adopted that it was a bad precedent, and I feel still that it was a bad precedent. I do not object much to the question of loyalty, but after all we must have a rule.

I have another claim that this committee turned down. The Court of Claims found that the claim possessed merit, but said that the evidence showed that the parties were not at all times loyal to the Federal Government. The committee turned that claim down, and I notified the people interested that the claim would not go on the bill and would not be passed by this House because of the court's finding in regard to the loyalty of the claimants.

Now, we should have some certain rule, otherwise it would put some of us in a false attitude. Having these considerations in mind is the reason why I voted against the Underwood amendment the other day. I have great confidence in the judgment of the committee, and feel that the committee should have

considered all these claims and passed upon them carefully, and that after that was done we ought to let the matter rest at that, and let every claim come before the committee and receive a report from the committee, and not add to the bill by ill-considered amendments on the floor of the House. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to suspend the rules, discharge the Committee of the Whole, and pass this bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds voting in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. LLOYD rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] will be recognized.

#### LIMIT OF DEPOSITS IN POSTAL SAVINGS SYSTEM.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House bill 7967, Union Calendar No. 40.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7967) to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, authorizing a postal savings system.

Be it enacted, etc., That such part of section 6 of the act approved June 25, 1910, authorizing a system of postal savings depositories, as provides that "no one shall be permitted to deposit more than \$100 in any one calendar month" is hereby repealed, and said act is further amended so as to repeal the proviso in section 7 thereof and insert in lieu of such proviso the following: "Provided, That no interest shall be paid on such part of the balance to the credit of any person as is in excess of \$1,000."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] demands a second.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] has 20.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I have but little to say upon this bill, because a few days ago, when we had under consideration here some other bills from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, Members of the House saw proper to discuss this bill most of the time rather than the bills that were then before the House. The Members of the House seemed to be interested in this question, and there has therefore been considerable discussion upon the pending bill.

It is a simple proposition, to raise the limit of the amount of money that can be deposited in any one month in the postal savings banks of the United States. Under the present laws deposits of \$100 and no more can be made by one person in one calendar month.

The second provision of the bill is that no interest shall be paid on such part of the balance to the credit of any one person as is in excess of \$1,000, repealing a section in the old bill.

It has been found in the administration of this service in the Post Office Department that the limit that has been placed upon deposits operated to the disadvantage of the promotion and utility of that service. There have been many instances where men desired to deposit \$500 or \$1,000, and in some instances as much as \$3,000, and because under the provisions of the law they could not do so they refused to deposit anything.

This institution has been running at a loss. The present total loss to the Government in the operation of the postal savings bank is about \$1,000,000. The department is of the opinion that if this limit is removed and deposits are permitted in greater sums monthly than are now permitted, the deposits will double in a short time. If that turns out to be true, then the interest that the Government is getting in excess of that which it has to pay upon the deposits will, to a very great extent, relieve this deficiency, which the Treasury now has to bear.

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

Mr. MOON. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, the savings deposits in the postal savings bank now amount to \$30,000,000 or \$33,000,000.

Mr. MOON. They are now a little over \$33,000,000, as I am advised.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think that a savings bank with deposits of that amount can not be conducted without a loss to the Government?

Mr. MOON. It has not been up to date.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think, if that is so, that doubling the deposits will enable the institution to be self-sustaining?



Mr. MOON. The view of the department is that if the limit is taken off the amount of deposits this institution will so flourish that after awhile it may be self-sustaining.

Mr. MANN. I never was in favor of a limit on the amount of deposits, but I will say to the gentleman that I do not quite see upon what theory you can conduct a business at a profit if it amounts to \$66,000,000 if it is conducted at a loss when it amounts to \$33,000,000.

Mr. MOON. You get the additional interest.

Mr. MANN. But you have an additional expense.

Mr. MOON. Not necessarily an additional expense, or very little. If you are getting a profit of one-half of 1 per cent on \$33,000,000, surely your profit will be greater on \$66,000,000. Of course it necessarily follows that in the administration there must be some additional expense, but it would not be proportionate to the gain.

Mr. MANN. If you really get a difference of one-half of 1 per cent on \$33,000,000, I do not see how it is possible for the Government to conduct this business at a loss.

Mr. MOON. It seems very clear to me that the more money on which you draw interest the greater profit you will get from it. A bank doing a business of \$1,000,000 will make more profit than a bank doing a business of \$500,000 with the same force of men.

Mr. MANN. If it was losing money on \$33,000,000, the ordinary bank would lose much more on double the amount.

Mr. MOON. I will state to the gentleman from Illinois that this institution could not have lasted 24 hours if the Government of the United States had not been behind it. A common bank could not have lasted under such conditions.

I want to remind the gentleman, too, that so far as this whole system is concerned there are many of us who have been opposed to it altogether, and there are many who think it ought to be abolished; but that view was not maintained by the Congress. The Congress established this bank, and now all legislation that can be enacted to enable the trustees who are administering this fund to run the institution in such a way as to make it self-sustaining ought to be passed. This is one of the provisions—

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. In a moment. This is one of the provisions that the department believes will be of great advantage to it and will ultimately recoup what has been lost. It may not make the institution self-sustaining, but it will make it more nearly so than it has been heretofore.

Mr. GARNER. I should like to get the gentleman's viewpoint with reference to each branch of the post office being self-sustaining—whether or not he thinks that each branch of the department ought to pay its own way?

Mr. MOON. Of course it is impossible for each branch of the postal system to pay its own way. If it pays its way as a whole, it does well.

Mr. GARNER. Does not the gentleman think that the banking business of the Post Office Department ought to pay its own expenses? Does the gentleman think the people ought to be taxed so that the Government may go into the banking business?

Mr. MOON. I will say to the gentleman that this institution has been, until covered by a recent order, an independent department under the control of the Postmaster General. It is not properly a part of the postal service of the United States. As the House will recollect, the bill was a measure that was passed really for the purpose of gathering in funds which could not or would not be placed in the common banks of the country by foreigners and others. The Post Office Department could be administered, as it has always been administered, without connection with the postal savings bank. The department had to adopt some instrumentalities to carry out the postal savings bank when imposed on it.

Mr. GARNER. I would like to ask whether or not it is the view of the gentleman from Tennessee that the department should conduct a banking business or any other kind of a business at a loss to the people? Does he think that one set of taxpayers should contribute to help run the business of another set of taxpayers?

Mr. MOON. I will answer the gentleman candidly. I do not think this institution ought to have been established. But that is not the question; it is not the view I entertain or you entertain on this question now under consideration. The Congress that had the power and jurisdiction had another view, and it believed that it was wise to establish a postal savings system. It has been done; it has been operating obedient to law and losses have occurred; and now it seems to me that it is the part of wisdom to pass all laws that may be possible in

connection with the system that will sustain and uphold it and make it profitable.

Mr. GARNER. And this is one step in that direction?

Mr. MOON. This is one step in that direction. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have here a statement furnished by the Third Assistant Postmaster General that gives a good many facts in reference to this service, and the views of the department, and affords reasons why this legislation should be passed. If there be no objection, I will ask the Clerk to read certain parts of it, and then I will place the whole of it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read such portions as are indicated by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read portions of the paper, which is as follows:

The office of the Third Assistant Postmaster General furnishes the following statement to accompany the report on the bill:

"The postal savings service in this country was largely experimental at the outset, so Congress, moving cautiously, placed the above referred to restrictions on deposits. Experience has demonstrated that these restrictions have seriously interfered with the purpose of the service. It was thought by many that heavy withdrawals from solvent banks would follow the installation of postal savings. The thought of the framers of the postal savings act on this point is reflected in the following excerpt from the report on it by the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"It is the intention to make the rate of interest so low and so to restrict the maximum amount to be received from any one depositor that there will be no incentive to patronize the postal savings bank at the expense of private establishments."

"On June 30, 1913, the postal savings service had standing to the credit of depositors \$33,818,870, and \$2,389,120 of postal savings deposits had been converted into Government bonds, making \$36,207,990 for which the Government is accountable to the public. The files of the Post Office Department show conclusively that this money represents chiefly the hidden savings of timid wage earners, who have implicit confidence in the Government and who will not patronize private savings institutions. It is money that was lost to commercial activities until brought into light and business availability through postal savings. So the fear that the service would occasion heavy withdrawals from the banks has proved utterly unfounded. On the other hand, more than 7,000 banks now hold in excess of \$30,000,000 of postal savings funds—money which would otherwise have been beyond their reach. The sources of postal savings deposits have been so clearly demonstrated that the bankers now freely admit that the service has been a positive advantage to them and to the business public."

"From the very inception of the service postmasters and private citizens have complained to the Post Office Department of serious embarrassments that have resulted from the limitations on deposits, and these complaints, which may now be numbered among the thousands, show clearly that the handicap on the service was not temporary but is continuous."

"There are no figures available in the Post Office Department that show with certainty how much money has been rejected on account of the restrictions on deposits, but from the best information obtainable the department is convinced that more money has been turned away and thus driven back into hiding and disuse than it has been possible to accept. But aside from this enormous amount that has been actually lost to trade another serious feature is the disheartening effect the limitations have had on our foreign-born citizens, who are the most liberal patrons of the service and who can not understand why the Government will safeguard a portion of their savings and not all of them. Their disappointment often amounts to a secret resentment which makes itself felt among others of their countrymen, thus defeating in a measure the very purpose of the service, namely, to encourage thrift and economy among our people."

"Under the postal-savings act funds accepted from the public must be deposited in qualified banks in the city or locality where they originate, and any solvent bank under National or State supervision may qualify, by furnishing the required security, to receive its proportion of the funds. Therefore every additional dollar of secreted money that may be accepted, if the bill under consideration becomes a law, will be made available for business needs in the very field from which it was withdrawn."

"On June 30, 1913, 13,265 persons had maximum accounts aggregating \$6,632,500, or one-fifth of all the deposits in the postal-savings system. A very large percentage of these depositors are unwilling to purchase Government bonds. They simply want to continue adding to their savings, but the \$500 limitation has practically closed the doors of the post office in their faces. The testimony of postmasters is almost unanimous on the point that if foreigners tender larger amounts than can be accepted they usually refuse to open accounts at all. In instances of rejection they frequently go to the money-order window and purchase foreign orders."

"Following are a few excerpts from recent letters from postmasters illustrative of the serious handicap on the service which the present limitations on deposits occasion. The files of the Post Office Department contain hundreds of communications reporting similar incidents:

"NEWARK, N. J., November 20, 1913.

"To-day a French lady deposited \$20, thus completing the \$500 limit. She had a large roll of bills, representing hers and her husband's savings, which she hid away on her person, remarking that they had lost money in banks on several occasions and would not trust them again. She requested to be notified whenever the limit on deposits was removed. Did not care to buy postal-savings bonds, as might some day need the money at short notice. The suggestion was made that her husband open an account, and she left, with the promise to talk the matter over with her husband."

"CLEVELAND, OHIO, November 29, 1913.

"The need of this (removal of restrictions on deposits) is shown by the fact that from September, 1911, to April, 1913, inclusive, over \$182,000 was refused at the main office alone because of the monthly limit of \$100, and during the past six weeks about \$9,000 had to be refused. At one station alone this sum amounted to \$5,000."

"FLINT, MICH., December 3, 1913.

"I was very much impressed with this incident to-day: A foreigner, an Austrian, sold some property for which he received a check for \$700. He lost no time in getting it cashed and brought the money to

the post office for deposit. Of course, we could not accept it, and explained as well as we could that he could only deposit \$100. He seemed to be in a quandry and lingered in the lobby awhile, finally shook his head, and departed. In the afternoon he returned, deposited \$100 and bought \$600 in money orders for Austria and sent it there. He made us understand that he did not consider it safe to have so much money in his house, and it cost him \$6 to send it home for safekeeping."

"JOHNSON CITY, TENN., December 9, 1913.

"I strongly recommend the removal of the statutory restriction on the amount of deposits as it now is. This restriction has greatly handicapped the increase of deposits at this office. I have in mind half a dozen or more cases where the applicant refused to make any deposit at all for the reason that he could not deposit all his savings at one time. One party desired to deposit \$300, another had \$500 to deposit, and another had \$1,300. Neither of these applicants deposited anything and we have had other similar cases."

"BURTON, KANS., December 4, 1913.

"I am badly handicapped because of the limit of \$100 per month and a total limit of \$500 to each depositor, and can cite you to one party in particular that wished to deposit \$4,000, and when he found out that there was a limit he made no deposit, and stated that he would not trust it to any other bank either. I have had several cases where people wished to deposit more than the limit, and because they could not deposit all their money refused to have anything to do with it."

"WILKES-BARRE, PA., December 5, 1913.

"Since the establishment of the postal-savings system, this office has been compelled to refuse more than 25 deposits ranging from \$500 to \$1,000 in each instance, and about the same number ranging in amounts from \$200 to \$500. If we were not handicapped by the restrictions to which I have alluded, the postal savings of the office would now be near the \$50,000 mark instead of hovering around \$13,000. Fully 90 per cent of the Wilkes-Barre depositors come from the foreign-speaking element, and every time a large deposit is refused the would-be patron goes away with a poor impression of the Government's banking system. I feel that if the restrictions were removed the postal-savings business would be a big success at this office. I wish to add that we do not receive our deposits from those who are accustomed to carrying deposits in the local banks, but from a class of people who, not being acquainted with the excellency of our financial institutions, do not care to trust them and keep their money in some hidden recess of their own homes. They are accustomed to Government savings banks that receive unlimited amounts in their native countries, and look with caution on such an institution in this country that will receive only a limited amount. The day upon which your letter reached me the postal-savings clerk had to turn away a depositor with \$500, and a few days previous one was turned away with \$1,000. These are some of the discouraging features that dampen our enthusiasm when we endeavor to increase our deposits."

"SAYRE, PA., December 5, 1913.

"We have had two instances where deposits were not made because we could not accept \$1,000, and it would seem that the general growth of this department would be hampered so long as the limit remains where it is now. Why should one man not be allowed to deposit \$1,000 as well as 10 men \$100 each? Why should the man who lacks faith in banks and who has saved \$400 be allowed the protection of the Government any more than the man who has accumulated \$700 in the same length of time?"

"FLORENCE, ALA., December 6, 1913.

"I think the Postal Savings System would be improved if the restriction on the amount of postal savings deposits that may be accepted from one depositor could be removed. At this office we have had several persons who desired to deposit more than \$100 per month and also more than \$500 in total."

"SAN ANTONIO, TEX., December 3, 1913.

"In regard to making suggestions for the betterment of the postal savings bank, would suggest that the limit of deposits be raised. During the month of November two depositors wished to deposit \$500 each and another wished to deposit \$2,000. In my estimation, the postal savings bank is a much safer depository than cracks and crevices, where mice and cockroaches may nibble the savings of a workman. In many cases the money deposited at this office has been badly mutilated in this manner."

"VERSAILLES, KY., December 4, 1913.

"I had a case last month when a lady had several hundred dollars she wanted to deposit for her children and wanted to know if she could deposit it all at one time, and after talking and explaining the matter to her she concluded to deposit the \$100 and deposit the other later; and I had a similar case last year of a lady who wanted to deposit several hundred dollars, and she said unless she could deposit all she would not deposit any."

"GOODING, IDAHO, December 4, 1913.

"During the two and a half years we have operated the system at this office I would judge that I have turned away as much money as has been actually deposited, because we could not accept more than \$100 in any one month and the total limit of any one person was \$500. I have had during this time a dozen or so different persons ask to deposit all the way from two or three hundred to as much as two thousand at one time. After a time the public came to understand that the limits were \$100 in any one month and a total of \$500 to any one person, and from that time the interest in the Postal Savings System seemed to fall off in this community."

"PROVIDENCE, R. I., December 4, 1913.

"In regard to the statutory restriction as to the amount which any one person may deposit, there is no question but the present limit has been a great hindrance to the growth of the postal savings system. Many people are turned away every month on account of the restriction, and many will not bother with the postal savings bank on account

of the small limit, and many have expressed great disappointment in the system. A good many have had a few hundred dollars, and in one or two instances several thousand dollars, which they desired to deposit, but would not deposit in the postal savings bank as they desired all their money in one place. In several cases when additional deposits were refused on account of the restrictions the depositors have become very angry and withdrawn what they had already put in—in two instances the depositors stated that they wanted their money in a "real bank," and many have made unfavorable comments on the system when their deposits have been refused. There have been many opportunities to receive \$500 at a deposit, and even as high as \$2,000, and when these deposits were refused the prospective depositors declined to open any account. In the case of the depository recently established at contract station No. 10 of this office, it is believed that many thousand dollars will have to be refused during the year on account of the limited restrictions. The plan of increasing their deposits by the purchase of bonds does not appeal to the majority of the foreign depositors. A very large amount of money is sent out of Providence every year by foreign money orders and through the foreign agents of the different classes of foreigners in this country, which might be held in this country if these foreigners were permitted to deposit their entire savings in a Government bank."

"VICTOR, N. Y., December 6, 1913.

"I certainly believe that this restriction should be taken off, so that a depositor could put in any amount he desired at any time. For not being allowed to do so the growth of the service is handicapped and the very object of the system is practically defeated. Now, for instance, only yesterday this matter came up and we were obliged to turn away a would-be depositor. He came into the office and wanted to deposit \$600, and when informed that we could not accept this amount he insisted, saying that he did not feel safe in putting it in any other bank. We tried to induce him to open an account and we would do the best we could for him, but he would not do this unless we would accept the whole amount, consequently we lost the business."

"CONCORDIA, KANS., December 4, 1913.

"Several of our depositors reached the \$500 limit some months ago and would gladly have continued to deposit had it been allowed—in fact, one has been purchasing money orders as an investment with the money which we could not receive in the postal savings department. Only a few days ago a lady, whose husband was recently killed in the railroad yards at this place, asked permission to make a deposit, but would not do so when we were obliged to decline to accept an opening deposit of \$1,000."

"LITTLE ROCK, ARK., December 2, 1913.

"It seems to me that the postal-savings service is seriously handicapped by not being permitted to receive larger deposits. This office has on a number of occasions been forced to refuse deposits on money from \$1,000 to \$7,000."

"BUTTE, MONT., November 22, 1913.

"It is a conservative estimate when I say that during the first 60 days upon the opening of the postal savings bank at this office that we turned down or refused deposits in the aggregate of \$150,000, due to the restrictions of the amount that a person could deposit at one time or in one month, and at the present time there are many inquiries as to the possibility of those restrictions being removed, which, in my judgment, would not only be a step in the right direction, but one that would be most popular with the laboring class of people. Had there been no restriction as to the amount that a person could deposit, since the opening of the Butte postal savings bank, instead of \$410,595 on deposit in this bank at the present time, there would be at least \$2,000,000."

"LEADVILLE, COLO., October 20, 1913.

"Do away with the limit of deposit as soon as possible, as it injures all and helps no one. The depositor who has \$500 in quits because he must. While he waits till he can apply for a bond he grows indifferent, his interest dies out, he doesn't care, his habits change for the worse."

"LOUISVILLE, KY., November 8, 1913.

"An Italian woman, who had fallen heir to \$5,000, offered the entire amount for deposit in the postal savings bank, but on account of the limitation did not open an account. On the 6th instant a man offered \$300 and did not open an account because he could not deposit it all."

"NEW BRITAIN, CONN., November 8, 1913.

"We have had several persons make application to deposit in excess of \$100 at one time. We recently had a patron who had \$200 which he wished to deposit for safekeeping, but he could deposit but \$100. The balance he kept at his home and a few days later his son stole the amount and disappeared. It is also an occasional happening that foreign-born residents in this city receive money from Europe which they wish to deposit."

"ELWOOD, IND., November 12, 1913.

"As stated above, our present deposits in this office are about \$20,000. It could have been \$50,000 if it had not been for the limit monthly. To illustrate, within the past three weeks there have been at least eight people desiring to make large deposits. An old gentleman and his wife came to me with \$1,100, and wanted to deposit it all. They were afraid to keep it at home. Yesterday a man wanted to deposit \$400 to secure bonds in December, and we couldn't take it. Another man last week with \$600. We have a foreign population of about 500 in this city, and while some of them are depositing in the post office those having large amounts are compelled to secure drafts and place the money in New York banks conducted by Greeks or Italians."

"MONTE VISTA, COLO., November 11, 1913.

"We had one instance where it lost us a deposit of \$800 by one of the inmates of the soldiers' home. We explained to him that we could take \$100 from him each month and that then he could purchase a bond for \$500, and eventually would be able to have it all cared for. His remark was that that was too much red tape; that he wanted Uncle Sam to be his banker, but not with all that trouble to make the deposit."



## "COAL CITY, ILL., November 11, 1913.

"Several of our citizens, especially the foreign born, desired to deposit more than the statutory limit. Three Italians at different times desired to make deposits—one was for \$1,500, second for \$1,300, and the third \$1,000, and several others from \$300 to \$500—but was prohibited from accepting by the statutory limit."

## "JOLIET, ILL., November 15, 1913.

"This morning a foreigner wished to open an account with \$400. Upon being informed that we could accept but \$100 during a month he asked to be allowed to leave \$200, and as we were unable to accommodate him in this request he purchased foreign money orders amounting to \$400."

## "ST. PAUL, MINN., November 18, 1913.

"At the St. Paul post office we had many applications from widows who desire to deposit their insurance money, ranging all the way from \$300 to \$2,000. Many others make application to deposit their savings, which are in hiding, running all the way from \$300 to \$1,000 or more. There is no doubt that the deposits would greatly increase in this office if the limitation were removed, as it ought to be to conform to the Canadian limitations."

## "NILES, MICH., November 18, 1913.

"I have in mind two cases where this limitation worked a hardship on the depositor and on the bank. A citizen of this place had, for safe-keeping, invested \$700 in money orders. These he afterwards turned in for a Treasury warrant, and he wanted to deposit the amount in our bank. We could only take \$100, but to deposit that amount he would have had to cash the warrant for \$700 and would have had \$600 in cash on his hands—just what he wanted to avoid."

## "BOSTON, MASS., November 14, 1913.

"If the limitation were removed or the maximum increased considerably, with no monthly restriction, experience causes me to believe that amounts of considerable magnitude which are being sent to Italy for deposit with that postal administration would be intrusted to the domestic service."

## "SALEM, MASS., November 17, 1913.

"An Italian desired to open a postal savings account and deposit \$900. \* \* \* This is only 1 of some 15 or more instances where this office has had to refuse deposits in excess of the limitations."

## "COLQUET, MINN., November 15, 1913.

"Men in this part of the State of Minnesota who work all winter in the woods and return to town in the spring wish to leave their whole winter's earnings and return to the log drive. Have known of an incidence where a larger amount was refused at our office, and the individual lost same on a drunk and had to draw out to get him out of trouble. It is hard to build up a business when one is compelled to turn men away who are willing to give you business."

## "KANSAS CITY, MO., November 13, 1913.

"Will say that about 10 per cent of our depositors tender as an initial deposit an amount in excess of \$100. At least 50 per cent of this number refused to make any deposit at all. Our tellers say that an average of three would-be depositors a day go away with from three to five hundred dollars, for the reason that they refuse to make two, three, or four trips to the post office, entailing loss of time, street-car fare, and other inconvenience. Yesterday a cook tendered \$360. He said he was afraid of the banks, so left \$100, and the other \$260 will be carried around on his person until he is allowed to deposit. The day before a colored laundress offered \$400 for deposit. She left \$100, and no doubt will put the balance in hiding. A day or two before this a man pushed \$500 in the teller's window. When \$400 was given back to him with the explanation of the law, he became angry and demanded the other \$100. These cases are typical of what is occurring daily."

## "DUBOIS, PA., August 20, 1913.

"During the second month of operation we were offered nearly \$20,000 in excess of the amount that we could accept, and it has been a frequent occurrence ever since. In the past month we have been offered over \$5,000 by foreigners that could not be accepted on account of this provision."

## "SHELBYVILLE, KY., August 21, 1913.

"Mr. Crapster (clerk in charge) tells me that the greatest drawback to the postal savings here is that no one is allowed to deposit more than \$100 per month. He has had a good many persons come to him to deposit from \$200 to \$1,500 at one time. One hundred dollars being the limit per month, they declined to make a deposit, saying it would take too long to get their money on deposit."

## "CHATTANOOGA, TENN., August 29, 1913.

"From the experience of this office, I feel sure that if the postal savings regulation could be so amended as to increase the limit on deposits from \$100 to \$500 a month, we could reasonably expect our deposits to be doubled."

## "PORTLAND, OREG., August 22, 1913.

"We have now over 6,000 depositors, of whom about 350 have reached the \$500 limit and according to the law as it now stands are not permitted to make further deposits, although many of them have bitterly complained at this restriction. We do not doubt but that everyone who has reached the \$500 limit would increase his deposits were he permitted to do so. Some individual customers have brought as high as \$4,500 to deposit and many have brought from \$1,000 to \$2,000. Many foreigners who find that it takes five months to get \$500 into the postal savings bank make an initial deposit of \$100 and buy international money orders, shipping the balance out of this country. Yet at the same time a great many short-sighted bankers are opposed to the postal savings."

## "COHOCTON, N. Y., November 21, 1913.

"I have a depositor now that is putting in \$100 each month and would like to deposit about \$1,500. This is money that she received for property sold, and she will not deposit it in any except a postal savings bank, and this also is in hiding and out of circulation, and I can see no good reason why these restrictions should be placed on depositors."

## "CAMDEN, N. J., November 24, 1913.

"The \$100 monthly and \$500 total limit is without doubt one of the greatest handicaps the bank has to contend with. Among the many instances illustrative of its inadequacy was a Norwegian who came from one of the country villages about 15 miles from here to deposit \$2,100. When informed we could receive but \$100, he refused to open an account. Many other examples could be cited ranging from \$250 to \$6,000."

## "CLINTON, OKLA., November 18, 1913.

"I think the service would be more satisfactory to the public if restrictions as to amounts that may be deposited were removed. A patron just recently tendered \$600 to this office, and because we could only accept \$100 he refused to make any deposit."

## "BUFFALO, N. Y., November 25, 1913.

"A serious handicap to the growth of that branch of the service is the statutory restriction on the amount of postal savings deposits that may be accepted from one depositor—\$100 in a calendar month and \$500 in all. There is a large foreign-born population in this city, and, I have no doubt, there is a large amount of money hidden away in homes that would now be in circulation if the restrictions were in a measure removed. Very frequently large amounts are offered here for deposit, and, when the matter is explained, they occasionally make the \$100 deposit; more frequently they leave the office without making any deposit. They can not understand why the Government should encourage thrift up to a certain limit only and then refuse to accept deposits beyond that amount."

## "ANADARKO, OKLA., November 26, 1913.

"I beg to state that this office has been sadly handicapped during the past six months owing to the restriction on amount of deposit. I now recall the following applications to deposit larger amounts: One of \$3,000, one of \$2,000, one of \$2,500, one just this morning of \$350, the would-be depositor stating that he would probably have \$600 or \$800 per month to deposit. The above applications are probably due in part to the failure of one of the leading banks of the city."

## "NEW YORK, N. Y., October 4, 1913.

"Mr. JOSEPH ELLIOTT, Jr.,  
"Superintendent Money Order Service."

"The Italians are a peculiar people, in so far as money is concerned. They hoard it until they accumulate a large sum and then they buy international money orders with it, payable to the Cassiere Centrale Mo Poste e Telegraf, Roma, Italy. They generally come to this office on rainy days, when they are idle. Of course they do not all come here, because, as previously stated, the east side bankers get a good deal of their money on account of their attractive fees. A goodly number of them deposit up to the limit, namely, \$100 per month; but most of them come here with wads of bills, stuffed in their bosoms, containing from \$500 to \$3,000, to send to that bank to be placed to their credit. About three months ago two Italians came to this office with a bundle of bills of various denominations, amounting to \$3,600, which they wanted to send to the savings bank in Rome. The bills were so soiled and faded that the cashier thought some of them were counterfeits, but on close inspection were found to be genuine. The men were asked how the bills became so faded and dead looking; they replied that they had kept them buried in the ground. On another occasion a man with domestic money orders amounting to several hundred dollars wanted to cash them and to deposit their total in our postal savings depository. He was told that we could only take \$100 in any one calendar month, and that the limit was \$500. He said it was his practice to save up until he got \$50 and then bought a money order for this amount. He had quite a number of them, and, as he wanted to deposit the whole amount, he sent it to the savings bank at Rome."

## "NEW RICHMOND, WIS., November 27, 1913.

"The limit of \$100 deposits in a calendar month and \$500 in all should be by all means removed. We can see no good or useful purpose served by the restrictions, and it has on several occasions prevented us from accepting deposits of larger sums that have been offered. Not long since a prospective depositor wanted to start an account with \$1,200. He was informed of the regulations. It was also suggested that he might open separate accounts in the names of his children or relatives, but it turned out that he was a single man and he had no near relatives in this country. He took the money away, and it was his intention, so he stated, to buy a draft and send the money to Norway, to be banked in his native town."

"The postal savings system is a balance wheel in times of financial disturbances and can be made a much more effective agency in this respect by removing the restrictions now placed on deposits. A few illustrations on the point follow:

"On July 31 postal savings deposits at Youngstown, Ohio, were \$13,556. The average monthly receipts for the preceding three months had been less than \$800. On August 5 the receipts for the day jumped to \$3,526, and in the nine days ending August 15 they were \$11,958, as compared with a little over \$13,000 taken in during the preceding two years. This sudden increase was due to a two days' run on the local bank. The following is from the postmaster's letter dated August 8:

"These foreigners brought from \$100 to \$1,400 each for postal savings, and when told they could deposit but \$100 in any one month they, some of them, bought money orders on foreign countries, in amount \$10,000, in three days. \* \* \* We turned away close to \$30,000 in real cash because of postal savings rules on deposits."

"Ironwood, Mich., with about 12,000 population, was made a savings depository in May, 1911. A bank failure occurred there in June, 1912. The postal savings at Ironwood now aggregate nearly \$150,000, a larger amount than many cities accumulate of ten times the population."

"On October 20, 1913, a bank failed at Lowell, Mass., and during the month there was a net gain in deposits of \$3,373, and in November there was a net gain of \$14,749, as against a gain of \$163 in September. The postmaster wrote under date of November 17:

"In two days we have had one Italian with \$900, one Greek with \$150, one Canadian with \$300, one Greek with \$200, and one Greek with \$1,400, all for deposit. It is estimated that at least \$50,000 has been refused for deposit in this office since October 21 on account of the restrictions covering monthly deposits."

"On June 30 postal savings deposits at McKeesport, Pa., were \$12,402. On July 7 a bank in that city was closed temporarily on account of its close affiliation with a Pittsburgh bank which failed that day. The amount on deposit at the end of July was \$20,398; August, \$29,145; September, \$36,705; October, \$43,248."

"The First-Second National Bank of Pittsburgh, Pa., was closed on July 7, 1913. The postal savings receipts for the week beginning on the day of the failure were \$19,624, a larger sum than had been deposited in an entire month. The postmaster, in commenting on the situation July 17, said:

"Very many of the depositors wanted to leave large sums, ranging from \$1,000 to \$9,000. Some persons who came to the office when they learned that only \$100 could be accepted did not open an account. While no record was kept of the amount offered and refused, there is no doubt but what the aggregate was in excess of \$100,000."

"He again wrote the Post Office Department on November 26, in part as follows:

"I beg to report that the postal saving system in Pittsburgh is no longer an experiment, nor is it neglected by either the people or this office. From the date of its organization here on September 9, 1911, to July 5, 1913, the total deposits were \$134,271. Yesterday the total was \$140,310, a gain of \$266,039 from July 5 to November 25."

"This increase began with the closing of the First-Second National Bank. The large amount of local advertising given the postal savings system in connection with this closing brought as patrons many persons in no way connected with the First-Second National Bank, many of them who had never before had a deposit."

"If the limit of deposit was taken off, this office would have \$2,000,000 on deposit in six months. Every day sums in excess of \$100 are offered, and almost every day patrons who have reached the maximum for one month attempt to make additional deposits. To-day three persons tried to deposit \$500 each. One of them was induced to open an account at \$100, the other two would not deposit anything when not permitted to deposit all of it. Yesterday a woman appeared with \$2,000, and it was with difficulty that she was induced to take it away with her. These are daily occurrences."

"A run on the United States Trust Co. in Washington, D. C., began about noon on November 21. The newspapers next morning announced that the company had been taken over by the Munsey Trust Co. and that full protection to depositors was insured. The run continued, however, until noon, the closing hour. During the six days prior to the run 30 postal savings accounts were opened in the Washington post office and \$3,413 was received. In five days after the run 147 accounts were opened and \$15,650 was received, and during this period \$24,261 was rejected on account of the monthly limitation."

"The panic-stricken depositor who withdraws his savings from a bank and entrusts them with the postmaster does not thereby deprive the business public of the use of his money when it may be needed most, as it is immediately turned over to the local banks—frequently to the very bank from which it was hastily withdrawn. An alarmed public can not be prevented from making withdrawals, and the more latitude the Post Office Department has in accepting their funds the more effective service it can render in averting financial stringencies."

Mr. MOON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I was not one of those who was enthusiastically in favor of the bill when it originally became a law, but as the chairman of this important committee has well said that it is now a part of the postal system of this country and if it requires legislation now to make it self-sustaining, I am in favor of that legislation. There is no question on earth but that down to this good hour the system has been run at a loss; that is to say, at a loss as a banker would run his banking business, as a banker would balance his books every night. But you must take into consideration the fact that a system of this kind has been of advantage to the country in bringing more money into circulation, and the fact that there is no way on earth whereby you can get at all the benefits that come as a result of this legislation.

It strikes me, Mr. Speaker, that there is a way out of it to make this business self-sustaining. If I remember, the law creating the postal savings bank system provides that the banks should pay not less than 2½ per cent interest on the deposits. Now, I know of no good reason on earth why bankers should not pay at least 3 per cent on these deposits. I endeavored to ascertain from the Post Office Department what effect it would have on the balance of profit and loss in the event that the Government had charged 3 per cent instead of 2½ per cent, and I was unable to get these figures.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. COX. With pleasure.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman is right, the rate of interest is 2½ per cent.

Mr. COX. Under the present law?

Mr. MOON. Under the present law. The trustees managing this institution have a right to increase the rate of interest above 2½ per cent. That department is contemplating, as I am advised a possible increase of the rate of interest as one of the means by which to remove this deficit along this line, but the situation is such in reference to this matter that it is not deemed advisable to press the department by any legislation to

order this rate of interest increased. A readjustment of this system is going on, and probably it is not wise for Congress to undertake to legislate in regard to it now.

Mr. COX. I quite agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield for a question?

Mr. COX. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. If I understand the chairman, his intimation was as to what the department was doing; that it was undertaking to make the business self-sustaining.

Mr. MOON. Self-sustaining.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee has well said that under the original act establishing the postal savings-bank system the authorities have power to increase the rate of interest. I quite agree with him as to the wisdom of Congress at this time not undertaking to compel the department to increase the rate of interest. But, Mr. Speaker, trust companies all over the United States are to-day paying 3 per cent interest on daily deposits, checking accounts; and so forth, and why should not the bankers pay 3 per cent interest on this?

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Did the gentleman state that banks were paying 3 per cent interest on checking deposits?

Mr. COX. I said the trust companies.

Mr. MADDEN. On checking accounts the average rate of interest paid is 2 per cent on all above \$1,000, and if you have less than \$200 they charge you \$1 a month for keeping the account.

Mr. COX. I will say to the gentleman that I never did any business with a trust company. They advertise that they are paying 3 per cent interest on daily checking balances. As I said a moment ago, no hardship is placed on the bank, because practically all of them already have on deposit the character of bonds which the Postal Department exacts in order that they may secure postal-savings deposits, and I believe if the Postal Department would require a 3 per cent interest we would soon see a return sufficient to make this institution a paying institution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Chair to notify me when I have occupied 10 minutes.

In no country where the postal savings system is inaugurated were such restrictions placed on the system as under our existing law. As the letter just read to the House containing an excerpt from the report of the Senate committee confirms, it was the manifest purpose to discourage the deposit of savings funds in these postal savings banks. In no other country is so low a rate of interest as 2 per cent paid to postal savings bank depositors. It is to the shame of this Government that we pay the lowest interest rate to these poor depositors who avail themselves of these depositories because of lack of faith in our existing banking institutions. Even Italy pays more. France and Great Britain pay 2½ per cent and Canada pays 3 per cent. Not only was this system discouraged with the low rate of interest paid on these deposits, but it was wet-blanketed in the restriction as to the amount that depositors could put into the banks, not to exceed \$100 in any one calendar month and not to exceed \$500 at any one time. The purpose of this bill is to lift that restriction as to the amount of deposits, enabling anyone to deposit as much as he desires, with deposits in excess of \$1,000 drawing no interest whatsoever. There were few in the Post Office Committee when this system was originally inaugurated who favored the very amendment we have under consideration to-day. For my part I can not understand why we should withhold the payment of interest on deposits in excess of \$1,000. If it is proper to pay interest at all, what argument can we advance against paying it on the entire deposit? It is true that in some countries a limit is placed on the amount on which interest will be paid, but in Canada, where the amount is \$3,000, the average deposits run up to as high as \$200 per depositor, whereas in this country the average deposit is only \$102.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman tell us how the interest is allowed? Does the money have to remain any length of time before it begins to draw interest?

Mr. STAFFORD. In this country, as in very few others, we allow interest provided only that the deposit has remained a full year, and more than one-half of all of the accounts in the postal savings bank are withdrawn during the course of the year. In this past fiscal year there were \$41,000,000 of deposits



and \$28,000,000 were withdrawn. And it has been the rule with these deposits that only one-half of them are left the full period to draw interest.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. That if a deposit has been in the hands of the Government for 11 months, no interest is paid on it at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. No interest is paid whatever; whereas, as the gentleman well knows, there are many instances of private savings banks where, if the deposits are on deposit for three months, the depositor receives interest. The usual rule is six months. But, seemingly, the Government does everything possible to discourage investment on funds of the poor in these safe depositories.

Considerable emphasis during the discussion has been laid on the expense of this system, that it does not pay; but if the department would exercise the discretion that it has under existing law and charge the banks the same rate of interest which the banks pay to the ordinary depositor for savings funds, it would in a short time equal and exceed the expenses of administration.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] says that at the rate of 3 per cent he is unable to ascertain how much more would result. I have here a computation that shows that there would be \$133,600 additional profit paid to the Government if the money were loaned at 3 per cent instead of 2½ per cent. One of the great faults with the existing system, which has led to these enormous expenditures, is that they have been established too recklessly. As I said the other day, they were established at every cross-road post office, so that among the 4,000 fourth-class post offices in the country designated as savings depositories there are 3,000 of them that have no deposits or deposits of only \$1. I direct the attention of the House to the report of the Postmaster General, House Document No. 359, just printed, and if you will turn to the record of the deposits in the various offices in the different States—North Carolina, Wisconsin, Iowa, and some others—you will find in nearly one-half the offices where postal-savings banks have been established that there are no deposits at all or in a large number there is a mere deposit of \$1. Now, it was never intended by the supporters of this proposed system that we should continue these offices at great expense where there was no business to warrant their establishment. The returns show that the expense last year chargeable directly to the establishment of this service was \$206,724. If these minor offices should be discontinued and the expense connected with the administration of those offices eliminated and a little additional interest paid on deposits by the banks, say, from 2½ to 3 per cent, there would be no question but what there would be a proper showing on the right side of the ledger account.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Was not a bill passed a few days ago proposing to discontinue the compensation to postmasters in these 4,000 fourth-class offices the gentleman describes?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman if he has any statistics as to what per cent of money deposited in savings banks is drawn out before they begin to draw interest as compared with the deposits in the postal savings banks.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, that you could not estimate definitely. For example, these figures that have been returned in this voluminous report of the Postmaster General show that the postal savings bank system has not been availed of to any great extent in those cities and communities where people have faith in existing savings institutions. The savings have increased largely in those centers of foreign population such as my home city, and Detroit, Indianapolis, and New York. In Philadelphia, where the first savings bank in the history of the Nation was established, in 1816, and where the people have had such firm confidence in the security of those institutions that they have not availed themselves of the postal savings bank system. In those old established institutions like the Philadelphia Savings Fund or the Western Savings Fund of Philadelphia, the people rarely withdraw their accounts until they can obtain the six months computation of interest.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Do the banks pay interest on these postal deposits? That is, after they are deposited in the postal savings bank then I understand they are put in local banks. Do they pay interest, and if so to what extent?

Mr. STAFFORD. The Government receives interest on the average yearly deposit at the rate of 2½ per cent. The law says the bank receiving these deposits shall pay not less than

2½ per cent, and the department has authority to charge a higher rate.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Has the Government paid out more interest on deposits than it has received from deposits in the bank?

Mr. STAFFORD. It has not; but the cost of administration has been greater than the interest received from the banks after deducting the interest paid the depositors. How much time have I used, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used 10 minutes exactly.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What are the principal additional costs of administration? The gentleman has referred to the cost of administration.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is an extra cost of administration occasioned by the clerical force; the administration of this branch of the service is placed at \$388,000—a very extravagant estimate. In the opinion of many of us we think it should be reduced nearly one-half. In conclusion, I wish to say this system is here to stay, and there is no reason why it should not be a paying institution. The department officials have stated they have in the department here a sufficient clerical force to handle twice the amounts of deposits without increasing that force.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Have we increased the clerical force on the average in the third-class post offices where this system has been in force?

Mr. STAFFORD. In third-class post offices there are no clerks—

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I beg the gentleman's pardon, I meant second class.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the second-class offices the clerks perform this work in conjunction with their other duties. Only in the larger first-class offices, like New York, Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, San Francisco, is additional clerical force occasioned by the establishment of this system. I now yield, Mr. Speaker, five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this law was primarily enacted not with the expectation of making a lot of money out of it but for the purpose of creating a higher spirit of patriotism in the American people. It was enacted for the purpose of taking money out of hiding and putting it into circulation. It was enacted to accommodate a class of people in our citizenship who were not in the habit of dealing with banks and who had confidence in the Government. It was enacted to obviate the possibility of loss to depositors in private banks that were not under legal control, as had been the case in many instances in every great State in the Union. I was one of the men who was enthusiastically for the law long before it was enacted, and while it was being enacted, and when it was enacted. I believed then, as I believe now, that it was one of the most beneficent pieces of legislation enacted by the Congress of the United States. I was one of the men who was opposed then to a limitation of the amount to be deposited in any one month or at any time, but a lot of other men did not agree with my opinion. They believed we ought to have a limit placed on the amount that any one man would deposit. They feared it might interfere with the banking system of the country. I had no such fear. It has been shown beyond any question of doubt that a good deal more money would be on deposit in the postal savings bank if there were no limit placed on the amount that could be deposited by any one person.

I congratulate the Postmaster General on the fact that he has discovered the means by which this institution can be popularized, and I am glad that he has recommended the lifting of the limit of the amount that can be placed on deposit. I believe the institution can not only be made self-sustaining, but that it can be made a profitable arm of the Government of the United States.

I believe when you encourage men that will not place their money on deposit in banks to deposit it with the Government of the United States you encourage them in thrift; that you encourage them in frugality; that you encourage them in the habit of saving and in the habit of investment; and when a man has deposited money for a time, who has never deposited before in one of these institutions, he learns the habit of dealing with money, and he learns to take that money from deposit in the postal savings bank and buy an American bond, and when he buys that bond he becomes a closer observer of how the Government of the United States is conducted. He becomes a better citizen, he becomes more patriotic, and he is an interested observer of events that take place in the Congress of the United States from day to day.

There can be no question about the advisability of the enactment of the bill proposed by this committee, and I feel quite sure that if the law which we propose be enacted, and the limit of the deposits be taken off, that within the next year we will not only have \$33,000,000 on deposit, but we will have \$75,000,000 and more on deposit, and the difference between the present deposits and the amount that I have named will come from the stockings and the bootlegs and the stovepipes, and other places of hiding in the United States and go into the circulation of the commercial life of the country, and thus aid in the increase of prosperity of our people.

You can not do too much to encourage the class of people that we are endeavoring to help by the enactment of such a law. I am glad, and I congratulate, as I said before, the Postmaster General on having recommended to the Congress the lifting of the limit of the amount that to-day can be deposited by any one individual in the postal savings banks of the Nation. Why, the mere fact of the existence of the postal savings bank is an insurance policy against danger in any community.

For example, in the case of the United States Trust Co. a few days ago, when we had a run, a great many of the people who drew their money from the United States Trust Co. offered to deposit it with the post-office authorities right here in Washington. What would have become of that if it had been deposited with the post-office authorities? It would have gone back into the commercial life of the Nation by being redeposited in the banks. So as a matter of fact, if people withdraw their money from the banks and place it with the Government, the Government can again redeposit that money with the banks and thus establish the condition that ought to have prevailed before the want of confidence arose that induced the people to draw their money from the banks. This bill will, without doubt, not only make for the certainty of the operation of this postal savings bank institution along lines that will not only prevent loss, but will just as certainly show in the next report of the Postmaster General a profit to the credit of the account of the postal savings bank under the direction of the Post Office Department. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Four minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to oppose the bill offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, but I do rise to state that when postal savings bank legislation was passed a few years ago I doubted at that time the wisdom of the legislation. Although I voted for it at the time, I did not believe then any large amount of money would be deposited in these banks, and time has demonstrated the fact that I was right. I do not believe that if you raise the limit the amount deposited in these banks will be increased to any great extent.

The foreigners, for instance, in the great cities whom you might say have deposited the bulk of the \$30,000,000 in these banks are not concerned as to whether or not it has been a losing proposition for this Government. I believe you have gotten in these banks now practically all the money you will get, no matter whether you raise the limit or not.

Then as to the contention that was made a few moments ago by my good friend from Indiana [Mr. Cox] that the way to make this business self-supporting is to increase the interest charge to the banks, let me say to you now and here, speaking as one who has had some experience in the banking business, that when you undertake to raise the interest to 3 per cent the banks of the country will not want the deposits. Just bear this in mind, that there is a big difference between your going into a bank as an individual and depositing \$10,000 and receiving 3 per cent interest on it and the Government depositing a like amount. The bank can well afford to pay you 3 per cent interest. It may be able to pay you 4 per cent interest. But when this Government deposits \$10,000 in a local bank, that bank must invest a like amount of money in 4 per cent bonds, or in bonds upon which it may realize 4 per cent interest, and put up such bonds as security for the Government deposit. So you can readily understand that when a bank is required to invest a like amount of money in 4 per cent bonds there is no profit in the transaction. In my judgment, whenever the department attempts to raise the rate of interest it will find no banks in the country, except those in the extreme West, will accept it.

Already there are banks which refuse to accept these deposits at 2½ per cent.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman acquainted with the fact that the average rate of interest on deposits in New York City is more than 3 per cent, something more nearly 4 per cent on the average?

Mr. ADAIR. That may be true; but they can take that money and loan it on real estate and realize 5 per cent or 6 per cent on it. But if you are required to take out of a bank a like amount and invest it in 4 per cent bonds, any man who can add 2 and 2 together can understand that there is no profit to the bank in accepting the deposit.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that this bill will materially increase the deposits in these banks. I did not believe at the time that there was any real necessity for these banks, and time has demonstrated, as I said before, that they have been a losing proposition. But I shall not oppose this bill. We have these banks. They are here, and they must be operated, whether they lose money to the Government or not, and I am perfectly willing that the limit shall be raised in order, if possible, that the banks may get enough business to be self-supporting. But you can rest assured they will never get it by raising the interest rate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. All time has expired, and the question is on the motion to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of this bill, to suspend the rules, and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

#### TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL BY AEROPLANES.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3393, to suspend the rules, and pass the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3393) to authorize the carrying of mail by aeroplane or by any other similar device.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for carrying the mail by aeroplane or by any other similar device when in his opinion the efficiency, dispatch, or general interest of the service will be promoted thereby, and when he deems it advisable may advertise for proposals therefor.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MANN. I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands a second.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois 20 minutes.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the recommendations made to Congress this year by the Postmaster General was one asking for an appropriation of \$50,000 to make a trial, or an experiment, in carrying mails by aeroplane service. I can assure the House that no more than that is expected this year and no more than that amount will be appropriated. I think I can promise that.

Of course, this is a service that will never become general in the conduct of the Post Office Department, but there are sections of this country where, in the opinion of many people who are well informed, such a service can be undertaken and thereby the efficiency of the Post Office Department added to, and first-class mail, at least, transported economically in the manner provided in this bill. There are arid sections of the country. It is also claimed that at certain seasons of the year the mails can be carried expeditiously and probably economically in parts of the Territory of Alaska in this way—not in all parts of that Territory, but in certain parts. There is, I believe, one case where from a point in the State of Idaho to a point in the State of Nevada mails are now transported by mule trains a distance of something like 700 miles, that being the shortest practicable trail, because of mountains, canyons, and obstructions of that character, whereas, as the crow flies the distance is only about 100 miles or a little more. In other words, instead of carrying the mail 700 miles by mule train, an aeroplane would make the trip in two hours and return the same day, giving both dispatch and return of mail.

As I stated before, it is not expected or intended that this service shall become general; but in a great country like this,



with a vast area such as the United States has, it is entirely within the bounds of reason to suppose, and it is a fact, that there are certain sections of the country where the star-route service is poor; service lacking in efficiency and economy. The purpose of this bill is to try out the aeroplane service in such localities. If it proves a failure, then no further steps will be taken in this respect; but if it is a success, then we will have an actual demonstration, we will have facts, we will have something on which to base our actions in the future.

While the United States was the pioneer in aeroplane development, while the Wright brothers were the first to fly a heavier-than-air machine, yet the United States is not keeping up with the progress of other nations. So far as I know, the French people are now ahead. They have made the greatest progress, and I believe a flight of 500 miles has been made across the widest part of the Mediterranean Sea. Not only that, but they are using the aeroplane service for transporting mails in the Desert of Sahara, which, as we all know, is an arid region like some sections we have in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is a short explanation of the bill, and I think we ought to try out this proposition. It will not be a waste of money. It will be money well spent. I hope that the bill will go through without opposition.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. FINLEY. Certainly.

Mr. HAMLIN. Do you provide also for parcel post by aeroplane?

Mr. FINLEY. That is not mentioned in the bill, but I take it the Postmaster General, in the exercise of his discretion, if he finds it feasible to carry small parcels, will include them.

Mr. HAMLIN. He would have to carry them up to 50 pounds weight, would he not?

Mr. FINLEY. No; not at all.

Mr. HAMLIN. Would it necessitate a special mail agent or clerk to go with the machine?

Mr. FINLEY. I think it would necessitate the employment of some one who was an expert in navigating the air.

Mr. HAMLIN. As a matter of fact the gentleman does not believe the scheme is at all feasible, does he?

Mr. FINLEY. Well, yes; in some localities I think it is. I have stated that the service will never be general; but in the arid regions, and in parts of Alaska, and in places like the one I have mentioned, where the distance traveled is now 700 miles and the air-line distance is only 100 miles, it may very well be tried; and there may be places in the State of Missouri. I do not know about that.

Mr. HAMLIN. In the place the gentleman speaks of there are not 700 people in the whole 700 miles, are there? Seriously speaking, if this law should be placed on the statute books, would we not simply fool away a whole lot of money for no good purpose?

Mr. FINLEY. I do not think so. I think this \$50,000 will be well spent, and I think the gentleman will change his mind if he will read the recommendation of the Postmaster General and the hearings before the Post Office Committee.

Mr. HAMLIN. Of course, I can understand that the Post Office Department would like the authority to do all these things and to try all these experiments, but I think my opinion is not far different from that of the gentleman when I say I believe it would be an expenditure of a good deal of money for no real benefit.

Mr. FINLEY. That same argument has been made in every instance where a new departure has been made in the postal service.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINLEY. With pleasure.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman from South Carolina is an expert in aerial transportation, and I want to ask the gentleman if there are any places now where the mails are being carried by aeroplanes?

Mr. FINLEY. The French have a partial service, not a complete one, in some sections in the dominion of France.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Can the gentleman state what the service is and between what places?

Mr. FINLEY. In the Desert of Sahara, North Africa. I do not think the service is complete, but mail is carried by aeroplane.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. It is safer than by camel?

Mr. FINLEY. I would not pass judgment on that, although I should say that between the kick of a camel and a fall from an aeroplane there would not be much difference in the result.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINLEY. Yes.

Mr. SWITZER. Does the gentleman think it would obviate the construction of railroads in Alaska?

Mr. FINLEY. I want to say to the gentleman that I understand that we will come to that bridge a little later, and I have not my bridge shoes on now as to that proposition.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman from South Carolina yield?

Mr. FINLEY. I will.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I understand this proposition is to keep pace with the times?

Mr. FINLEY. That is one reason.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Along with the spineless cactus, the motherless chicken, the seedless raisin, the wireless telegraphy you want a trackless travel? [Laughter.]

Mr. FINLEY. A way through the air.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am a friend to aviation, as is also the author of this bill, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHARP]. I believe that we two have been heard on the subject oftener than anybody else in the House. I had the honor to first offer the amendment which went into the Army appropriation bill providing for the purchase of a number of airships. There is now on the calendar, just reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, a bill to create an aviation division in the Signal Corps of the Army, with 60 officers to be attached to it and a number of enlisted men.

In addition to this considerable expenditure which we will make in the Army for aviation, experimental in the main probably, teaching officers and enlisted men how to manage airships, we are spending quite a sum of money for aerial navigation in the Navy; not enough, in my judgment, in either case.

There has been talk of some kind of a laboratory to be constructed by the Government, either under the Smithsonian Institution or under some other branch of the Government service. I believe in all these things. I am perfectly willing, as far as I am concerned, to spend a considerable amount of money in experimenting with air navigation; but what will come out of this that is good I fail to see. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY], for many years one of the able and distinguished members of the Committee on Post Offices, suggests that there is a place out in Idaho where you can fly across the tops of the mountains and save 600 miles, stating that if you fly as a crow flies—and the fact is a crow can not fly there at all, and neither can the airship—it would be but 100 miles. Nobody has ever tried to fly over mountains that high, and they will not for a long time to come.

If it were practicable to fly over these mountains and save 600 out of 750 miles, it would be easy to construct a road there. The other case mentioned by the distinguished gentleman where you could use an aeroplane for carrying the mails is up in Alaska, where they can save about the same amount of space. One has, indeed, yet to discover a method by which a man flies an airship at night with the thermometer at 70° below zero. There is no way of housing the man in to protect him.

Mr. SHARP. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. SHARP. Does not the gentleman from Illinois know that all through the summer months in Alaska, instead of flying by night, we have 20 hours of daylight?

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman from Ohio will not interrupt me to ask such a foolish question.

Mr. SHARP. Then he does not have to fly by night.

Mr. MANN. You have to fly at night a part of the year, and you can not make a contract there or anywhere else for carrying the mail during one-half of the year, the hard half, by dog team and then let the airship take it during the easy period, even if that were practicable, which I doubt. Yet that was the proposition. It will not do any good as an experiment. But what might it do? Here is an unlimited authority for the Post Office Department to let contracts for the carrying of mail by aeroplane.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] said he could promise there would be only \$50,000 appropriated, but no one can promise that. No one in this House can promise how much Congress will appropriate for a specific purpose when there is no limit on the authorization, or, if he does, such a promise is of little value. The gentleman may control what the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads would do, though I do not think he would claim he would have that control; but there is another body besides the committee, and that is the House, and there is another body besides the House before an appropriation bill becomes a law. This authority might not be exercised for years. It might be. It is no good as an experiment. We ought to experiment in the War Department and in the Navy Department with the laboratory, if we have one, or, if the Post Office Department wants to ex-

periment, I am perfectly willing that they should have the money to do it with.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. COX. I want to make this statement. Since the bill was introduced, I think since the bill has been placed on the calendar, I have had letters from probably five or six concerns engaged in the manufacture of aeroplanes, insisting, begging, and pleading that this bill become a law, showing a very active interest in the manufacture in this kind of air craft.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt about that.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to inquire if the gentleman has investigated as to what success other countries have had in carrying mail by flying machines? I understand that France has such a mail.

Mr. MANN. The report says that France carries some mail by aeroplanes in France and some across the Sahara Desert with great regularity. I submit that that does not mean very much, and I venture to say that there is no place in the world to-day where mail is regularly carried by aeroplane—in the Sahara Desert or anywhere else.

Mr. FOWLER. I will ask the gentleman if he does not think if flying is successful that the mail may be carried over mountainous country much more easily that way than by land?

Mr. MANN. I really have a good deal of doubt about carrying mail over the mountainous country by aeroplane up to date. As we all know, the danger in flying aeroplanes is in the changing currents of the air. Those are much worse in the air over mountains than in the level country. Aviators are very careful about going over mountains and watercourses wherever they fly.

Mr. FOWLER. If success could be obtained by this means, would it not be a great advance and benefit to the people of the mountainous countries?

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt whatever, as I have said before on the floor of this House, that the time will come—probably not so very distant in the future—when it will be possible to so construct aeroplanes and put them together that there will be no danger, as there is at present, of the machine falling to the ground. I have no doubt of that at all. I do not think that will be helped by this proposition in the slightest degree.

Mr. FOWLER. Does not the gentleman think we might learn a good deal by experimenting in this way?

Mr. MANN. If the Post Office Department wants to take some money and experiment, I am willing to give it to them, or to anyone else in the Government service for that purpose. But that is not what this is, and the only effect that this can have is to let a high-priced contract to some contractor who is building aeroplanes, and then when a man who is running a flying machine is killed they will come to us and ask us out of sympathy, because the man was doing it for the benefit of the service, to pay his widow a large sum of money and put her on a pension for the balance of her life, or, if he is injured, they will say that we ought to pay him a large sum of money. We are already proposing to increase by 75 per cent the pay of a portion of the military officers engaged in aviation. I think they are entitled to it, but you can not carry this mail in that way. There is no need or demand for this as an experiment. Some one in a moment of dream, after eating mince pie, suggested to my distinguished and worthy friend from Ohio [Mr. SHARP] that this would be a good thing. I am willing to join him in any proper experimentation of aviation, but I am unwilling to commit the Government to this kind of proposition which seems to me can do no possible good and may do harm.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. GORMAN. Does not the gentleman think that in addition to the danger that accompanies the use of this machine to the occupants of the machine the use of them in carrying the mail is an unfair means because of the lack of safety for the people who have mail to deliver? Is it not unfair to expect the people who pay for mail transportation to be obliged to make use of such uncertain methods?

Mr. MANN. I think if this method was to be applied at the places that have been named a large share of the mail would be left on the Rocky Mountains, and that the rest in Alaska would be scattered over the snowy slopes. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used 11 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I regret to disagree with my distinguished friend from Illinois on the advisability of enacting this bill into law. I am in favor of this bill. I believe

it is a good bill. The objections made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois seem to me to be rather captious. For instance, he says that you can not carry mail by aeroplane in Alaska in wintertime, because it is 70 degrees below zero. Now, that is true only of certain places in Alaska. The places where it is contemplated to carry mail are along the coast, and it is not so cold there. It is not near as cold as it is in some of our Northern States, on account of the proximity of the ocean. It is only extremely cold when you get far into the interior of Alaska; and even if it were as cold as stated, the aeroplane would not be in the air very long each trip. It would be feasible for a man to be exposed to that kind of weather for a few hours, in which time he could travel several hundred miles. It seems to me that this House ought to have some confidence in the men charged with the duty of studying postal affairs, the department officials who appeared before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, who were unanimously in favor of this proposition. Gen. Stewart, the Second Assistant Postmaster General, has been in the service for a great many years and in charge of the transportation of the mails, and he stated in the hearings that he favored this proposition and that he thought it was practical in a great many instances to carry the mail by aeroplane.

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

Mr. STEENERSON. Certainly.

Mr. COX. Did the gentleman state the committee was unanimous in reporting this bill?

Mr. STEENERSON. How is that?

Mr. COX. Did the gentleman make the statement that the committee was unanimous in reporting the bill?

Mr. STEENERSON. Not that I know of. I would not state anything about what position members of the committee took. I stated that Gen. Stewart favored the bill at the hearings.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman stated the department officials all favored it.

Mr. STEENERSON. I stated the department officials who appeared before the committee were unanimous. I would not, of course, disclose the attitude of members of the committee. Now, the statement has been ridiculed that the French Government is transporting mail "very" regularly. I do not know why that word "very" is put in there, but the fact is that mail has been for nearly a year transported regularly across the desert of Sahara, and those people would not have had a mail service at all if it had not been for the aeroplane. These department officials who have made a study of the subject are in favor of trying this experiment. I am very glad to hear the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY], a member of the committee, state that he believes the Post Office Committee will favor the appropriation of the money estimated for this service. The Book of Estimates shows that the department estimates \$50,000 for this service for experiment of carrying mail by aeroplane. It is an experiment, it is true, but there is sufficient reason why we should enter upon it. Why should the other departments of the Government, like the Army and Navy, have a monopoly of this experimentation? There is no service so important as the mail, and I believe that we can do no better than to pass this bill and make an appropriation asked for. The Post Office Department is rendering a great service. They have requested this, and they believe that it is practical and in some instances that it will save a great deal of money. Gen. Stewart stated in the hearings that it would probably be a contract service. If so, the contracts will not be let unless the department finds it advantageous. I earnestly hope that the bill will receive favorable consideration. I will insert extracts from the hearings before the Post Office Committee on the bill.

#### AEROPLANE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. FINLEY. I see here where you ask for airships. The CHAIRMAN. Are there any more questions on this item? If not, we will proceed with the airships.

Mr. FINLEY. I see here that new legislation is recommended by the department for experimental aerial mail service by aeroplane or other devices (submitted). And the Postmaster General is authorized to provide such service, in his discretion, without advertisement therefor. Estimate for 1915, \$50,000.

What information has the department as to the probable use of that appropriation by the way of adding to the efficiency of the mail service? Mr. STEWART. I should like to keep abreast of the development of aeroplane service throughout the world. France has established one or two aerial routes; Spain is now following suit; France has carried the mails across parts of the Sahara Desert for some time past in aeroplanes.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose would you use such service in the United States?

Mr. STEWART. We could use it in the Western States, in the mountainous and the arid regions.

The CHAIRMAN. Across the Rockies?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, sir. I think that where the route by wagon or trail is circuitous and difficult there are times when we could use this service advantageously.

Mr. STEENERSON. How about Alaska?



Mr. STEWART. There are places in Alaska where I think it could be developed. I have made inquiry of people who have come down from Alaska, with whom I have talked concerning the mail service recently, and I find some difference of opinion as to its availability there; but I think I could find some places where we could use it to advantage. I should like to keep abreast of the development throughout the world, and I should like to see the Post Office Department put in the front rank. The War Department and the Navy Department have received encouragement from Congress.

Mr. REILLY. If you should institute this aerial mail service, what is your idea about supplying the aerial carriers? Would you supply them from the classified list or by draft?

Mr. STEWART. I think if we opened that to competition we would have more applicants than we could use. I have already had applications from railway mail clerks to enter the aero mail service.

Mr. STEENERSON. I have one volunteer in my district.

Mr. GRIEST. Would it come under the civil service?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, if we supplied the operators; but I think we would have a contract service.

Mr. STEENERSON. Do you think it might result in saving in other expenses?

Mr. STEWART. I think it would in some of those sections that I spoke of.

Mr. STEENERSON. In those places where you can not carry the mail on account of obstructions or floods you could get mail service where you otherwise could not?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, sir. I have now a case in mind.

Mr. FINLEY. Have you any information as to the cost of such machines as you would probably use? You spoke of it in connection with the operating, but I mean without the operating.

Mr. STEWART. No, sir. I have not any figures at hand as to the cost of the machine itself.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield his time?

Mr. FINLEY. I believe I have nine minutes. I wish to yield to the author of the bill, and several other gentlemen have requested time from me. I can yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHARP].

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make this explanation and appeal to the generosity of the House. I was not aware that this bill, of which I am the author, was to be brought up by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] to-day. I only learned it on my way over to the House. I am going to take the liberty to ask unanimous consent that when I take the floor I may have time to conclude my remarks. It is too important a matter to discuss in five minutes' time.

Mr. MANN. I would suggest to the gentleman that he ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] to withdraw his motion.

Mr. SHARP. That will come later.

Mr. MANN. No; that would have to come now.

Mr. SHARP. I have not made my formal request yet. But I will ask the gentleman, if that is necessary, to withdraw his motion.

Mr. FINLEY. How much time would the gentleman like?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will pardon me, the vocational educational bill was put over until Friday, the other day, and then it was put over until to-day, and if it should go over until to-morrow it would conflict with the District appropriation bill, and the chances are it would not be reached again for a month. I am not interested in it—

Mr. FOSTER. Does the gentleman think we would be able to pass that bill to-night?

Mr. MANN. I think it would come to a vote.

Mr. FOSTER. I think not. It is nearly 5 o'clock now.

Mr. MANN. There is nothing left but the vote.

Mr. FOSTER. There are amendments.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, if it is in order I would like to to ask—

Mr. MANN. How much time does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHARP] want?

Mr. SHARP. If I could have 20 minutes I would appreciate it very much.

Mr. MANN. That would be 15 minutes more on a side. I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended 15 minutes on a side.

Mr. FINLEY. That is agreeable.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the time be extended 15 minutes on a side. Is there objection?

Mr. RUCKER. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES] if he wants to take up that bill that was under consideration a few days ago.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. I would like to do so.

Mr. MANN. Your committee will be reached before long on the call. I have tried my best to help the gentleman out.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. I know you have, and I appreciate it very much. I think it would take but a short while—

Mr. MANN. I fully agree with the gentleman, but the indications are that the gentleman will not be able to pass his bill to-night anyhow.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. We were under the impression that we could pass it to-night. I think nearly all the debate has been had upon the bill that is desired. I would like very much to have it passed to-night.

Mr. MANN. That can come up later. Maybe we can stay here and dispose of it. It may take but a moment.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. I think it will take but a very short while.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the extension of the debate on this bill to 15 minutes on a side? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHARP] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago day after to-morrow two young men, brothers, hailing from my State, after having made months and months of trials and tests, found that they could accomplish that which had been the dream of the ages. They found after these experiments that they were enabled, down at Kitty Hawk, in North Carolina, to propel a heavier than air machine 60 seconds in the air after several tests had been made on that day. The art of navigating the air progressed so rapidly that within a few years after that time, as most of us remember—and I was one of the 20,000 people who saw the exhibition of their flights over at Fort Myer—they were able to comply with the requirements of Gen. Allen, of the Signal Corps, and fly 1 hour in the air with a machine, carrying two passengers, in all aggregating in weight some 1,400 or 1,500 pounds, at a speed of 40 miles an hour.

That was four years ago. So great and rapid has been the progress of aviation during these four years that to-day aviators in European countries are flying from 500 to 1,300 miles at a single flight, ascending in some instances upward of 19,000 feet, and with the ability, demonstrated time and time again, of carrying from 5 to 12 passengers in their flight.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is usually very careful in his statements, and I pay to him now the compliment that probably he knows more about legislation that has been passed during the past decade than any other Member in the House. He is generally very well informed. But I am sure that upon this subject—and I say it in no offensive sense—he does not seem to know what he is talking about. Evidently he has not kept track of the developments in this field of exploitation.

The other evening I was at a meeting at which our distinguished Speaker, Mr. CLARK, spoke. He mentioned the fact in the course of his remarks that he had a constituent—I think now living in his district in Missouri—who had anticipated Alexander Graham Bell by four or five years in the invention of the telephone. He actually did invent a telephone that carried a message, but it was only for a short distance. He abandoned his efforts with the thought that it was only a toy, that it never would amount to much, and that that was the end of its sphere of usefulness.

Had the Wright brothers been actuated by that same short-sighted policy and come to the conclusion that after all, with all their efforts, following the experiments and investigations of such men as Bell and Langley along the same line, they had invented only a toy that could skip over the ground and perhaps cross a river, we might still be back where we were 10 years ago. But they had a prophetic vision, and they went on making their improvements, until to-day the navigation of the air is a tremendous actuality. It is not experimental. Its future sphere of usefulness is as certain as that of the telegraph and the telephone.

Why, the arguments of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] remind me of the objections that were made to the possibility of crossing the Atlantic Ocean under steam power. They could well go along in the deadly parallel column, one as absurdly ridiculous as the other. I make the prediction now on this floor that long before another 10 years have rolled around there will be seen the same absurdity, in the light of the events of that day, attaching to the arguments of the gentleman from Illinois that we came long ago to see in the reasoning of those skeptics who thought that crossing the Atlantic Ocean some 60 or 70 years ago under steam power was an impossibility.

The gentleman from Illinois speaks of the lack of feasibility of delivering mail by aeroplane in Alaska. Why, on many occasions aviators have safely crossed the Alps, very much higher in elevation than the mountains of Alaska, and they will probably be called upon in the future to cross Alaska time and time again. Does the gentleman know that on this very day—and not to-day only, but every day in the year—in Europe there are thousands of flights made of from 10 to 1,000 miles without accidents? We have no such exhibitions here, because we are far behind the aviators of Europe, although to the credit of American genius it must be said that we first invented the art

of flying. They have risen to the occasion over there, and in recent years there have been appropriated by the French, the English, and the German Governments as much as \$4,000,000 in a single year for experimenting in the navigation of the air for war purposes. We have done very little development work by Government aid on this side of the water, because every single effort, in so far as carrying the mails is concerned, that has been made in this House to get appropriations for aviation, has been met with the objection that there is no law for it; that it is new legislation. It was to remedy that difficulty that I introduced this bill.

The gentleman from Illinois errs again in thinking that some of these aviators by their arguments have inspired me with the practicability of carrying the mail by aeroplane. I needed no such inspiration as that. When I stood during that hour over at Fort Myer and saw those men glide around the field with the rapidity and ease of the swiftest birds of the air, without any seeming exertion lifting nearly a ton of weight, it did not take very much to convince me, as I think it did not take much to tell many other witnesses of that flight, of the tremendous possibilities that would open up for aerial navigation.

Now, I have not asked for a dollar's appropriation in this bill. My only object in asking for the enactment of this measure, gentlemen, is to allow the Postmaster General, at his discretion, as the time may come, to put its provisions into actual operation. If you prefer to say experiment, all right, but I would not say that. This is not alone the view of the Postmaster General of to-day. It is with the same purpose, it is the same request that was made by the former Postmaster General. I think it was made four or five years ago; and Second Assistant Postmaster General Stewart has been persistent in coming before this committee, attending the hearings, and stating why this appropriation should be made for this purpose. The object of this bill is only to authorize it, so that the Postmaster General may enter into those contracts, if it seems advisable to do so.

In the limited time I have I can not enter into a full discussion of what may follow from the enactment of this measure; but we never will make any progress in aviation, we never will begin to catch up with the procession on the other side of the water, if we follow the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and say, because it is not an approved, absolute, established success to-day, therefore it should never be encouraged. That argument would have prevented the plying of the first steamships across the Atlantic and upon any of our rivers.

There have been great advances in navigation during recent years, but in the half century or more of steam navigation, in the remarkable development of our great railway locomotives, there has been no greater progress than in the navigation of the air in this one decade.

Do these skilled men know nothing about what they are talking? Do those who have petitioned Congress to enact this legislation, who have studied these problems seriously, know nothing at all about the subject? Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] know a great deal more about their business than they know?

Let me cite a single instance which I discussed with the Second Assistant Postmaster General the other day. I have verified the information, and it is true, that to-day our Government is carrying mail, not up in Alaska, but from a point in Idaho down to northern Nevada, which is transported 700 long miles, occupying 10 days. It goes partly by rail and partly by mule team. Yet aviators stand ready to enter into a contract with this Government to deliver that mail in two hours, because it is only 100 miles from one point to the other as the crow flies.

This does not mean that the Government is going to build an aeroplane factory. It does not follow that the Government is going at present to build its own aeroplanes; but I know from talks with the department that it is only for the purpose of hiring skilled aviators to enter into a contract and to give bond, the same as the railway companies have to give bond, to furnish this kind of transportation.

I would like to have the time to outline the many benefits that may come through the development of aeronautics, not alone through carrying the mail, but in many other ways. We have appropriated money from our Public Treasury for intensive agricultural experiments, for perfecting the accuracy of the work of our Weather Bureau, which we all must recognize as having some direct or indirect bearing upon our material wealth and advancement; but who shall stand here to-day and undertake to limit the scientific knowledge that may come from explorations of meteorological conditions so greatly facilitated by this new invention?

I do not think I have the reputation—I hope not—of being a visionary upon any subject; but I have given considerable time

to the study of the possibilities of the further development of this industry, and it seems to my mind as clear a proposition as we have ever been called upon to vote for. This bill calls for no money from the Treasury as has been stated. It seems clear, to my mind, that the argument is all on one side. I would dislike very much—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Mr. SHARP. Certainly; I will be glad to.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is the gentleman serious when he states that this does not mean an expenditure of money? Is not it the very purpose of passing this bill to enable the Post Office appropriation bill to carry an appropriation?

Mr. SHARP. I will qualify my statement by saying that as far as this measure is concerned it calls for no appropriation. I think the gentleman will agree with me when I say that the Postmaster General may not expend any money under this bill, assuming that it is enacted into law; of course, without there is first such authority, there can be no appropriation of money for the purpose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is it not a fact that the Post Office Department has submitted an estimate of \$50,000 for experimental work in aeronautics?

Mr. SHARP. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Such an item would not be in order on the Post Office appropriation bill if the committee reported it; but if this bill is enacted into law it will make in order an appropriation of \$50,000; and I will ask the gentleman if the Post Office Committee is not ready to make that recommendation if it can be done in accordance with the rules of the House?

Mr. SHARP. I can not say as to the latter part of it, because I do not know. I can only say that I hope the gentleman's conclusion is absolutely correct.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It seems to be logical.

Mr. SHARP. I hope the gentleman is correct. If out of an appropriation of \$305,000,000 for the Post Office Department for the ensuing year we can not appropriate \$50,000 to put into effect a system that has been demonstrated to be absolutely feasible on the other side of the Atlantic, then I think we are away behind the times and recreant to our duty. The gentleman from Illinois questioned the statement of the gentleman from South Carolina as to the accuracy of matter contained in the report. I want to say to the gentleman that French aeronauts are carrying the mail to-day across the Sahara Desert, and they have established and are now carrying aerial mail from Paris down to the Mediterranean coast, a distance of 400 miles, to catch the outgoing steamers.

It was only three months ago that a famous French aviator, Roland Garros, starting from the northern coast of the Mediterranean Sea, made a single flight of 500 miles over to the French possessions in northern Africa. I read with great interest his story of that flight. After he had gone halfway across, he became enveloped in the clouds and his machine stopped for a moment. He was speculating as to whether he could go on and safely continue his flight. He whirled around, lowered himself sufficiently to see where he was, and seeing that his machine had resumed its regular operation, he started again without alighting and finished his 500 miles at the rate of over 50 miles an hour.

Garros said there has been much talk about crossing the Atlantic Ocean in an aeroplane. He said that he covered the distance of 500 miles in a single flight—greater than the distance from North Scotland to Iceland, and as great as from Iceland to Newfoundland, and nearly as great as from Newfoundland down to the north Atlantic coast—thereby showing that he could cross the Atlantic Ocean without making more than three landings. That such journeys will be regularly made by aeroplane or similar air craft within a few years no one abreast of the times seriously doubts.

There is no question about it; there is no doubt in my mind to-day but that we should authorize this kind of mail delivery. We have not a rattle-brained man as a Postmaster General; we have not that kind of men in that department. Certainly no one would accuse Mr. Stewart of being such. He is about the most conservative and methodical official there, and he has advocated this plan for three or four years. Put it in execution, and let us not send word to the surviving brother, when his admirers next Wednesday celebrate the tenth anniversary of his achievement—let us not send the news that, though its practicability has been demonstrated everywhere else, even in the smallest of countries, yet in the land of its discovery the American Congress would not recognize it, nay, could not see its utility as anything beyond a freakish invention.

Let me say in conclusion that it is not in any sense of the word from a personal pride that I have sought the enactment of this measure into law. I would have been glad to have had



some other Member introduce it if he could have carried it through to success, but I have taken such an interest in the whole subject that I do want to see the American people, through their Representatives in Congress, rise to the occasion. Let us be progressive, as the message from the Postmaster General suggests, and meet the situation, so important to the cause of aeronautics, that is knocking at our doors for admission. [Applause.] I thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a brief statement to the House, being a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, why I oppose this bill. I must confess that I do not know when this bill was reported out of committee. I have done my best to be present at all times and have been there unless it was some morning when I may have gotten there a few moments late. Had I been in the committee when the bill was reported I should have opposed it to the extent of making a minority report against it, if necessary.

I was present when Postmaster General Stewart was there and asked for the appropriation. I opposed the appropriation at the time he asked for it, and, if I remember correctly, he asked for an appropriation of \$50,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, from whence comes this demand for this legislation? Where does it come from; where is the power that is now being brought to bear to force this kind of legislation through this House? Does it come from the men that support the mails of the country? Is there any demand coming from the people who write letters, postal cards, who send newspapers, who send second, third, and fourth class mail through the post offices? Does the demand come from that class of people for this kind of legislation? I failed to hear that demand develop before a post-office committee. I failed to hear Postmaster General Stewart say that the demands were coming to him from all sections of the country as to legislation of this kind, from the people who use the mails.

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

Mr. COX. I will.

Mr. SHARP. Has not Postmaster General Stewart time and again come before the gentleman's committee and told that committee why he did want it—to cover some of these western points?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the statement of the Postmaster General; but, as I stated to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] a moment ago, since this bill was put on the calendar I have received letters from three or four or five of the manufacturers of aeronautic machines asking me to support this bill. I ask the gentlemen on the floor of this House if it is right, if it is fair, if that is the source whence this demand comes, for us to appropriate money that belongs to the people to demonstrate the ability of aeronautic machines to carry the mails? In my judgment, no.

Mr. STEENERSON. Does the gentleman think that is any argument against the passage of this bill?

Mr. COX. I do. Let the manufacturers of aeronautic machines demonstrate it themselves and not ask the people to pay the bill. Read this bill. What does it provide?

That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for carrying mail by aeroplanes.

Under that provision, in my judgment, there is authority broad enough to justify and empower the Postmaster General to manufacture aeronautic machines if he desires to. If the language carried in the bill is not broad enough for that purpose, then it unquestionably is broad enough to enable the Postmaster General to buy and operate the machines. Whence comes the demand? How many men on the floor of this House have been requested by letters or otherwise from their constituents who use the mail to vote for this bill?

I undertake to say, Mr. Speaker, that the number is exceedingly small. With railroad trains to-day carrying mail at the rate of 60 miles an hour, is not that fast enough to distribute the mail to the remotest corners of the country? But they say it is needed to carry the mail up in Alaska. Read the last Post Office appropriation bill, read the Post Office appropriation bills for the last number of years. The Congress of the United States has abundantly provided for the carrying of mail in Alaska under any and all conditions, and no request comes from Alaska for the inauguration of this kind of service. There is no request except that of the Postmaster General, through his representative, the Second Assistant. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] was criticized by my friend from Ohio [Mr. SHARP], but he hit a very vital point. Suppose this becomes a law, do not be deceived in the proposition. Do not be deceived in this little bill that my friend from Ohio says is a very small matter. You will be called upon to vote an appropriation

here for the Lord only knows how much, and that is not all you would be called upon to vote in a very short period of time.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COX. Yes; for a question.

Mr. SHARP. Does the gentleman think the Postmaster General will call upon this Congress for any considerable amount until its feasibility has been demonstrated?

Mr. COX. Oh, I do not know. If the Post Office Committee were to grant everything that the Postmaster General and his assistants want, we would bankrupt the Nation. I am not in favor of giving to the heads of departments everything they want. Simply because a Cabinet officer writes that he is in favor of a measure is to me no evidence whatever that we have to grant his request.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, discussing what the gentleman from Illinois touched upon a few moments ago, up until, I think, the Sixty-first Congress we had paid to the heirs of railway postal clerks killed on duty \$1,000. It was on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois that that was increased from \$1,000 to \$2,000, and I am not quarreling about that; but watch the appropriations. You have seen the appropriations under that item double, and double in the very last few years. You enact this into law, and what will likely be the result? It is broad enough to enable the Postmaster General to buy these air craft. If he is able to buy one with the money thus appropriated, he is then able to put a railway postal clerk or any other employee of the Government in the operation of one of these machines. The moment he is injured or killed, as the gentleman from Illinois well said, then we will be called upon to increase the appropriation. I do not know that if the exigencies of the occasion arose I would oppose it, but I would go back to the proposition I made a moment ago. Whence comes this demand? It certainly does not come from the great moving mass of the people of this country who use the mail. At least, I have not received any requests coming from that class of people asking for this kind of legislation, and I doubt if any other person has. We have abundantly provided for the carrying of mail in this country, and we have abundantly provided for the carrying of mail in all the arid and semiarid countries of the land. Aye, we have abundantly provided for carrying the mails under any and all conditions in the United States and all of its possessions. The very moment you put this upon the statute books, gentlemen, that very moment you furnish a basic law that appropriations must follow as a matter of necessity. Well, I would oppose even appropriating \$50,000 for experimental purposes to enable the Postmaster General to try this out, but if the Post Office Committee desires to put that item in the bill and the House desires and sees fit to permit it to remain as an experimental matter, without a basic law on which to rest it, but simply to try it out, I do not know that I would have such serious objection to it. But the very moment that it is written upon the statute books as the law of the land, from that moment on we are going to be called upon to make appropriations every year for this item, and more and more for this item each year. In addition to that, we will be called upon to make appropriations for the killing, injuring, and wounding of employees carrying the mail in air craft.

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

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. SHARP. If it proves to be a feasible thing and a just arrangement, is there any objection?

Mr. COX. Oh, there is no necessity for it, there is no demand for it whatever, when the people are getting their mail at the rate of 60 miles an hour. That is not all. A proposition now before the committee is to buy the postal telegraphs, and in the name of common sense where are we going to stop?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Illinois has 11 minutes and the gentleman from South Carolina 6.

Mr. FINLEY. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois to use his time.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I know whence some of the agitation for this legislation comes. The Kirkham Aeroplane & Motor Co., Janney-Steinmetz & Co., of Philadelphia; the Sloane Aeroplane Co., of New York; the Wright Co., of Dayton, Ohio; and the Aero Club of America are all very anxious that this bill should be passed by the 17th day of December, in order to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the first flight of a

heavier-than-air machine in the United States under the control of the Wright brothers.

Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat astounded to learn that the Post Office Department had been urging legislation of this character for four or five years. In 1909, only four years ago, a contract was made by the Board of Ordnance and Fortification out of their authority to experiment with a fund of \$100,000 for the perfecting of weapons of war with the Wright brothers, of Dayton, Ohio. The contract, as I recall, provided for the furnishing of an aeroplane to the Government at a cost of \$25,000.

The conditions required that the machine should remain in air at least 45 minutes, that it should attain a speed of some 50 miles an hour, that it should remain in the air with one passenger for 15 minutes, and that it should make a trip of 5 miles across country and return without alighting. Those of us who were present in this city in the summer of 1909 may recall that the Wright brothers, the greatest of all manufacturers and developers of heavier-than-air aeroplanes, spent between five and six weeks at Fort Myer practicing and testing their machine before they risked these apparently simple tests; yet it seems even that before such simple tests as those indicated could be made the Post Office Department was seriously urging an appropriation for such service. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that this recommendation probably is not more than two years old. Two or three years ago at Belmont Park, on Long Island, there was what might be termed an "aeroplane meet" or an "aviation meet." Noted aviators from all over the world met there and entered a series of contests. Among the visitors who journeyed to Belmont Park was the Postmaster General of the last administration. Some one induced him to make a trip around the aviation field with one of the expert aviators, and he was taken aloft for a few hundred feet, encircled the field, and then safely landed. Then to demonstrate how useful the aeroplane might be in the postal service a letter or a note was written, I think signed by himself, and sent by aeroplane from Belmont Park to Garden City, a few miles away, to some person there, and a reply was penned and sent back. The result was that at the following session there was a recommendation from the Postmaster General for an appropriation for carrying mails under contract by aeroplane. On this same occasion, Mr. Speaker, within two or three years, a prize of \$10,000 was offered to the aviator who would fly from Belmont Park around the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor and return to Belmont Park without alighting, a total distance of about 30 miles. For a number of days a number of aviators, the most expert men in the world, made attempts to make this trip.

On one Sunday two of them started, and Bleriot was successful. He crossed the city, circled the Statue of Liberty, and got back safely to Belmont Park. Another aviator also made the trip. Of all of those gathered there but two of them were able to make it. It was considered dangerous to travel 30 miles and return because of the pockets in the air found in traversing over the great city.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This shows, Mr. Speaker, that aviation has not been developed in this country to a stage where it has become practicable to utilize it seriously for the purpose of carrying the mails.

Mr. SHARP. Will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHARP. I do not want to take much of your time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hope the gentleman will not. He had 20 minutes himself.

Mr. SHARP. Does not the gentleman know that up to the present time there are a thousand flights a day made by those machines in Europe?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I shall come right down to date. This is a commercial proposition. Those most vitally interested in this proposition are the aeroplane manufacturers who have been endeavoring to secure governmental assistance in one way or the other. Not having secured it from one committee a few years ago, they now come to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. To show this I shall read this letter:

THE KIRKHAM AEROPLANE & MOTOR CO. (INC.),  
Savona, N. Y., December 18, 1913.

Hon. J. J. FITZGERALD,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We understand that there is a bill now in Congress authorizing the Postmaster General to enter into contracts for carrying mail by aeroplane or by any other similar devices, and we earnestly solicit your support of this bill.

You no doubt know that the first flight in an aeroplane was made by the Wright brothers in America just 10 years ago. Since then, however, America has made little progress in aviation as compared with the foreign countries, due to the fact that the industry here has not had the support of the Government. What progress has been made has been through individual efforts, and it is through the efforts of these few individuals that America has been able to hold her standing in aviation.

They forget that Prof. Langley, of the Smithsonian Institution, was the man who originated the idea of navigating the air with a heavier-than-air machine, and over \$50,000 of Government funds were expended by him out of the money at the disposal of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification before the Wright brothers were able to fly.

The letter further says:

With a little assistance from the Government America could become the leading nation in aviation. The aeroplane is now here commercially. This is well shown by the wonderful work which is being done with it in Europe. The same can be done here. All we ask is an opportunity to demonstrate it. Will you give us that opportunity by supporting the bill in question? Whatever you may be able to do along this line will be greatly appreciated.

The Army appropriation bill has been carrying \$125,000 available for aviation purposes. The naval appropriation has been carrying \$10,000 for experimental purposes. The officers detailed to this work received 35 per cent additional compensation because of the extremely hazardous character of the occupation in which they are engaged. I saw it stated recently that despite the fact that \$125,000 for the last two years, if I recall correctly, has been made available in the Army appropriation bill, the Army has not a single aeroplane which is now considered up to date, and that most of the accidents which occur, resulting in the death of the enterprising young officers assigned to that work, are due to the fact that the aeroplanes of the Army are obsolete.

Mr. SHARP. I am glad the gentleman has mentioned that fact.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I decline to yield at present. I mentioned that fact because I thought it would please the House to know it, or that perhaps it would furnish some information. I have only a few minutes remaining and I hope I shall not be interrupted.

It is proper, Mr. Speaker, that the Government through the proper channels should place at the disposal of the proper officials money for the conduct of experiments along scientific lines for purposes that may be beneficial to the people or to the Government. But I believe it is the utmost folly seriously to argue that an appropriation of \$50,000 would enable the Post Office Department to make a contract that would provide for the carrying of the mails in Alaska by aeroplane or for the carrying of mails by aeroplane in the arid regions—over the great desert portions of our country. Several attempts have been made in the last year or so by aviators to fly across the Isthmus of Panama. One of them finally succeeded in doing it. It was found to be so extremely hazardous a task that the canal authorities have prohibited further attempts in that direction. Why should we seriously discuss the utilization of aeroplanes for such a purpose as carrying the mails at this time in the development of these machines?

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time has the gentleman from Illinois remaining?

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has one minute and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] has six minutes.

Mr. FINLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] two minutes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, as there are only six minutes' time left, I do not desire to take any time. I will be glad if the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] would use the time.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] use his one minute? Does the gentleman care to use it?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, again reiterating the statement that I am a friend of aviation, notwithstanding what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHARP] has said, I am not in favor of this bill, and nobody will ever get any good out of it unless it be some manufacturer of flying machines who can not sell them to somebody else.

We are willing to spend money for experimentation work in aviation, but that is not what this bill provides for; and if the Democratic Party or Congress is going to have any idea whatever of economy you can not afford to waste money in this way. [Applause.]

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the arguments against this bill, and they may be summed up briefly. But be-



fore I commence would the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] like two minutes?

Mr. WILLIS. I would.

Mr. FINLEY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the fact that in two minutes it is not possible to discuss the merits of this bill. I simply want to say, in reply to what the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has said, that the reason why we have not been able to make satisfactory progress in aeroplane construction in this country is because we have had to import the engines that are used on these machines from foreign countries. The Government has not given the encouragement to aviation that has been given elsewhere, and consequently this country has not been able to make the progress that has been made in Germany and France. The committee in its report, at page 2, indicates what the French Government has been doing. The report states:

We believe the carrying of mail and light packages by aeroplane has passed beyond the experimental stage. As a matter of fact, mail is now being carried by the French Government not only in France but across the Sahara Desert with great regularity. The results have so pleased the minister of finance that he is planning to extend the service as rapidly as the demand will warrant.

It was Roland Garros who, less than 90 days ago, in a single continuous flight in his 80-horsepower monoplane, crossed the Mediterranean Sea at its widest point, covering a distance of approximately 500 miles at the rate of more than 60 miles an hour. This feat fairly illustrates the development of aviation within the past three or four years, since which time Bleriot startled the world by making a flight from the shores of France across the Channel, a distance of 21 miles, landing on English soil.

The one point I want to make particularly is this: According to the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] we are spending \$125,000 in the War Department for the encouragement of aviation. We are spending \$10,000 a year in the Navy Department for the encouragement of aviation. We are spending, all told, \$135,000 per year for the encouragement of aviation for the purposes of war; and yet when a bill is brought in here which proposes to enable the Postmaster General to establish better postal facilities and give some encouragement to the development of the aeroplane as a messenger of peace, we are told that the Government can not afford it, though it is admitted that this bill does not carry a single dollar of appropriation.

On this point the committee say:

Indeed, though to the United States belongs the signal honor of making the first flight in machines heavier than air, as well as the invention of the hydroneroplane which navigates both the air and water, we have been badly distanced in this field of enterprise by every other civilized nation. While it may be urged that the unsettled conditions abroad have been responsible for the military needs for this new kind of warfare, yet there still remains a field in which the United States can, with great benefit to our people, exploit this new enterprise.

It would seem that no better opportunity could be offered for bringing about this result than by putting it into practical service in the transportation of mails, which system can be inaugurated under the provisions of this bill whenever the Postmaster General deems its use to be advantageous and economical.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this great House of Representatives can ill afford to take the position before the people of this country and before the people of the world that here in the United States, which witnessed the birth of the flying machine, we do not propose to give it any encouragement whatever except for purposes of war. It should be the handmaiden of peace and progress, not simply a death engine of war and destruction.

Now, there is another thing to which I wish to refer. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX] says that there is not any demand for this from his people. I should like to know whether or not any demand was received from his people for the encouragement of the development of the electric telegraph. Is Congress to sit here and wait until some one tells it to take a forward step?

The gentleman has undertaken to frighten the House by reading letters here to the effect that certain manufacturers of aeroplanes are in favor of the passage of this bill. I do not care if they are. I am in favor of the passage of the bill, not because of that fact, but in spite of it. It is no argument at all to say that the people who are getting the mail have not been writing to the gentleman from Indiana asking that he vote for this bill. Very likely not. But he is a Representative of the people, and is supposed to know what is going on in this country and in the world. He is supposed to keep abreast of the times. I believe if he does that, he will support this bill.

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

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was about to say I have listened to the arguments against this bill, and it occurs to me

that they may be summed up briefly in this way: That carrying the mail by aeroplane in this country, no matter what has been done in other countries, notably in France, to illustrate, has not been tried out, and until it is tried out and proven to be a success it should not be undertaken. Encouragement of it ought not to be given until it has been tried and proven. That is about the sum and substance of the argument against this bill. I have listened very carefully to what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX] said. He said he was not present at the committee meeting when this bill was ordered to be reported; but I can say to him that I was not there myself. I was some 20 or 30 minutes late that morning, being necessarily detained. When I arrived I found I had been delegated to report the bill.

So that, after listening to the arguments of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX], I am bound to say he reminds me of the man who believed that good things came from him. On one occasion he was in company and some topic was under discussion, and the question was asked, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" He said, "No. How can it? I never was in Nazareth in my life."

Mr. Speaker, the arguments against this bill simply amount to this, that it has not been proven to be a success in the United States; and when we point to other countries and say that it has been a success there, that makes no difference in the minds of some people.

Why should there be opposition to this bill? No more money will be spent than is absolutely necessary. Does anybody believe the Post Office Department will ever ask for more money than can be economically expended for the betterment of the postal service? Does anybody believe that Congress will ever appropriate more money than is necessary for these purposes? I do not, and I do not think there is anybody in this House who does believe that.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have here a proposition that is simply a repetition of what has been said time and again. Why, when Columbus wished the means to make his trial trip of discovery he was argued down for years. It has been the same way with every great invention. When it was first proposed they said it was impracticable; that it could not be done. I say that I am sure this will never be a general service.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] says he believes the time will come when by the linking of two or three airships together they will be of some service. I ask him how he is ever going to do that unless Congress authorizes a start to be made and something to be done in the way of a beginning? Why should gentlemen stand in the way of progress? I think I have about as good a reputation for economy and for old-line, yard-wide Democracy as anybody in this House. I take second place to nobody in that, and I am in favor of trying this proposition in certain localities which are recommended by the Postmaster General and by the Second Assistant Postmaster General. I have stated before, and I do not mind stating again, that I believe the Second Assistant Postmaster General is the ablest all-round postal official this Government has had in its service in the past 15 years. I believe this plan is practicable in some places, and I much prefer to take the judgment of Joseph Stewart, the Second Assistant Postmaster General of the United States, and other postal officials, including the Postmaster General, than to take the views of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] or the views of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. I think I am safer in taking the judgment of those officials about a matter concerning which they have informed themselves.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill will pass.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on discharging the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from further consideration of this bill, suspending the rules, and passing the bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. No! no!

Mr. COX. I will withdraw the point for the time being.

The question was taken; and on a division, demanded by Mr. FINLEY, there were—ayes 28, noes 54.

Accordingly the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill was rejected.

#### DISTRIBUTION OF THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a privileged report (H. Rept. 141) from the Ways and Means Committee. I report back House resolution 340, distributing the President's message.

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. That resolution was reported back several days ago, and was on the calendar for three or four days, and I was going to ask how it got off the calendar.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that it was a mistake.

Mr. MANN. I can not help whether it was a mistake or not. It was reported back by dropping it into the basket, and was printed. I do not know any authority in the Clerk of the House to throw it out and strike it off the calendar.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the gentleman from Illinois that I prepared the resolution and the report at the same time and by mistake dropped the report in the box with the resolution, and they were both printed at the same time. The clerk at the Speaker's table called my attention to the fact, and I told him then of the mistake, and he said it would be corrected.

Mr. MANN. I do not see by what authority. Here is the resolution, House resolution 340:

Mr. UNDERWOOD, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the following resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar—

The wrong calendar by the way—and ordered to be printed.

Now, by what authority does the gentleman report the same resolution over again—House resolution 340—and by what authority did the clerk take it off the calendar after it had been on the calendar for four days?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the gentleman from Illinois that I did not report the resolution; that it was not reported back. The Ways and Means Committee never had a meeting on the resolution until this morning, and it got upon the calendar by mistake. I assume that the gentleman from Illinois does not desire to keep a resolution on the calendar that really was not reported back.

Mr. MANN. Of course, if the statement of the Clerk in the report is a mistake I do not care anything about it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I explained how the mistake occurred.

Mr. MANN. That was not an explanation. If the gentleman from Alabama deposited in the basket the report that was printed and the resolution that was printed, it is too late for him to say that he did not report the resolution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I did not—

Mr. MANN. Who put the information on the report which is not correct?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman from Illinois will be quiet for a moment, I will explain.

Mr. MANN. I do not take that very kindly from the gentleman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I was trying to explain to the gentleman, but he kept on talking.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman made a statement—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not mean anything offensive.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman was a little offensive.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I apologize. I never mean to be offensive to anybody, and least of all to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman knows that that is all off. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, when the President's message was referred to the Ways and Means Committee I prepared a resolution for the distribution of the message, and a report at the same time, which is usual. It is a perfunctory matter, as the gentleman from Illinois knows. I introduced the resolution in the box, so that it would go back to the committee, that it might have the printed resolution before it when we got to it, which is usual. By mistake I left the report which I had prepared with the resolution in the box.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, I understood that, and I was not criticizing the gentleman from Alabama; I was trying to ascertain by what authority the Clerk of the House, after the Journal had been approved showing the resolution reported from the committee and that it was on the calendar, had it stricken out without saying ah, yes, or no to anybody.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think largely by my authority. He came and asked if I had reported back such a resolution, and I said no, and then I discovered that by my own mistake I had left the report which I intended to lay before the Ways and Means Committee attached to the typewritten bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the gentleman that before he reports the resolution back he ask unanimous consent to correct the Journal so as to show that it is not already reported. The Journal of the House, which has been approved, shows that this resolution was reported from the Committee on Ways and Means by the gentleman from Alabama and placed on the calendar.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I did not know the Journal did show it, because I thought that it was called to my attention on the same day that it was dropped in the box.

Mr. MANN. It was on the calendar up to to-day. It was on the calendar Friday, Thursday, and last Wednesday.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire if the Journal shows that the resolution was reported; and if so, I ask unanimous consent that it be corrected.

The SPEAKER. The Journal is in the Journal clerk's room.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will not delay the House, but I will ask unanimous consent that if the Journal does show that this resolution was reported that it be corrected.

Mr. MANN. The Journal does show it, and also the RECORD shows it on page 537.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the Journal be corrected in that regard. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I also ask, Mr. Speaker, that the permanent RECORD be corrected in accordance with the fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The resolution and report will go to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### IMMIGRATION.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I have reported, by the instruction of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, House bill 6060. The committee directed me to ask unanimous consent that three days be given to the minority to file minority views.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the minority of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization may have three days in which to file minority views. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not think the gentleman ought to bring the matter up in the absence of the Member from New York.

The SPEAKER. But he has already brought it in, and it has been referred.

#### VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I know the House is weary from many long hours of hard work, but I hope that it will be considerate enough to remain in session a little while longer in order that we might get through with the consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 5, respecting vocational education. I therefore move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the further consideration of that resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-nine Members present; not a quorum.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 16, 1913, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact and conclusion in the case of Julia O'Brien, widow of Peter O'Brien, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 475); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact and conclusion in the case of Arren Bray v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 476); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact and conclusion in the case of Martha E. Adamson, administratrix of Gideon F. Mann, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 477); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, submitting an amend-



ment to the estimate of appropriation for construction of suburban roads, District of Columbia, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 478); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of documents received and distributed during the year 1913 (H. Doc. No. 479); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. IGOE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10308) to provide for the construction and repair of sidewalks in the District of Columbia, and for the assessment and payment of the cost thereof, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 135), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the Senate resolution (S. J. Res. 74) appropriating money for the payment of certain claims on account of labor, supplies, materials, and cash furnished in the construction of the Corbett tunnel, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 134), which said resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1051) to authorize the issuance of absolute and unqualified patents to public lands in certain cases, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 138), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6204) to promote the efficiency of the Public Health Service, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 139), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1057) to authorize the allowance of second homestead and desert entries, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 137), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURNETT, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 140), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6939) to reimburse Edward B. Kelley for moneys expended while superintendent of the Rosebud Indian Agency in South Dakota, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 133), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10505) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cause allotments to be made to Indians belonging and having tribal rights on the Morongo Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 10506) to provide for a site and public building at Reedsburg, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 10507) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire and dispose of private lands in connection with the operations under the reclamation act; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. FERGUSON: A bill (H. R. 10508) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant further extensions of time within which to make proof on desert-land entries in the county of San Juan, State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New York: A bill (H. R. 10509) providing for the resurvey of the harbor of Echo Bay (New Rochelle), N. Y., and a report thereon; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10510) providing for a resurvey of Mamaroneck Harbor, N. Y., and a report thereon; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10511) providing for the completion of the Port Chester Harbor (N. Y.) improvement; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: A bill (H. R. 10512) providing for the completion of the Harlem River Ship Canal in New York City; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10513) providing for the completion of the Bronx River (New York City) improvement; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10514) providing for the deepening and widening of the Bronx Kills, in the city of New York, creating a direct channel between Long Island Sound and the Harlem River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 10515) granting increased pay to rural letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DUPRE: A bill (H. R. 10516) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Bayou Barataria, La., and connecting waters to Barataria Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 10517) for the prevention and eradication of hog cholera; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 10518) to promote the safety of employees and passengers on railroads engaged in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 10519) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Camden, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 10520) securing and confirming to the adjoining landowners the titles acquired by adverse possession to certain lands within the grant heretofore made by the United States of parts of its public lands to the Central Pacific Railroad Co. of California for railroad right of way; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SAUNDERS: A bill (H. R. 10521) to provide for the construction, maintenance, and improvement of rural post roads through the cooperation and joint action of the National Government and the several States in which such rural post roads may be established; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 10522) to establish in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the bureau of highways, and to provide national aid in the construction, improvement, and maintenance of public highways in each State and Territory, and to provide funds for the same; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. PAGE of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 10523) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

By Mr. NEELY of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10524) providing for the appointment of a board for the purpose of selecting a suitable site for a naval armor plant in the Ohio Valley, in or near the city of Moundsville, in the county of Marshall and State of West Virginia, and to submit a report of the cost and availability of said plant; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: A bill (H. R. 10525) appropriating \$10,000 to be used by the Forest Service in the construction of a public road through a portion of the Medicine Bow Forest Reserve, in Larimer County, State of Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10526) to authorize the cities of Colorado Springs and Manitou, in the State of Colorado, to purchase certain lands for the protection of the source of their water supply; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10527) making appropriation for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Loveland, county of Larimer, State of Colorado; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10528) to provide for the erection of a public building at Waverly, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10529) declaring all highways in the several States used for the purpose of trans-

porting rural mail to be post roads, for the establishment of rural route and post roads and the improvement and maintenance of existing rural route and post roads under Federal authority, and creating a bureau of public post roads; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 10530) for the compensation of rural letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 10531) making an appropriation for continuing improvement on the Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La., and for maintenance of same; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10532) making an appropriation for continuing improvement on the Ouachita River, Ark. and La., and authorizing the construction of locks and dams Nos. 5 and 9; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 10533) directing the Secretary of War to pay to the Oregon State Board of Fish and Game Commissioners certain moneys, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 10534) to authorize a survey of Petaluma Creek, Cal.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 10535) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend sections 2291 and 2297 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to homesteads"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10536) amending the act approved May 11, 1912, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 10537) to reapportion and rearrange the judicial districts of Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10538) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make monthly settlements to all persons borne on the pension rolls; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 10539) for the improvement of grazing on the public lands of the United States and to regulate the same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 10540) providing for the eradication of the cotton boll weevil; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARLIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 10541) to acquire the manuscript of Charles Chaillé Long containing an account of the unveiling of the McClellan statue; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10542) providing for the segregation and apportionment of Indian tribal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 10543) for the establishment and construction of a coal depot, including underwater storage plant for the use of the United States Navy on the Bay of San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 10544) to amend an 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. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 10545) making an appropriation for continuing the work of road and bridge construction on the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10546) making an appropriation for the reconstruction of a part of the military road between Fort Washakie and Jacksons Hole in Wyoming; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10547) making an appropriation providing for repairs to buildings on the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 10548) to authorize the purchase of certain lands in the District of Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 10549) making an appropriation for the improvement of Baudette Harbor and River in Minnesota; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McDERMOTT: A bill (H. R. 10550) providing for the regulation, identification, and registration of automobiles engaged in interstate commerce, for the licensing of the operators thereof, for cooperation between the States and the Federal Government in such purposes, and for distributing the revenues arising hereunder between the States and the Federal Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10551) to prescribe the method for banks to compute interest on loans and prescrib-

ing punishment for its violation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10552) to limit the value of buildings used by banks for banking purposes and providing punishment for its violation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 10553) to provide for refunding to lawful claimants the proceeds of the cotton tax unlawfully collected; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10554) to increase the compensation of carriers on rural free-delivery mail routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10555) to amend sections 1 and 105 of the Judicial Code to provide for the appointment of a district judge, district attorney, and marshal for the western district of South Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 10556) to authorize the donation of certain unused and obsolete guns now at Chickamauga Park, Ga., to the village of Toronto, Ohio, for its park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 10557) to provide for the erection of a public building at Pikeville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 10558) to construct a sanitarium or hospital for the restricted Indians of the Creek and Seminole Tribes in that portion of Oklahoma formerly occupied by said Creek and Seminole Tribes and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10559) to construct a sanitarium or hospital for the restricted Indians of the Cherokee Tribe of Indians and the Confederate Tribes in northeast Oklahoma and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 10560) requiring telegraph companies to capitalize and punctuate certain telegraph messages in a specified manner; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 10590) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver two mounted bronze cannon on carriages to McIlwain Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Vandalia, Ill.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLAYTON: Resolution (H. Res. 348) authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to expend certain money, for purposes stated in House resolution 486, passed April 5, 1912; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HARRISON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 170) authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to invite the Governments of Great Britain and other countries to appoint representatives to join representatives of the United States to consider the question of eliminating the gambling features in agricultural and food products on the exchanges in such countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 171) providing for the appointment of a commission to consider the need of and to report a plan for the revision of the navigation laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 172) directing the Secretary of War to investigate and report to Congress at the earliest practicable time the advisability of the establishment of wireless telegraph stations along the Ohio River; 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. 10561) granting a pension to James A. Stephen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10562) granting a pension to Mary J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 10563) for the relief of Mrs. C. D. Corbin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10564) for the relief of Mary S. Corbin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10565) granting a pension to Henrietta Abney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10566) granting a pension to Medicus F. Day; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 10567) granting an increase of pension to Nesbitt L. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10568) granting a pension to Katherine Rodgers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 10569) granting an increase of pension to James Button; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10570) for the relief of the city of Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10571) for the relief of Davidson County, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 10572) granting a pension to Elsie A. Owen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 10573) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10574) granting an increase of pension to Millard F. De Geer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 10575) granting a pension to Nancy Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10576) granting a pension to Mary A. Slattery; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 10577) granting an increase of pension to John N. Eddinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 10578) for the relief of Dr. J. W. Stokes; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 10579) granting an increase of pension to Catharine A. Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 10580) granting an increase of pension to Albert M. Patrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 10581) for the relief of Patrick H. Wheat; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FERGUSON: A bill (H. R. 10582) granting a pension to Jose de J. Romero; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10583) granting a pension to Anna Pearce; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10584) for the relief of the heirs of Francisco Barela; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10585) for the relief of the heirs of Bonifacio Coca, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 10586) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George W. Riley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 10587) granting an increase of pension to Montville Cooksey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10588) granting an increase of pension to Major L. Middleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 10589) granting a pension to George W. Graves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 10591) for the relief of John A. Bingham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 10592) granting a pension to Rebecca Ann Hayes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10593) to amend an act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Causey for the benefit of Wiley Causey, approved March 3, 1901; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 10594) granting a pension to the Forsyth Scouts and to widows of the deceased members of said organization; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 10595) granting a pension to Anna A. Engel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 10596) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Bruck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10597) granting a pension to Joseph Bryant; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10598) granting a pension to Ella H. Candy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10599) granting a pension to Myrtle M. Dunham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10600) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Dunkley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10601) granting a pension to Lionelle Gottschall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10602) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Granger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10603) granting an increase of pension to William M. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10604) granting a pension to Dock Leach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10605) granting a pension to David Lightcap; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10606) granting a pension to James M. Lynch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10607) granting a pension to Francis P. McCue; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10608) granting a pension to Theodore J. McNally; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10609) granting an increase of pension to William W. Ramsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10610) granting a pension to Alice Ricketts; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10611) granting a pension to Alonzo A. Ruckman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10612) granting a pension to Martin W. Ryan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10613) granting an increase of pension to William Trew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10614) granting an increase of pension to George E. Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 10615) granting an increase of pension to Jacob L. McCoy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10616) for the relief of George R. Gary; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 10617) for the relief of J. A. Garland; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 10618) granting a pension to Carrie Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10619) granting a pension to Lucina Tigue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10620) granting a pension to Lyman Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10621) granting a pension to Mary M. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10622) granting a pension to Elmer E. Sprague; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10623) granting an increase of pension to Jason J. Tillyou; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10624) granting an increase of pension to Marshall L. Maxson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10625) granting an increase of pension to Frank M. Beyea; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10626) granting an increase of pension to Sylvanus Balcom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10627) granting an increase of pension to James A. S. Cull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10628) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Higgins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10629) granting an increase of pension to Silas H. Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10630) to correct the military record of Nelson T. Saunders; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 10631) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church of Normandy, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 10632) granting an increase of pension to William M. Hairston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 10633) granting a pension to J. M. Luck; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10634) granting a pension to John R. Hamilton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10635) granting a pension to Sallie C. Dowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10636) granting a pension to James W. Carr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10637) granting an increase of pension to Harmon L. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10638) granting an increase of pension to James N. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10639) granting an increase of pension to William Younger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10640) granting an increase of pension to Barnett Dillahay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10641) granting an increase of pension to Susan Read; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10642) granting an increase of pension to T. J. Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10643) for the relief of W. H. Mohler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10644) for the relief of Harde Chadwick, jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10645) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel Kimbro, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10646) for the relief of the estate of James B. Hallum; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10647) for the relief of the legal representatives of Joseph Chipman; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10648) for the relief of the legal representatives of William E. Nance; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10649) for the relief of the legal representatives of Isaac W. Baker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10650) for the relief of the legal representatives of Wilson Bloodworth; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10651) for the relief of the legal representatives of Alexander Harlin, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10652) authorizing the Secretary of War to recognize John M. Pearson as having been a member of Company F, Fifty-second Regiment Kentucky Mounted Volunteer Infantry, Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10653) to place the name of First Lieut. Joseph P. McKee on the unlimited retired list of the Army of the United States with rank and pay as a retired officer of the Regular Establishment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 10654) for the relief of Robert M. Adams, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10655) granting a pension to Samuel P. Kahler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 10656) granting a pension to Mary J. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 10657) granting a pension to Nancy J. Picklesimer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10658) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Fields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10659) granting an increase of pension to Frederick K. Murry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 10660) granting a pension to Sarah Hart North; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10661) granting an increase of pension to Paulina Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 10662) granting a pension to Eugene Belanger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 10663) granting an increase of pension to John Steele; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10664) granting a pension to Felix Hightower; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. METZ: A bill (H. R. 10665) for the relief of Mrs. H. O'Neill; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10666) for the relief of Charles Lauber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10667) for the relief of Patrick Burns; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10668) granting a pension to Walter B. Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10669) granting a pension to Joanna Steinborn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10670) granting an increase of pension to Moses Peterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10671) granting an increase of pension to Deborah A. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 10672) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Lee Coulling; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10673) granting an increase of pension to William H. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 10674) granting a pension to John C. Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 10675) for the relief of the State Board of Harbor Commissioners of the State of California; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 10676) granting an increase of pension to James Flanagan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10677) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Dunahey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 10678) granting an increase of pension to J. T. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10679) granting an increase of pension to Christianna Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 10680) granting a pension to Peter L. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10681) for the relief of H. N. Edom; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10682) for the relief of Robert T. Hill, James B. Hill, Thomas Spencer, and Ellis Spencer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: A bill (H. R. 10683) for the relief of John I. Brown & Son and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 10684) granting a pension to Thomas Lathrop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10685) granting a pension to Joseph H. Curbow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10686) granting a pension to Charles C. Mauch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10687) granting an increase of pension to Richard C. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10688) granting an increase of pension to Charles Muelbach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 10689) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Freed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 10690) granting an increase of pension to Warren Morrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10691) granting an increase of pension to Frank Libby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10692) granting an increase of pension to Henry Lemke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10693) for the relief of the legal representatives of George W. Soule; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 10694) for the relief of the legal representatives of Joseph and Newton Haynes, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10695) granting a pension to John Kennedy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10696) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Lewis Keaton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 10697) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 10698) granting an increase of pension to Moses Davison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10699) granting an increase of pension to Levi M. Winchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10700) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10701) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10702) granting an increase of pension to Henry O. Hayes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10703) granting an increase of pension to William Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10704) granting an increase of pension to Bernard Daffner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10705) granting an increase of pension to Joel H. Townner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10706) granting an increase of pension to David S. Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10707) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Storm; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10708) granting a pension to Ellen A. Chappell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10709) granting a pension to Ada E. Teeter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10710) granting a pension to Elizabeth P. Townsend; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10711) granting a pension to Percy D. Ganung; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10712) granting a pension to Mary E. Greiner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10713) granting a pension to Elizabeth Sawyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10714) granting a pension to Maria Scribner Plimpton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 10715) granting an increase of pension to Andrew L. Weatherford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 10716) granting an increase of pension to Seth Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10717) granting a pension to Earl W. Maitland; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10718) for the relief of F. D. Bain; to the Committee on Claims.



Also, a bill (H. R. 10719) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph P. Leiter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10720) to correct the military record of John D. Rex; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10721) to correct the military record of William Loar; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10722) for the relief of H. C. Owens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: Resolution (H. Res. 347) authorizing the Clerk of the House to pay witness fees and mileage to Henry W. Elliott and to Andrew F. Gallagher to and from the Seal Islands of Alaska for House Committee on Expenditures in the Departments of Commerce and Labor; to the Committee on Accounts.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petitions of the Merchants & Miners' Transportation Co., of Baltimore, Md.; Michael Bros., of Louisiana, Mo.; captains and chief engineers of the Hartford & New York Transportation Co.; and the Kings County Democratic Club, protesting against the passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136) in its present form; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also (by request), petition of G. Douglas Wardroff, favoring the passage of House bill 3330, for carrying the mail by aeroplane; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of officers of the United States employed in the service of the Southern Pacific Co. Atlantic Steamship Lines, protesting against the passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also (by request), petition of the Aero Club of America, of New York City, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 3393, to authorize the carrying of the mail by aeroplane; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of the Twentieth Century Club, of Detroit, Mich., favoring the passage of Senate bill 2739, known as the Newlands river-regulation and flood-prevention bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Edward M. Keating and other Philippine ex-soldiers, favoring the passage of House bill 3330, relative to increase in pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Twentieth Century Club, of Detroit, Mich., favoring the passage of the Newlands river-regulation and flood-prevention bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Twentieth Century Club, of Detroit, Mich., protesting against the use of the Hetch Hetchy Valley for the water supply for San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Manitowoc Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., protesting against the passage of the seamen's bill in its present form; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CURRY: Memorial of the city council of the city of Richmond, Contra Costa County, Cal., favoring the passage of House bills 9912 and 9913, providing for the control of the flood waters of the Sacramento River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the Chicago Peace Society, favoring international agreement for the suspension of the building of battleships; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the council of the city of Benton Harbor, Mich., and the Benton Harbor Development Co., protesting against the passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petitions of the Charlton Nursey Co., of Rochester; the Crisca Co.; and National Association of Master Steam and Hot Water Fitters of New York City, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Bartlett bill, for 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petition of citizens of the fourth district of the State of Kansas, favoring the passage of the Lindquist pure fabric and leather bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the council of the city of Benton Harbor, Mich., and the Benton Harbor Improvement Co., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 136 without proper distinction between Great Lakes transportation and ocean transportation; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Twentieth Century Club, of Detroit, Mich., protesting against granting the use of the waters of the

Hetch Hetchy Valley to the city of San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 10450, granting an increase of pension to Leander Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Twentieth Century Club, of Detroit, Mich., favoring the passage of Senate bill 2739, for the prevention of floods on the Mississippi; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GARNER: Petition of the business men of Aransas Pass, Tex., favoring the passage of House bill 5308, relative to mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Petitions of the Chicago Federation of Musicians and International Association of Bridge and Structural Iron Workers, Local Union No. 1, of Chicago, Ill., in favor of the passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Petition of citizens of Junction City, Lewisville, and Prescott, Ark., all favoring the passage of the Lindquist pure fabric and leather bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petitions of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange and the council of the city of Benton Harbor, Mich., protesting against the passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Twentieth Century Club of Detroit, Mich., favoring the passage of Senate bill 2739, known as the Newlands river-regulation and flood-prevention bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Twentieth Century Club of Detroit, Mich., protesting against the use of the Hetch Hetchy Valley for a water supply for San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Petition of the Olean (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the passage of the bill for flood protection; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of the citizens of the twenty-fifth Illinois congressional district, favoring the passage of the Lindquist pure fabric and leather bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Evidence in support of House bill 4916, for the relief of Sarah E. Hendricks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KONOP: Petitions of Racine Junction Advancement Association; Benton Harbor Development Co.; Muskegon Chamber of Commerce; Retail Merchants' Association of Racine; Commercial Club, of Sturgeon Bay; Frank Hamschek, of Keweenaw; Nick Kuffan, and others, of Wisconsin, protesting against the passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of residents of the District of Columbia, favoring the passage of legislation for a reform in the civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of the chamber of commerce, New Haven, Conn., favoring the passage of House bill 6282, the Harrison anti-narcotic bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the council of the city of Benton Harbor, Mich., and the Benton Harbor Development Co., protesting against passage of the La Follette seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Wethersfield Grange, of Wethersfield, Conn., protesting against free distribution of seeds by the Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, protesting against the passage of the seamen's bill in its present form; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of citizens of Shawneetown, Ill., favoring the passage of House bill 13853, of August, 1911, in behalf of Jacob Barger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Loyalty Council, No. 53, Daughters of Liberty, of Constantia, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation for the restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Benton Harbor (Mich.) Council, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 136, to increase the equipment and size of crews on all boats; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of residents of Carthage, N. Y., favoring the passage of an antipolygamy amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of the

Bartlett-Bacon bills (H. R. 1873 and S. 927); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of citizens of California, favoring the passage of the Lindquist bill, providing for the labeling and marking of fabrics, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of city council of Richmond, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation for improving the harbor at that place; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of San Francisco Labor Council, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of House bill 1873, to exempt labor organizations from the operation of the antitrust act as the latter has been interpreted and enforced by the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the secretary of the board of harbor commissioners of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation to establish a lighthouse at Point Vincento, Cal.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of the Twentieth Century Club, of Detroit, Mich., favoring the passage of Senate bill 2739, for the prevention of floods on the Mississippi; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the New Jersey Savings Bank Association, Orange, N. J., protesting against the elimination of section 27 of bill (H. R. 7837) relating to savings departments; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the New Jersey Bankers' Association, Jersey City, N. J., proposing certain changes in the proposed banking and currency bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the Rumson Borough Improvement Association and other citizens of the third congressional district of New Jersey, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 136 in its present form; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Twentieth Century Club, of Detroit, Mich., protesting against granting the use of the waters of the Hetch Hetchy Valley to the city of San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petition of Mrs. Orton H. Clark and 10 others of Kalamazoo, Mich., for the appointment of a committee on woman suffrage; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of the Association of Passenger and Steamboat Lines, of Chicago; Muskegon Chamber of Commerce, of Muskegon; board of directors of the Mendelssohn Club, of Detroit; C. H. Barrett, of Kalamazoo; Detroit Hotel Association, of Detroit; Detroit Rotary Club, of Detroit, Mich., protesting against the passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Memorial of 222 members of West Side Business Men's Association, protesting against the passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WATKINS: Petition of citizens of Webster Pass, La., protesting against the passage of House bill 9113, to regulate the shape of drug tablets; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of D. V. Disney and 100 other citizens of Delaware, Ohio, favoring legislation to extend control of the United States Government over nonnavigable waters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, December 16, 1913.

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

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

### CALLING OF THE ROLL.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Shafroth
Bankhead	Groanna	Myers	Sheppard
Brady	Hollis	Nelson	Sherman
Brandegee	Hughes	Norris	Simmons
Bristow	Jackson	O'Gorman	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	James	Page	Sterling
Burleigh	Johnson	Perkins	Sutherland
Burton	Kenyon	Pittman	Swanson
Chamberlain	Kern	Polindexter	Townsend
Chilton	La Follette	Pomerene	Vardaman
Clapp	Lane	Ramsdell	Walsh
Colt	Lea	Reed	Weeks
Crawford	Lewis	Robinson	Williams
Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	Works

Mr. KERN. I wish to state that the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] is detained from the Senate on account of illness. He is paired with the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. CULBERSON]. He is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SIMMONS. My colleague [Mr. OVERMAN] is detained from the Chamber on business of the Senate.

Mr. REED. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. STONE] is necessarily absent from the Senate and will probably be unable to attend to-day's session. I make the announcement now, to stand for the day.

Mr. KERN. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] is detained from the Senate on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. RANSDALL. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] is unavoidably absent. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] is absent from the Senate on important business.

Mr. WEEKS. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. LODGE] is absent on account of illness, and to have this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

### MEAT PRODUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I am going to ask for the printing in the RECORD of the document I send to the desk. I am not much given to putting extraneous matter in the RECORD, but I believe it relates to a matter of vital importance and that it should be published and distributed to some extent. There are a great many people who will see it in the RECORD who would not see it otherwise. It is a statement of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, relating to slaughter of animals from 1899 to 1909, a period of 10 years.

We all know that the production of animals during that time has decreased to a vast extent against a great increase of population, but this table shows that the average slaughter kept pace with the increase of population, 21.7 per cent, but the slaughter of hogs reached only an increase of 10.7 per cent.

What I wish to put before the Senate, in the hope that it may go to the country as a warning, is the fact that while the slaughter of beef cattle increased 46.9 per cent the slaughter of calves increased 183.4 per cent. I think it is time the American people began to wake up to the problem of food consumption and production as affected by this overwhelming increase in the slaughter of calves. Already we are contemplating legislation on the subject. I do not touch upon that, for I do not know how far we could go in that direction; but it did seem to me that it might warrant a place in the RECORD, that, so far as the RECORD comes under the observation of the public, this overwhelming increase in the slaughter of calves might be brought to the attention of the American people.

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

Mr. BURTON. I should like to ask by what bureau or person the table was prepared.

Mr. CLAPP. The Bureau of the Census, in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. BURTON. It is supplemental to their report contained in the last census report?

Mr. CLAPP. Certainly.

Mr. BURTON. And brings the figures down to date?

Mr. CLAPP. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. I recognize, Mr. President, the great importance of having statistics on this subject. The trouble has been the inaccuracy of many statements given out to the public. Four or five years ago certain figures were prepared which seemed to show that the number of cattle had kept pace with population and gave no indication which would justify an increase in price. The more recent figures, however, have more correctly described the situation.

I should like to know how long these figures were in preparation and to what extent we can rely on them.

Mr. CLAPP. I accept them as sent out by the bureau, to be released to the press on the 15th of this month, that period having elapsed.

While I am on my feet, in line with what the Senator has said I wish to state that the decrease in stock has simply been terrific in view of the increase of population. In the State of