

## NORTH CAROLINA.

J. Otho Lunsford, Durham.

## OHIO.

Frank C. Carey, Waynesville.  
 Mathew H. Darby, Deshler.  
 Charles B. Dechant, Lebanon.  
 William E. Gordon, Somerset.  
 Ambrose E. Hough, Hillsboro.  
 John S. Hummel, Wilmington.  
 Thomas Kyer, Jackson.  
 Isma H. Malick, Van Wert.  
 John L. Strange, Greenfield.  
 Charles A. Trinter, Vermillion.  
 George F. Zeller, Ottawa.

## OKLAHOMA.

John H. Anderson, Snyder.  
 J. P. McLarty, Wilburton.

## OREGON.

T. J. Tweedy, Pendleton.  
 Charles N. Wait, Canby.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

B. N. De France, Ellwood City.  
 Robert M. Foster, State College.  
 John M. Graham, Volant.  
 Phillip W. Miller, New Freedom.  
 M. D. Salyards, Pitcairn.  
 David B. Thomas, New Brighton.  
 William V. Wirtz, Albion.

## TEXAS.

W. F. Juliff, Granbury.

## UTAH.

Adelbert K. Huish, Payson.

## VERMONT.

Patrick Mahoney, Poultney.  
 Maurice J. Walshe, White-River Junction.

## WASHINGTON.

Arthur A. Barnes, Pasco.  
 S. S. Moritz, Dayton.  
 Helen R. Whitney, Wapato.  
 James M. G. Wilson, Waterville.

## WYOMING.

J. S. Van Doren, Casper.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, June 23, 1914.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

With inexpressible gratitude we bow in Thy holy presence, Father in heaven, for all the blessings vouchsafed unto us, especially for the faith, hope, love, which Thou hast woven into our being; indissoluble ties which bind us to Thee and to all mankind. Strengthen these qualities of soul that all the world may move forward to the ideal civilization in Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

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

## AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, in looking over the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill, which is printed in the Record of June 22, 1914, I find that the clerks of the two committees have made some errors in reference to page numbers, and in order to save the House confusion, and to aid the enrolling clerk, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the conference report and the papers in the case.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to withdraw the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill because of some arithmetical errors. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield for one moment?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, my attention was called to amendment No. 106, providing for the extension of the franking privilege. Does the gentleman contemplate having this report go back into conference?

Mr. LEVER. Not at all. Later I am going to present the report with the corrections made in it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think that amendment is subject to a point of order, because the committee went beyond its province.

The SPEAKER. That is a question that will arise when the conference report is up for consideration. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

## NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 14034, the naval appropriation bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee calls up the conference report on the naval appropriation bill, and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The conference report is as follows:

## CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 853).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14034) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 14, 15, 16, 18, 39, 42, 43, 44, 50, 54, 66, 68, 70, and 72.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 32, 41, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 56, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 69, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of said amendment, after the word "only," insert the following: "and officers of the Construction Corps"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out said amendment and in lieu thereof insert the following: "Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to detail such naval officers, not exceeding four, as may be necessary to the Hydrographic Office"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of Senate amendment insert the following: "June 30, 1917"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Under authority of the House granted to change totals not in conference, the committee on conference amended the bill as follows: Page 20 of the bill, line 21, strike out "\$170,000" and in lieu thereof insert "\$180,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "to be immediately available"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out Senate amendment and in lieu thereof insert the following: "Naval Proving Ground, Indianhead, Md.: Toward extension of powder factory (cost not to exceed \$500,000) \$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In said amendment strike out the following: "For fuel-oil storage, at some point accessible to the oil fields of Texas and Oklahoma, to be determined by the Secretary of the Navy, \$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In said amendment strike out the words "to be available until expended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Line 7 of said amendment, strike out "\$150,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of said amendment, after the word "men," insert the following: "of the Navy and Marine Corps"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the proviso in said amendment and in lieu thereof insert the following: "Provided, That such appointments shall be made in the order of merit from candidates who have in competition with each other passed the mental examination now or hereafter required by law for entrance to the Naval Academy, and who passed the physical examination required before entrance under existing law"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In line 1 of said amendment, after the word "type," insert the following: "to have a surface speed of not less than 20 knots"; in line 5 of said amendment, after the word "expended," strike out the comma, insert a period, and strike out the words "and the" and in lieu thereof insert "The"; in line 10 of said amendment, after the word "said," insert the words "eight or more"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out said amendment and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"Hereafter there shall be charged against the several appropriations for the support of the Naval Establishment the overhead charges incident to upkeep and to industrial work at navy yards and stations. The total sum so charged shall be distributed in accordance with the work done in the various yards and stations in order that the cost of work may be determined."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and the Senate agree to the same.

On the amendments of the Senate numbered 28, 29, 33, 40, and 71 the committee of conference have been unable to agree.

L. P. PADGETT,  
J. FRED. C. TALBOTT,  
THOMAS S. BUTLER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

B. R. TILLMAN,  
CLAUDE A. SWANSON,  
GEO. C. PERKINS,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

The Clerk read the statement, as follows:

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 14034) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and submitted by the accompanying report on the amendments of the Senate, namely:

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: Provide for an increase of \$104,000 in the appropriation "Contingent, Navy," to provide a fund for entertaining the officers and crews of foreign fleets which may be sent to attend and participate in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in consequence of the invitation of the President of the United States, extended in pursuance of the authority contained in the joint resolution approved February 15, 1911, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: Provides that tolls shall not be assessed against or collected from any war vessel of any foreign nation which may pass through the Panama Canal en route to or returning from the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, provided such vessel has been sent by its Government to attend and participate in said exposition, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 4: Provides that the Secretary of the Navy be authorized to define and establish suitable anchorage grounds in Hampton Roads and San Francisco Bay for the combined fleets of the United States and foreign Governments which may rendezvous in these waters during their attendance at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 5: Provides that officers who now perform engineering duty on shore only shall be eligible for any shore

duty compatible with their rank and grade to which the Secretary of the Navy may assign them, and the House recedes with an amendment by which officers of the Construction Corps and the officers above named are eligible for any shore duty to which the Secretary of the Navy may assign them.

Amendment No. 6: Increases the appropriation for recruiting from \$130,000 to \$150,000, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 7: Permits the employment of more than one advertising agency in advertising for recruits, and the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 8, 9, and 10: Extend to the Revenue-Cutter Service the right of any alien of 21 years of age and upward who may, under existing law, become a citizen of the United States and has served or may hereafter serve for four years in the Revenue-Cutter Service and receive therefrom an honorable discharge or an ordinary discharge with recommendation for reenlistment, to be admitted to become a citizen of the United States upon his petition without any previous declaration of his intention to become such, and without proof of residence on shore, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 11: Increases the appropriation for gunnery exercises from \$100,000 to \$115,000, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 12: Provides for the producing of American charts and sailing directions to replace those of foreign production, which now have to be purchased abroad, and for this purpose the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to detail such naval officers as may be necessary to the Hydrographic Office, and the House recedes with an amendment by striking out said amendment and in lieu thereof providing for the detail of not exceeding four naval officers to the Hydrographic Office.

Amendment No. 13: Provides that the pensions of beneficiaries of the naval home shall be disposed of in the same manner as prescribed for inmates of the soldiers' home, except that in case of death of any beneficiary leaving no heirs at law nor next of kin any pension due him shall escheat to the naval pension fund, subject to certain provisions, and the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 14, 15, and 16: Make certain appropriations in the Bureau of Ordnance "available until expended," and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 17: Makes the appropriations for "torpedoes and appliances" "available until expended." The House recedes with an amendment making that appropriation available until June 30, 1917.

Amendment No. 18: Includes the Naval Observatory in the appropriation "Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks," without increasing the appropriation, and the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20: Strike out the House provisions for building slips and equipment at navy yard, Boston, Mass., to cost \$148,000, and the provision whereby the unexpended balance under the appropriation "Marine barracks, Boston, Mass.," for the fiscal year 1914 is covered back into the Treasury, and provides that the unobligated balance under the appropriation "Marine barracks, Boston, Mass.," for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, not exceeding \$148,000, is made available for building slips and equipment at Boston, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 21: Increases the appropriation to complete Pier D from \$12,000 to \$25,000, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 22: Increases the limit of cost of Pier C from \$130,000 to \$150,000 with no increase in appropriation, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 23: Provides an appropriation of \$8,500 to extend the second floor mold loft in the navy yard, New York, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 24: Is a change of total and an increase of \$21,500.

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26: Provide for a "building slip and equipment" at the Philadelphia Navy Yard to cost \$200,000, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 27: Provides for a fireproof general storehouse, Washington Navy Yard, D. C., cost not to exceed \$225,000, with an appropriation of \$100,000, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 30: Increases the appropriation for dredging at navy yard, Charleston, S. C., from \$10,000 to \$20,000, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 31: Makes the sum of \$207,000 for improvement of hydraulics, Mare Island Straits, "to be immediately available," and provides an appropriation of \$20,000 for dredging and diking Mare Island Straits, and the House recedes with an amendment striking out the words "to be immediately available."

Amendment No. 32: Is a change of total.

Amendment No. 35: Provides for an appropriation of \$500,000 toward the extension of the powder factory at the Naval

Proving Grounds, Indianhead, Md., and the House recedes with an amendment whereby an appropriation of \$200,000 is made and a limit of cost of the extension to the powder factory is fixed at \$500,000.

Amendment No. 36: Provides for a fuel-oil storage, San Francisco, Cal., to cost \$100,000, and for a fuel-oil storage at some point accessible to the oil fields of Texas and Oklahoma, to cost \$150,000, and the House recedes with an amendment striking out the provision for oil storage at a point accessible to Texas and Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 37: Is a change of total and makes the whole appropriation "available until expended," and the House recedes with an amendment striking out the words "to be available until expended."

Amendment No. 38: Provides an appropriation of \$150,000 for naval disciplinary barracks at Puget Sound, Wash., and Port Royal, S. C., and the House recedes with an amendment reducing the appropriation to \$75,000.

Amendment No. 39: Places the Naval Observatory in the appropriation "Repairs and preservation at navy yards and stations" without increasing the appropriation, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 41: Allows the expenditure of \$40,000 from the naval hospital fund for the erection of such temporary structures and equipment of the naval hospitals at Mare Island and Puget Sound as may be necessary to relieve the crowded condition of those institutions and make special preparation for the sick of the Navy and visiting fleets at the time of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 42: Makes appropriation for "Transportation of remains" available until expended, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 43: Provides for an increase of pay of the dental surgeon at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., of \$200 per year based upon 15 years' service at this institution as a civilian dentist, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 44: Excludes the men of the Navy that are detailed for duty with the naval militia in being counted in the enlisted strength of the Navy, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 45: Provides that the number of enlisted men of the Navy shall be construed to mean the daily average number of enlisted men in the naval service during the fiscal year, and the House recedes with an amendment making the provision apply to the enlisted men of the Marine Corps as well as the Navy.

Amendments Nos. 46, 47, and 48: Provide for an increase in the corps of chaplains in the Navy by allowing 1 chaplain to each 1,250 of the total personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, which increases the number now allowed by law from 24 to 52, and also provides for a probationary period in the grade of acting chaplain of three years' sea service on board ship before a commission is granted. The amendment provides for no increase in the pay of chaplains, but only increases the number, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 49: Permits the accounting officers of the Treasury to allow the members of the Nurse Corps the amounts which have been checked against them for commutation of subsistence under the decisions of the comptroller dated December 21, 1912, and April 29, 1913, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 50: Provides that the amounts credited to the naval supply account from stores, equipage, and supplies turned in from ships be "available until expended," and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 51: Provides that the Secretary of the Navy be authorized in his discretion to issue free of cost the national flag used for draping the coffin of any officer or enlisted man of the Navy or Marine Corps whose death occurs while in the service of the United States, upon request, to the relatives of the deceased officer or enlisted man, or, upon request, to the school, patriotic order, or society to which the deceased officer or man belonged, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 52: Is a change of verbiage without any change of effect, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 54: Provides that unobligated and unexpended balances of the appropriation "Steam machinery" shall be "available until expended," and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 55: Provides that there may be appointed annually, from the enlisted men of the Navy who are citizens of the United States and not more than 20 years of age and who have served not less than one year, 15 enlisted men to the United States Naval Academy, to be selected in the order of merit by competitive examinations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, and such men so selected are required to pass the physical and mental examination now required by law for entrance to the Naval Academy, and the House recedes with an amendment by which the candidates are selected in the order

of merit as a result of competition in the examination now or hereafter required by law for entrance to the Naval Academy.

Amendment No. 56: Strikes out the provision which provides \$200,000 for building slips and equipment in order to equip a navy yard for building a battleship, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 57: Provides for the submarine boats by lumping the appropriations provided by the House and makes the appropriations available until expended, and the House recedes with an amendment which restricts the speed of the seagoing submarine to not less than 20 knots on the surface.

Amendment No. 58: Is a change of verbiage without any change of effect, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 59: Provides that the Secretary of the Navy in estimating the actual cost of a ship built by the Government may deduct from the estimated cost of such ship as built under the appropriation therefor any sums which he deems not to be just to be charged thereto, and the House recedes, with an amendment whereby the various appropriations for the support of the naval establishments may be charged with the overhead charges incident to upkeep and industrial work at navy yards and stations, and the sums so charged to be distributed in accordance with the work done at the various yards and stations so that the cost of work may be determined.

Amendment No. 60: Is a change of verbiage, owing to a previous amendment, without any change in effect, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 61: Strikes out building slips and equipment under the appropriation "Construction and machinery," and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 62: Strikes out the word "steam," making the appropriation apply to all kinds of machinery as well as steam machinery, and the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 63, 64, and 65: Make appropriations under "Increase of the Navy" available until expended, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 66: Provides an appropriation of \$8,000 for a correction of acoustics of the United States Naval Academy chapel and auditorium, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 67: Provides for a committee to investigate the cost of the erection of an armor plant to enable the United States to manufacture its own armor plate and special-treatment steel, and gives said committee authority to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and appropriates the sum of \$5,000 for the expense of said committee, and the House agreed, with an amendment whereby the committee is to be composed of the chairmen of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and one naval officer, to be selected by the Secretary of the Navy, to investigate and report at the next regular session of Congress upon the cost of erection of an armor plant of both 20,000 and 10,000 tons capacity to enable the United States to manufacture its own armor plate and special-treatment steel. The committee is given authority to sit during the recess of Congress and to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths. The sum of \$5,000 is appropriated to defray the expenses of the committee; and the Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House.

Amendment No. 68: Makes a total "available until expended," and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 69: Is a change of total, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 70: In the paragraph in the House bill which limited all appropriations for the procuring of any vessels, armament, articles, or materials which the navy yards, gun factories, or other industrial plants operated by the Navy Department are equipped to supply to procuring them from Government plants, the Senate struck out the requirement that Government plants be "operated approximately at their full capacity for not less than one regular shift each working day, except when contract costs are less than costs in said Government plants," and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 72: Makes all appropriations contained in the bill immediately available, and the Senate recedes.

The committee of conference has been unable to agree on the following amendments:

Amendment No. 28: Navy yard, Norfolk, Va., new dry dock (cost not to exceed \$3,000,000), \$200,000.

Amendment No. 29: In all navy yard, Norfolk, Va., \$225,000.

Amendment No. 33: Naval station, Key West, Fla.: toward construction of breakwater (limit of contract, \$600,000), \$100,000.

Amendment No. 40: Change of total.

Amendment No. 71: Provides that the President may, in his discretion, direct the sale in such manner, at such price, and upon such terms as he shall deem proper, of the battleships

*Idaho and Mississippi.* All moneys received from the sale of said vessels shall, after payment therefrom of the expenses of such sale, be deposited by the Secretary of the Navy in the Treasury, and shall, until expended, be available for the construction of such other vessel or vessels, at least equal for the purposes of offense and defense to the most modern vessels of the same class now projected here or abroad, as the President may in his discretion authorize: *Provided*, That no vessel shall be sold, exchanged, or conveyed under this authorization unless such sale, exchange, or conveyance, or the agreement therefor, shall have been made prior to July 1, 1915: *Provided further*, That any vessel constructed from the money received from the sale of the *Mississippi* and *Idaho* shall not be included in the annual appropriation for the increase of the Navy; and the Senate recedes.

L. P. PADGETT,  
J. FRED. C. TALBOTT,  
THOMAS S. BUTLER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

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

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The conference report was not read, but the statement was. On amendment No. 71, in reference to the sale of the battleships, the statement of the conferees is that the Senate recedes.

Mr. PADGETT. That is a mistake in the statement. I had not noticed it in the printed report. That is not in the conference report.

Mr. MANN. It might be a very serious mistake where the conference report is not read and the statement is, and the statement of the conferees is that the Senate recedes from the amendment which is in controversy and from which the Senate does not recede.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know how that got into the statement of the conferees. I had not noticed it. It is a misprint in some way.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the gentleman another question. What is the purpose and what is the effect of amendment No. 5, that officers who now perform engineering duty on shore only shall be eligible for any shore duty compatible with their rank and grades to which the Secretary of the Navy may assign them? In that respect the conferees went beyond their jurisdiction, but I did not make the point of order. I would like to know what the effect of it is.

Mr. PADGETT. In the personnel bill of 1899 there were certain officers in the engineer corps when it was amalgamated with the line that were limited to shore duty only in engineering. These men have been working and developing, and the department recommended that they should be allowed to be assigned to any shore duty and not to any sea duty to which they would be capable of being assigned.

Mr. MANN. And it will keep a few more of them on shore?

Mr. PADGETT. These are limited to shore duty, anyway. They can not go to sea by the act of 1899. This is simply to broaden the work to which they can be assigned on shore duty.

Mr. MANN. I suppose it will make more of them if they have to do something else.

Mr. PADGETT. No. They are the same ones. This does not increase the number. The number is decreasing all the while as they get older and retire under the retirement law.

Mr. MANN. Is that true also of the construction corps?

Mr. PADGETT. No. This is to broaden the work of the construction corps. It was to allow the Secretary to use the members of the construction corps in the navy-yard work. There is a shore duty anyway, and they are among the very best qualified men we have, and we inserted it for the purpose of giving the Secretary authority to assign these construction men to industrial work in the navy yards.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand that under the existing law they can not be put at work in reference to construction; that is, actual construction?

Mr. PADGETT. As I understand it, only in the hull department.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do further insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 28.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that the House further insist on its disagreement to amendment of the Senate No. 28.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—yeas 54, noes 1.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, amendment numbered 29 is a change of total. I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to amendment numbered 29.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 29.

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

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 33, naval station, Key West, Fla.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 33.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] wishes 10 minutes, and I yield that time to the gentleman.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and the House conferees could have seen their way clear ere this to accept the Senate amendment, for, in my judgment, that amendment provides for work very much needed and which ought to be done without any further, or at least without any great, delay. The answer to that statement may be that the Secretary of the Navy has not recommended this appropriation; that is, that the present Secretary has not done so. I wish to say, however, in response, if the claim is made, that Secretary Meyer just before his term of office expired—I think in December, 1912—recommended to the chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs in very strong language this very improvement, and since then I have seen nothing coming from the Navy Department recalling or superseding that recommendation. The recommendation of Secretary Meyer is contained in a letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs of December 7, 1912, in which, after stating several different kinds of work which he thought should be done at the naval station at Key West, work which he said was of very great importance, he goes on to say:

Further developments of the naval station and adjacent water front will be of little value unless at least a semi-enclosed basin is provided, not only as a protection against heavy seas and hurricane winds, but to make it possible to retain the dredged depth at piers and along the water front. Under existing conditions storms from a southerly direction carry sand around Fort Taylor, rapidly filling in such areas as have already been dredged.

Now, this work for which the Senate amendment provides, and which the then Secretary thought of very great importance, must be done, he said, before the other necessary works can be undertaken. In other words, they must be held up until the breakwater is completed and the harbor finished. Further on in the same letter he says:

With these harbor improvements assured, the department contemplates the systematic development of the navy yard at Key West for the purposes outlined in paragraph 1 of this letter.

Now, that letter is inserted in the hearings had before the committee last winter when that body was gathering material for the preparation of the naval bill, the one now under consideration. Admiral Stanford, then testifying before the committee, after this letter was produced, and I presume read, further said:

The sea wall and pier has recently been completed by the Navy at a cost of nearly \$200,000. Last March there was a depth of water off the face of the wall varying from 3 to 6 and 8 feet. The Navy has also recently completed the construction of marine ways; last March the outer end of the ways was embedded in sand, which made it impracticable to use the ways as expected. There is absolutely no protection at the station against storms from the south or from any western point of the compass, either against the direct force of the wind or from the sea which a storm would produce, and it is necessary for all small craft in time of storm to run for protection to an anchorage 2 or 3 miles distant, which requires that vessels shall constantly maintain steam pressure or that towing craft shall be available for the assistance of vessels which do not have their own steam. This adverse condition not only affects the navy yard, but also other departments of the Government which have property located in the immediate vicinity along a stretch of about 4,000 linear feet of sea front.

There is the War Department (Fort Taylor); the Treasury Department, with its Marine-Hospital Service; the Department of Agriculture has a small area; a pier is used by the Department of Commerce and Labor for lighthouse service; and included in the Navy tract is an area utilized by the Post Office Department for post office and customhouse. All of these departments, with the exception, possibly, of the Weather Bureau, have their small craft that require protection in time of storm and a depth of from 20 to 22 feet of water along the frontage for most efficient service.

After this sea wall is constructed it is contemplated to do some dredging there which, it is said, will increase the depth to some 22 or 23 feet, the purpose being to make it a harbor for the protection not only of Government property but naval and other Government vessels assembling there. Further on the admiral said:

Breakwater protection is absolutely necessary for the good not only of the Navy Department, but for all the other departments of the Government which are interested in this bit of water front.

There was also a board appointed in the spring of last year for the purpose of inspecting the navy yard at Key West and four or five other southern stations and yards. That board made its report in August following its appointment.

On this report, after mentioning the different Government properties at Key West, the board says:

95. The entire water front of the naval station, including the naval piers already constructed, the Lighthouse Establishment pier, and the Army wharf at Fort Taylor, are entirely unprotected from heavy seas from a southerly direction. In fact, these berths are dangerous during heavy weather, except when the wind is blowing from the north to the southeast. During 1909 and 1910 there were two hurricanes when the velocity of the wind reached for a brief time 80 to 100 miles an hour from directions producing the most dangerous conditions to vessels moored or berthed in this locality.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there could be stronger reasons given for an improvement in the interest of our Naval Establishment or for the improvement of a naval station, I am at a loss to know what they would be.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. I yield the gentleman five minutes additional.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the gentleman. Perhaps I may not use all the time given me. This is a very important station from many viewpoints. Its strategic value is of the very highest. I risk nothing in saying that there is no naval station south of Hampton Roads on the Atlantic or on the entire Gulf coast of more importance, and I doubt if there is one in the whole country of greater value, everything considered, than the naval station at Key West. A fleet assembled there—it need not be battleships, either—could in time of war, by reason of its ability to control the Straits of Florida, protect not only the entire Gulf of Mexico but the Yucatan Channel, and, in connection with the naval station at Guantanamo, protect the Panama Canal as well.

Mr. Speaker, there are few vulnerable points in the United States, including all her possessions. But there are some, and one of them, perhaps the most vulnerable, at the same time one of the greatest importance, is the Panama Canal, costing nearly a half billion of dollars, and cheap enough at that. It is to be among the greatest maritime highways of the world, an important aid to commerce in time of peace, but a source of anxiety and solicitude in time of war. This waterway we must protect at all hazards, and we can not afford to neglect anything that will add to its security, certainly not as important a factor as a naval base, at which a fleet can be assembled with power to control one of the approaches to this canal. Key West furnishes such a station and should be improved, if for no other reason, because of that fact.

Another reason—one which I have just mentioned—is the element of protection this station affords to the commerce of the Gulf of Mexico and the long stretch of coast line from the Straits of Florida around to the Rio Grande, including the many harbors dotting that coast and the navigable rivers flowing into the Gulf, chief among which is that of the great Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion before to present to this House the importance of the naval station at Key West. When the naval appropriation bill for 1910 was under consideration, speaking of certain other important improvements, the most of which have, I believe, since been made, I said, among other things:

There is no more important highway of commerce than the Straits of Florida. Through it passes nearly all the commerce that goes into or comes out of the Gulf of Mexico, and through it will go a large part of the commerce passing through the Panama Canal when that waterway is completed. Certainly it is important to protect this commerce in time of war, and this can easily be done by making Key West a first-class naval station and using it as a naval base when, if at all, war should come upon us. With an adequate fleet stationed there and scouting vessels patrolling the Straits of Florida it will be impossible for a hostile fleet to pass through without encountering and destroying ours, a thing not likely to happen if we keep on strengthening our Navy, as is proposed in this bill.

From this base we could also easily control the channel between Cuba and Yucatan, and thus protect the commerce of the entire Gulf. Assuredly, then, this strait should be improved as rapidly as possible, for while we hope war will not come, it may do so at any time.

The necessity for these improvements are fully set forth in documents from which I have quoted, and while the first is three years old the same reasons urged then in favor of Key West as a naval base are potent to-day. I therefore hope that, if not in this bill, at least in some

measure passed at this session of Congress a substantial appropriation will be made to continue the work there. The station has already cost nearly \$2,000,000, while the property secured and owned by the Government at that place is now worth a great deal more, but some of it is liable to depreciate and appropriations already made lost to the Government if something is not done at an early date. It would therefore be the height of folly to postpone further the making of the necessary appropriations to continue this work.

All this I now reiterate. Certainly few, if any, other places can make such a showing from a strategic standpoint, and yet in the face of all this and of the strong recommendation, yes, the urgent appeals of the experts of the Navy Department, the Committee on Naval Affairs hesitates to make the improvement greatly needed in time of peace, but which would be an absolute necessity in time of war.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not myself intend to ask for a separate vote on this proposition, because I doubt if it would carry. I do not know that by asking for a separate vote I would embarrass anyone here, but I do not care to do this. Certainly I would not like to embarrass my friend the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. Besides, I always prefer to sustain the committee whenever I can. All I desire to do is to call the attention of the House with that of the committee on conference to the matter, to emphasize, if I may, the importance of this work, so that when the conferees get back into conference they may have my views with whatever of little value, if any, they possess. Mr. Speaker, I believe that is all I desire to say.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield me 10 minutes?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I will concede that there are many naval stations that should be abolished, but I will not concede that all the naval stations on the Gulf coast should be wiped out by the Navy Department. Pensacola, the deepest-water station in the United States, has been wiped off of the map. Two months ago when it was thought that this country was going to become involved in war with Mexico, the gentleman from Tennessee, representing the Navy Department, came upon the floor of this House and asked that there be resurrected an old appropriation for the New Orleans Navy Yard that had been abandoned several years. New Orleans has been abandoned as a station. When war confronted us the necessity of the station was urgent. It is proposed to take the last station on the Gulf coast. Having wiped out Pensacola and New Orleans, now they propose to also abandon Key West. I do not know the merits of this particular project, but I do know that there is a movement on foot to cripple and destroy this yard.

Mr. Speaker, it is conceded by all naval experts that when we have war it will in all probability be on the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea on account of the Panama Canal. And yet we wipe out all of the strategic places on the southern coast of the United States without any consideration of the future whatever, and I do not think it is right. When the American Navy is called upon to protect the southern coast and the Panama Canal there should be a station for repairs near the scene of action. Key West is a splendid navy yard, and, used as a torpedo station, the torpedo fleet can protect that section and can also in a measure protect the Panama Canal from attack through the Gulf route. The Navy Department places much stress on a station at Guantanamo. Did you ever think of the fact that Guantanamo is on foreign territory? Cuba does not belong to the United States. Besides, Guantanamo protects the southern end of Cuba and the southern side of the waters that lead to the Panama Canal. Now, suppose you wipe out Key West. Then the enemy would not undertake to go around the southern end of Cuba by way of Guantanamo, where there is a station being established, to attack the canal, but the enemy would go around the northern end of Cuba unmolested, there being no fleet and no station at Key West, Pensacola, New Orleans, or anywhere else to protect the southern coast and protect the Panama Canal by that route. We should think well before we wipe out all the stations on the southern coast. I am not willing to concede that the chairmen of the committees are always right. I am not willing to yield my convictions and surrender my rights on the floor of this House. Everybody must admit that all the navy yards in the South are being wiped out. None of them are being abandoned anywhere else, and yet, as I said in the beginning, those who are versed in naval affairs say that in case of war the enemy will most surely confront us on the Gulf coast and Caribbean Sea.

Mr. Chairman, I rose only for the purpose of voicing my protest against the policy of the Navy Department to abandon all the navy yards and stations on the Gulf and southern coasts. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON].

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to answer the protest of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] and the remarks of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN]. This idea that you must have a navy yard or naval station at a certain place in order that that territory may be protected is all nonsense. The ocean is so big that you can not put a fleet anywhere that there will not be plenty of room for a hostile fleet to go way around it and get around it without being seen. It is an impossibility to arrange things so that you will have a fleet at every point on the ocean where a hostile fleet can not pass. The truth is the naval experts have explained to the committee that under the conditions that now exist, if we should ever have war with any nation, the first thing the nation's fleet that is at war with us would do would be to hunt our fleet, and it would not make any difference where it was. It would not make any difference whether our fleet was on the Florida coast, at Galveston, on the New England coast, or where it was. The first thing the enemy's fleet would do, according to these naval experts, would be to search the ocean until it found our fleet. It would never try to take any particular port or city, because they are all defended by immense guns, and a hostile fleet attempting to take it would run the risk of having a number of its ships destroyed and others disabled, and therefore be compelled to fight our fleet in a crippled condition. That is the reason given by the experts why we need never have any fear of any naval assault on any part of our coast until the enemy has first destroyed our fleet. And that being so, it is all foolishness to talk about having naval stations and navy yards so thick along every part of the American coast that you could have a fleet ready there to defend that part of the coast against a hostile fleet.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do you call naval stations very thick when there is a distance between Charleston, S. C., and Key West, of nearly 1,000 miles?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Oh, yes; I recall that fact. That is just what ought to be the fact. The truth is we have too many navy yards and too many naval stations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Possibly up North, but not down South, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Speaker, that is the reason we are squandering so many millions of the people's money without any reason. The truth is that this idea of having naval stations on the Mexican coast and the Florida coast, a truth that seems to have been discovered exclusively by my two colleagues from the South, is an erroneous one. Why do not some of these gentlemen from the Pacific coast, or gentlemen from the New England coast discover that? Why can they not see it?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman let me answer?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. TRIBBLE. The gentlemen from the other sections of the country are taking good care of the eastern coast and the western coast. We from the South propose to take care of the South.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. They are actuated by the same selfish motives.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I have no selfish motive in Florida whatever.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I stand, Mr. Speaker, for the American Union, the whole country, and I have no patience with this sectional selfishness that is always trying to raid the Treasury for some section.

Now, I am a southern man, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] have not got in their hearts any love for the South that is stronger and tenderer than the love within my own breast, and if you have got to waste millions of dollars somewhere I would prefer that you waste it down on the Mississippi coast, if it must be wasted. [Laughter.] But I protest against the selfishness that dominates the policy of the American Navy. There is no reason why you should have navy yards scattered from Frenchmans Bay to the Rio Grande, and the argument made here that you ought to have them so that you could have a fleet at every point, ready to defend that point against a hostile attack, has no reason in it.

I have no doubt my friends are sincere. I have no doubt they believe it. But there are a great many things that we believe honestly that we would not believe if it were not for the dominance of selfishness in our hearts. If it were not for the expenditure of money on the southern coast, you would not find southern men asking you to waste money on that coast. [Applause.]

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

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to disclaim any spirit of selfishness whatever in the remarks I have made or in the position I have taken with reference to this matter. Certainly no political consideration can actuate me, for while Key West is now in my district it will not be in the district I shall represent in the next Congress if I am fortunate enough to be re-elected to this body. The State has been redistricted and Key West has been taken out of the district which I have had the honor to represent heretofore, so that I will profit nothing politically or otherwise by the position I am taking. I am doing this in the interest of the whole country, and I trust solely from patriotic motives.

My friend from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] seems never to have heard of naval bases, never to have known that there is a necessity for a naval base wherever naval operations are to be had. I have no sectional feeling, Mr. Speaker, but try to look at all matters from a national standpoint. Members of this House know that. For a number of years I have been a member of a committee having to do with the improvement of the rivers and harbors throughout the country, and I think those who have watched my course with reference to those matters will credit me with having been actuated by no feeling of selfishness or sectional considerations, but by a desire to help the whole country.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that there are many naval stations and navy yards other than that at Key West, some of which it seems to me might well be abolished. But if there is anything in the idea of naval bases, if there is any necessity for naval stations where naval vessels may go in time of stress, or when crippled in action, or in any other way, for the purpose of repair, for the purpose of coaling or taking on supplies, then Key West presents the ideal conditions for such a station, a fact that should be recognized by Congress, as it has been by the naval experts.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say in reply.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Florida yield to me for a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will.

Mr. MOORE. I believe, if there was a necessity for a naval base at Key West, it would be a matter of regret to all of us if, when we found that necessity existing, we had no naval base there. I do not regard this proposition as a sectional matter at all. I would like to ask the gentleman what is the opinion of the Navy Department concerning this particular project?

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I said at the outset, Secretary Meyer, in a letter addressed to the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs on December 7, 1912, very strongly recommended the work for which this amendment would provide. He went on in that letter to mention other classes of work which he proposed to do—other improvements which he proposed to make there—but he wanted this work done first, so as to protect the later improvements and other Government interests at that place.

Mr. MOORE. Where is the nearest naval base to that point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. At Charleston, S. C.

Mr. MOORE. Charleston, S. C., which is, perhaps, not one of the best on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There is one also at Pensacola, of course, on the Gulf side.

Mr. MOORE. Then Pensacola is nearest on the Gulf side and Charleston nearest on the Atlantic side?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Now, may I ask whether the present Navy Department has expressed itself on this Key West project?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand that the present Secretary has not given expression to any views on this subject as yet.

Mr. MOORE. Then the matter really comes up without any special recommendation from the Navy Department as it stands to-day?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; except the recommendation from Secretary Meyer, which, as I understand, is still pending before the committee. As I am advised, it has not been withdrawn or superseded by any other recommendation.

In addition to that, I wish to say that the Navy board, appointed especially for the purpose of investigating all such matters, recommended very strongly the work for which this amendment provides, and Admiral Stanford, when before the committee at the time it was having hearings for the purpose of

preparing this bill, spoke very strongly in favor of this particular work.

Mr. MOORE. How far is Pensacola from Key West?

Mr. SPARKMAN. About 450 or 500 miles.

Mr. MOORE. And how far is Charleston on the other side from Key West?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should say about 800 miles.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] was very unfair to me in charging that I have selfish motives in this matter. I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that he lives 200 miles nearer to Key West than I do. I live about 600 miles from Key West station; and so far as sectionalism is concerned, I did not inject that issue into this question.

But I am here to say to you that when the interests of the Philadelphia Navy Yard at League Island are at stake you find present here and active Mr. Moore and Mr. Lee and other Members from that section, and when the Norfolk Navy Yard is under discussion you find Mr. Holland and Mr. Jones and other Members from Virginia and that section present and active, and when the navy yards on the Pacific coast are under discussion and their interests are at stake you find the Representatives from the Pacific coast here on guard and representing the interests of that section. I want to say to you on the floor of this House to-day that I am not ashamed of the fact that I am from the South, and I am not ashamed of the fact that I represent the interests of the South and the whole Union when I come here and tell you that the navy yard at Pensacola has been wiped out, that the navy yard at New Orleans has been wiped out, and that when the navy yard at Key West is wiped out the last vestige of this class of naval protection on the Gulf coast will be gone.

When the chairman of this committee came before this House two months since and requested that the navy yard at New Orleans be hastily put in order for emergency in case of war with Mexico my attitude on this question was thoroughly and completely vindicated.

I am not here to-day taking a new position. For three years, ever since I have been a member of the Naval Committee, I have stood on the floor of this House and advocated the same position which I take now. I think there is more coast line from Charleston to the Rio Grande than there is from Charleston to Maine. I may be mistaken in that statement, but I do not think I am, and in that whole territory there is not one efficient navy yard. I am not prepared to say how many there are between Charleston and Maine, but I am satisfied there are 10 or 12. I am not raising any sectional question. I am simply pleading for what is right, and pleading for the whole country.

Mr. MOORE. Is the gentleman familiar with the navy yard at New Orleans?

Mr. TRIBBLE. No; I am not, except from such information as I have received as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. MOORE. The New Orleans Navy Yard is practically out of commission.

Mr. TRIBBLE. That is true, and has been for a number of years.

Mr. MOORE. No very great effort has been made to build up a yard there.

Mr. TRIBBLE. That is true.

Mr. MOORE. Has the gentleman been to Pensacola?

Mr. TRIBBLE. No.

Mr. MOORE. There is practically nothing there.

Mr. TRIBBLE. There is nothing there, so I am informed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. I have been at New Orleans and Pensacola, and I want to confirm what the gentleman says. Having visited these stations, and being somewhat familiar with the southern Atlantic coast, it has seemed to me that that section of the country might properly ask to be protected. It has been suggested that in the event of a great naval war the West Indies would be a base of operations for foreign nations. Therefore it is not unreasonable that we should have an adequate naval base somewhere around the Florida coast. It is highly important that there should be a naval station somewhere about

the Gulf or at the lower end of the south Atlantic coast line. I am trespassing upon the gentleman's time—

Mr. TRIBBLE. Oh, no; I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. The only question in my mind is whether the Navy Department itself has so indorsed or recommended this proposition that the House can act upon it to-day. It seems to me to be evident to any man who visits that section of the country that there ought to be protection there. New Orleans has been neglected. Pensacola is one of the most beautiful stations in the country, but it is now wiped out, so far as active operations are concerned, as the gentleman has said. Charleston is not one of the best equipped yards of the country. Hence there is very little south of Norfolk all the way around to the Mississippi.

Mr. TRIBBLE. As a matter of truth, Key West, Pensacola, and New Orleans have been practically wiped out.

I am not here representing any section of this Union. In a broad and patriotic sense the Representatives from Maine and California are as much interested to-day in the Gulf Coast States as they are in any other section of the Union. From a patriotic standpoint I am as much interested in other sections of the Union as I am in the South. I have never understood why these navy yards on the Gulf coast should be abandoned. I can give no justification for that recommendation of the Navy Department, nor can anyone else.

I do not feel justified in withholding my views simply because some of my colleagues on the committee from the South do not agree with my views on naval policy. No yards have been abandoned elsewhere, and I contend that the yards most needed are the ones selected for abandonment.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used 25 minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I simply rise for the purpose of resenting the insinuation made by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] that those of us who have advocated improvements for local yards are actuated by selfish motives. So far as I am concerned, I want nothing for the Virginia yard that is not best for the country and best for the Navy. I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that there are other men in this body just as patriotic as he is. There are other men in this body who are broad enough to see the necessity for improvements outside of the limits of their own particular States. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to invite the attention of the House to the facts in this case just for a minute or two, and to get away from the sentimental questions that have been discussed.

In the first place, this matter is not asked for or estimated for by the department. In the second place, we are not abolishing Key West or depriving it of anything that it has. This is the beginning of a project for \$1,690,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. When the gentleman says it is not asked for by the department, he means only to say that it has not been estimated for by the department for this bill.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. It has not been estimated for, and there has been no request for it from the department at this time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I dare say the gentleman means that there has been no request from the present Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; that is exactly what I mean.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But I wish to ask, further, if he has recommended against the improvement?

Mr. PADGETT. I will state that we had it up two years ago, when Mr. Meyer submitted it, and we did not favorably report it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is not an answer to the question I propounded.

Mr. PADGETT. I know. The gentleman has kept asking me questions—

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not wish to embarrass my friend at all, but I wish to get the facts before the House.

Mr. PADGETT. I was just stating that fact.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wished to find out whether there had been any recommendation which had superseded or taken the place of the recommendation made by Secretary Meyer two years ago.

Mr. PADGETT. No; he sent no official communication. I have talked with the Secretary personally, but I do not care to involve any other matter.

Now, this is only the beginning of this project. We are not taking away from Key West anything that they have. We are

declining to go into this project. Gentlemen talk about the fleet gathering at Key West, but the water is so shallow that a battleship or a cruiser can not get within 3 miles of the naval station at Key West. I have a plan showing the proposed breakwater, and the water runs from 5 to 10, 17, 20, and 15 feet, and 20 feet is the deepest water that is inside of the proposed breakwater or artificial harbor. A battleship requires from 33 to 35 feet to go in safely, and this proposition only gives them, at a cost of \$1,690,000, a harbor to accommodate submarines and torpedo boats, which does not contemplate a fleet at all—only a proposed dredging to 20 or 22 feet where they can go.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I distinctly stated that I did not refer to battleships going into Key West.

Mr. PADGETT. I was referring to what the gentleman from Georgia said in regard to the fleet assembling there.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I referred mainly to the torpedo fleet and other small naval vessels, which would be of great value there in case of war.

Mr. PADGETT. So that we have before us a proposition to build an artificial harbor where the water runs from 5 to 20 feet and the bulk of it 10 or 15 feet deep, and the proposition is to dredge it, at a cost of \$840,000 at least, and then we get only an artificial depth of 20 feet, and we could not get a battleship within 3 miles of it. I could not consent to it in conference, and I ask the House not to consent to it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee to further insist on the disagreement of the House to Senate amendment 33.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 91, noes none.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 40.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 27, line 20, by striking out the figures "\$2,897,000" and inserting "\$4,140,500."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that the House further insist on its disagreement.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 71, with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment and then report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read Senate amendment No. 71, as follows:

The President may, in his discretion, direct the sale, in such manner, at such price, and upon such terms as he shall deem proper, of the battleships *Idaho* and *Mississippi*. All moneys received from the sale of said vessels shall, after payment therefrom of the expenses of such sale, be deposited by the Secretary of the Navy in the Treasury, and shall, until expended, be available for the construction of such other vessel or vessels, at least equal for purposes of offense and defense to the most modern vessels of the same class now projected here or abroad, as the President may, in his discretion, authorize: *Provided*, That no vessel shall be sold, exchanged, or conveyed under this authorization unless such sale, exchange, or conveyance, or the agreement therefor, shall have been made prior to July 1, 1915: *Provided further*, That any vessel or vessels constructed from the money received from the sale of the *Mississippi* and *Idaho* shall not be included in the annual appropriations for the increase of the Navy.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the Senate amendment and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"The President may, in his discretion, direct the sale in such manner, at such price, and upon such terms as he shall deem proper, of the battleships *Idaho* and *Mississippi*. All moneys received from the sale of said vessels shall be deposited by the Secretary of the Navy in the Treasury after said sale. In addition to the two battleships hereinbefore authorized the President is hereby authorized to have constructed a first-class battleship carrying as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any vessel of its class, to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action, and to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$7,800,000. Out of the money when so deposited in the Treasury there is hereby appropriated toward the construction of said battleship on account of increase of the Navy, construction and machinery, \$2,000,000; armor and armament, \$2,535,000; and equipment, \$100,000: *Provided*, That no vessel shall be sold under this authorization unless such sale or agreement therefor shall have been made prior to July 1, 1915."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the motion by striking out of the substitute all after the word "Treasury" down to the proviso at the end of the amendment and insert in lieu thereof the words "as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. PADGETT. That puts the parliamentary situation as it was the other night.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out all after the word "Treasury" down to the proviso and insert the words "as miscellaneous receipts."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURNETT. Would a substitute for that be in order now? I desire to offer a substitute, if it is in order, providing that the money be appropriated for the construction of public roads.

The SPEAKER. As a substitute to the whole of it?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes; to recede and concur with an amendment providing for the sale of the ships and that the money be used for the construction of roads.

Mr. PADGETT. I would reserve a point of order on that. But the gentleman has not offered the amendment.

The SPEAKER. No; he asked if it would be in order to offer such a substitute.

Mr. MANN. It would be subject to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. Let us see what the parliamentary situation is. The Senate proposes an amendment and the gentleman from Tennessee moves to recede and concur with an amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. To recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Yes. That is step No. 1. The gentleman from Illinois then moved an amendment to the Padgett amendment. That is step No. 2. The gentleman from Alabama then proposes to offer a substitute for the whole thing.

Mr. MANN. A substitute for the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BURNETT. My substitute would provide for the sale.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands all three of these gentlemen agree down to a certain point. The Chair is inclined to think that it is in order, and the gentleman from Alabama may send his amendment to the desk.

Mr. MANN. That is, it is in order to offer it.

The SPEAKER. It is in order if it is germane. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BURNETT moves that the House recede and concur in amendment No. 71 with an amendment providing for the appropriation of the money the proceeds of the sale of said battleships to the construction and maintenance of the public roads of the country traversed by rural and star-route mail carriers of the United States.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane. It deals with the subject of roads on the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order. The gentleman from Tennessee, the gentleman from Illinois, and the gentleman from Alabama all agree down to a certain point in their various amendments. The amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee provides that we shall build a new battleship. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois provides that the money obtained from the sale of the battleships shall be turned into miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury, and the gentleman from Alabama provides that we shall build roads with the money. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is germane and appropriate on a naval appropriation bill to provide in any way, whether the money is in the Treasury or to go into the Treasury, to appropriate it for the construction of roads.

The SPEAKER. Why not?

Mr. PADGETT. Simply because it is not in order. It is an entirely different subject matter. We might as well provide for any other subject.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. It is not in the bill.

Mr. PADGETT. It is not in this bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would it not be as germane to appropriate it for roads as to put it in the General Treasury?

Mr. PADGETT. Not at all. That is the place to put it, and then use it for the construction of battleships. That is the matter that is before us; that is pertinent to this bill. It is the construction of ships, and the use of money out of the Treasury for that purpose. We are not dealing in this bill directly or indirectly with the subject of roads.

Mr. RAGSDALE. This bill does not make it mandatory. This bill merely leaves it to the discretion of the President. The gentleman puts this House in the position that we are empowering the President to do a certain thing which he wishes to do and which he probably would not do if he thought the



sale of these ships would weaken the Navy without increasing its strength in the future.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. The title of the bill is making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; other germane and pertinent purposes, as it is ruled continually. If the purposes are not germane, they go out. "Other purposes" do not cover anything except pertinent and germane subjects.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. And if the House should decide to sell these battleships, what objection can the gentleman have to the House also deciding what it shall do with the money, if it does not want to put it into the construction of a new battleship?

Mr. PADGETT. It would then go into the Treasury, and that would be proper; but it would not be pertinent to take up and deal with any question as to whether or not it would go as an addendum to the legislative bill or as an addition to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill or the Indian appropriation bill. Those are matters that do not in any sense apply to this bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Would it jeopardize this bill in any way if that were done? Is it a matter of pride to the gentleman, or is it a constitutional question?

Mr. PADGETT. The parliamentary point is that it is not pertinent to this bill; it is not germane to this bill; but I will state to the gentleman and this House at this point that my position is to sell the ships and turn the money into another ship—to exchange these two ships for one that is far better than both of them combined. If that can not be done, I am not in favor of selling the two ships. That makes a clear-cut issue.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. And I will be glad to have the House determine the question upon that basis—to convert these two ships into one ship that has more fighting efficiency and military value than twice the combined military value of these two ships.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. DONOVAN. I would like to find out if we are being enlightened on the point of order.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. There has not been any very great amount of illumination as yet. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, it might very well be, that when the naval bill itself was before the House it might not be in order for a Member of this House to offer an amendment providing for the sale of battleships, and the use of the proceeds of that sale for the purpose of building roads. The point of order of the gentleman from Tennessee would be very properly directed against that proposition, and would be well taken, but the suggestion that the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama to use the money to be derived from the sale of these battleships, for the purpose of building roads, is not germane to the report of the conference committee, is not well taken. The propriety of this application may be challenged in debate, but it is for this House to determine whether the same should be made. The authority to make disposition of these proceeds, inherently attaches to this body, and once the proceeds are brought into court, so to say, by an amendment which in itself would not originally be in order, we can determine by a further amendment what we shall do with them.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Virginia think that any proposition to dispose of this matter would be germane?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Just as germane as the proposition to put it into battleships. The very proposition I am advancing is that it is a new matter of law to undertake to sell battleships, and apply the proceeds to the construction of other ships. There is no authority in present law to do this. As soon as this proposition is brought before the House by an amendment, then some other application of that money is entirely within the control of the House. This is substantially a new proposition, a proposition brought before the House by the report of the committee on conference. They propose to sell these battleships.

There is no authority in existing law for that proposition, but they propose to do it. Then they propose to couple with that proposition one to expend this money in some particular way. It is entirely competent for this House to control the application of that money. What authority of law has the

gentleman from Tennessee to direct this particular application of these proceeds? He makes the sale in order, by his report. When he makes the sale in order, he is not justified in coming before the House to assert that he can control the application of these proceeds, or in seeking to eliminate by a point of order any effort on the part of this body to direct that application in some other direction. I submit that it is perfectly germane to take the money derived in the above way, and apply it as we see fit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Virginia this question: Has the Committee on Naval Affairs any sort of jurisdiction over roads?

Mr. SAUNDERS. None; but this House has. We are dealing with an unexpected windfall, so to speak. The committee proposes to secure a large sum of money, by the suggested sale, but they also propose to put their hooks into it, and see that it is applied to one particular purpose. Now, I deny that they can do this. There is no present authority of law for the construction of another battleship. There is no law providing for the sale of battleships, and much less putting the money thus derived, into more battleships. They not only propose to sell two battleships but undertake to deny to this House the authority to determine the application of the proceeds. It is the right of this body to do with that money as it chooses.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I want to ask the gentleman if the House has not already, as far as the House is concerned, created a road fund, and would not it be just as well to pass this \$15,000,000 to the road fund as to turn it into the Treasury?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly, it would be as wise legislation to do this, as to return this money into the Treasury. I am speaking, however, purely on the parliamentary proposition.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. OGLESBY. The committee having this bill under its jurisdiction could offer an amendment to provide for the building of a battleship and its payment out of the Treasury.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. OGLESBY. And a Member on this floor could not offer an amendment to the bill providing for the building of good roads, irrespective of the pending amendment.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Oh, no, not at all. That has nothing to do with the situation at all. We have never had an amendment to the naval bill providing for the sale of battleships, per se, and appropriating the proceeds for the building of more ships. This committee is undertaking to do a thing for which there is no authority in law, namely, to sell battleships, and then they propose to limit the application of the proceeds. I maintain that any application that the House chooses to make is germane to this particular proposition. We are not authorized to provide for the unlimited construction of battleships, through the sale of other ships, or if we undertake to sell them, to budge the proceeds of sale, so to say, with some preferred application. We are not proposing to enact a road bill, but providing that a certain fund unexpectedly derived, shall be used for the improvement and construction of highways. The fund is merely set apart, the machinery for its application must be provided hereafter.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a word on the point of order. Certainly the proposition of the gentleman from Virginia is illogical, to say the least. The Speaker very well stated a moment ago that down to a certain point the three propositions are uniform—that is, all of them provide for the disposition or sale of certain vessels of the Navy. The consideration of that question is certainly germane as an amendment to the naval bill. The first proposition for consideration brought in here by the chairman of the committee is for the sale of these vessels and the conversion of the fund into other vessels of the Navy. Both of those propositions are germane to the question which is brought here by the Committee on Naval Affairs. The second proposition arising on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois consists of two propositions, one for the sale of these battleships and the other for the conversion of the money into the Treasury. Both of those propositions are certainly pertinent and germane to the bill we have now under consideration. Now, coming to the third proposition, what is that? It is for the sale of these battleships, and that far it is germane to the naval bill, but the other proposition is not to do anything connected with the Navy, not a question that is considered properly in the report from the Naval Committee in the bill as presented here, but another entire proposition that ought to be considered by the Committee on Good Roads.

That is entirely a different proposition that has not any reference whatever on the question of the Navy or any proposition in the naval bill. And for that reason it certainly can not be considered as germane to the question that we now have up for consideration.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I desire to know whether an amendment would be in order to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard just a moment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, as an original proposition my amendment would not be in order, because it would be legislation on an appropriation bill. I think that would be clear. If a point of order had been made against the amendment adopted by the Senate, it would have been sustained. But this is a very different proposition. The committee of conference comes in with a disagreement on the proposition the Senate has put on the bill to sell two battleships and to provide for the expenditure of that money. That is perfectly legitimate without regard to the direction of the expenditure, it seems to me. How is the money to go? Suppose nothing had been said about it? I assume it would have been converted into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. But whenever they undertake to give it any direction, whenever they undertake to legislate on an appropriation bill on an amendment coming from the Senate, and we can not then make a point of order against it, it seems to me to be perfectly legitimate, as has been well stated by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], that we have the right to direct the application or give direction to the proceeds of that sale.

It strikes me as a common-sense proposition that when we are proposing to sell Government property in the same law by which we propose to make that sale we can say how the proceeds of that sale are to be applied. That is the whole proposition in this case. Gentlemen have a right to say it shall be directed to the purchase of battleships. If that be true, it is a part of legislation, it is germane because it comes from the Senate as an amendment; and, then, why would not it be just as germane to say the proceeds of sale shall go to build public roads without regard to whether the committee has jurisdiction of the question of the importance of good roads or not? It is simply a plain, common-sense proposition that we order the sale of property and make the direction as to the proceeds of that sale. I do not think there can be any question about the germaneness of the substitute that I have offered.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, the proposition as has been stated is as to whether or not the House will sell these battleships. Now, as has been admitted on all sides, this proposition as an original matter could not have been placed in the bill. It would have been subject to a point of order. But once in the bill the question as to how men may vote on the sale of the battleships might be determined absolutely by what disposition would be made of the proceeds. Now, one proposition is that the proceeds shall be put into one battleship. Members might not vote to sell two battleships in order to buy one, but they might vote for the proposition to sell two battleships and put the proceeds into roads, and others to put money into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts. So that when the proposition is once in the bill it is Congress and not the committee that should determine what disposition will be made of the fund. Now, if the item had not been placed in the bill, it would have been subject to a point of order, and you would never have had an opportunity to vote on it in the naval bill; but once in the naval bill it is then in order for this House to appropriate that money for any purpose it may see fit to appropriate it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Why would it not have been originally in order to have offered it as an amendment in the naval appropriation bill when it was in the House?

Mr. SISSON. Because it would have been legislation. There is no law now authorizing the sale of battleships.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do we get anywhere now by assuming if it is once here we can deal with it in the naval appropriation bill?

Mr. SISSON. Absolutely, because you are not doing otherwise than disposing of the fund that we obtain by virtue of the sale of the ships. Now, the proposition is presented to each Member as to whether or not we sell the ships. One man will say, "Yes; we will sell the ships, because we want to build one." Another man will say, "We do not want to build a ship with it, but we want to put the money into the Treasury," and another man will say, "We want to put it on roads." The

whole proposition now is, When you sell the ships, what will you do with the fund?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Will the gentleman yield to me for a brief question?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The proposition is whether this is germane to the sale, and not a question of what is germane to the original bill.

Mr. SISSON. Absolutely. That is what I had in mind all the while. It is not a question of whether or not as an original proposition it will be germane on the naval bill. It is on the naval bill now and is germane here, and the only question is whether or not the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] is germane to the proposition now in the naval bill. And if it is germane to that item, it is now in order, placed in the bill in the Senate, and now here for the consideration of the House, and it is not a question of whether it would or it would not be in order on the naval bill. It is a question of whether or not this amendment of the gentleman from Alabama is germane and in order on this item. It has become in order by virtue of the fact that it was put on in the Senate and it comes here for the consideration of the House. And the Naval Committee can not now, since they have it in the bill, limit the direction which this money shall go or control the direction which the money shall go. It is for the House to determine what it will do with this fund.

I am extremely anxious that the House should have an opportunity to vote on this proposition. I want the issue to be made fairly and squarely between the improvement of our public roads and the enlargement of the Navy. The American Navy is now one of the strongest and largest in the world, except that of Great Britain. It is costing the American people \$140,000,000 annually. If these two battleships—*Mississippi* and *Idaho*—both new, are to be sold, I should be delighted to see this money expended on the public roads of the country. I would like to see the House tested as to whether it wishes to continue to squander millions of dollars on the Navy, or whether it wishes to do the country a real service by expending this money in the building and improvement of country roads.

If this amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] is in order under the rules in the opinion of the Chair, then this will be the issue presented to the House.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that the only question that is involved here is whether or not on the naval appropriation bill it is in order to legislate in reference to building roads. Now, an amendment to sell battleships and to use the money is germane upon the naval bill, for it relates to the Navy. It pertains to the increase of the Navy, and the appropriation of the money to build another ship is an increase of the Navy. And it seems to me that the only matter that would be pertinent would be whether the money should go into the Treasury, and remain in the Treasury, or whether it can be appropriated out on the naval bill for naval purposes. To appropriate it for any other purpose would not be germane or pertinent.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Will my friend yield to me a minute?

Mr. PADGETT. In just a moment. The Speaker the other day ruled it was not germane on the naval appropriation bill to provide for the construction of an armor-plate factory. Now, why would it be more germane to appropriate for the building of roads? This is the Government's money; it is a Government ship. We are dealing with the Government's money, and the appropriation is simply a method provided by the Constitution and by the Congress for the disposition of that money, and on the naval bill it is only in order to provide for matters that are germane to the naval bill.

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

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Is it in order on the Naval bill to provide for selling battleships?

Mr. PADGETT. It would not be in the House. It was in the Senate.

Mr. SAUNDERS. It is not in the House, so that when the question is asked whether it is in order on that proposition in this House the answer is it would not be in order.

Mr. PADGETT. In the House it would be a new proposition of legislation, but when it comes back to the House from the Senate it would be in order.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Is not this true as a proposition of parliamentary law, that a proposition that is not in order is now before the House, and it becomes in order to perfect that by a germane amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. If the point of order is waived in the House, it would be in order to perfect it by a germane amendment; but

that is not the case when it comes back on a Senate amendment.

Mr. SAUNDERS. It is precisely the same.

Mr. PADGETT. If the Senate amendment comes in on a bill, then it must be germane to that amendment.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen that debate this question lose sight of one thing and forget one thing, and that is that this all pertains to the increase of the Navy. No matter how you get to it, one dreadnaught is worth these two vessels and more, and the Senate attempted by legislation to dispose of two vessels and get one that will be worth more than both of them.

The SPEAKER. Is not this a proposition to diminish the Navy?

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. No, sir; not if you provide that this money shall be a Navy fund and shall be used, as this amendment says, for the building of another vessel, indicating the character of it; and the whole amendment looks toward an increase to the Navy. You might just as well ask us to put the money into the Mississippi River. You might just as well ask—and if you had done so nobody would have said it was in order—that the proceeds be used for a public building. You might just as well have asked for a thousand things in this bill, and every one of them would have been out of order, and the Chair would have to so decide.

But not one of them would be more out of order than this proposition of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT]. The money belongs to the Government and is at the disposition of Congress, and if the Congress wanted to do so it could appropriate on some other day for roads. But you are attempting something now that can not be done under the rules of this House. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. There are three propositions pending here. All of them would have been out of order originally in the House. Part of them are in order by reason of this Senate amendment. They all agree to sell these battleships. When we get through selling them, then there is a dispute about what we are going to do with the money.

There are three propositions on that. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] wants to build a new battleship, a dreadnaught, or superdreadnaught, or something of the sort. The proposition of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is really to strike out. That is always in order—to strike anything out of anything. Now comes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] and wants to build wagon roads with this money. It does not make any difference whether building roads by the Government is a good thing or not. It might be a very meritorious proposition—the most meritorious that was ever offered in the House—but it has nothing on earth to do with a naval appropriation bill.

Whether you happen to like a particular ruling or not—that is, a ruling on a particular item—it is very much to be desired that the business of the House be conducted in order. Now, let us see where we are on the road question. The pressure for an appropriation from the Federal Government to build wagon roads became so strong that the House created a Roads Committee. That is how it came to be created—because the pressure for Government aid in building wagon roads was so strong that the House could not resist it. The House created a special committee to take charge of this public wagon-road business, and under the lead of that committee the House authorized an appropriation of \$25,000,000 at the beginning of this session, or near the beginning of it. The Chair understands in a roundabout sort of way that the Senate has cut down the amount to \$5,000,000, but that does not make any difference. It will have to go to conference.

Now, if you can build roads on the naval appropriation bill, you can take charge of the entire business of the Government under the naval appropriation bill. The point of order is sustained against the substitute of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], and the question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to strike out.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, can we have an agreement about the time?

Mr. PADGETT. I think so. What is the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois as to time? I would like to expedite these proceedings, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. MANN. We might make an agreement such as we made the other day.

Mr. PADGETT. I am willing to stand for an agreement such as we had the other night—that my time be extended to two hours and that I yield one hour of that time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON], a member of the committee, and that at the end of that time we vote upon the amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] asks that his time of one hour be extended to two hours, with the agreement that he yield one hour to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON], and at the end of two hours the vote shall be taken; that is, unless the debate is closed in less than the two hours. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the House very long. This seems to me to be a very clear business proposition when the facts are understood.

I stated the other night, in answer to a question, that these two ships that we are proposing to sell—the *Mississippi* and the *Idaho*—are not worthless or no-account ships. They are good ships of their class, but the class of ships to which they belong is a misfit in our Navy. They are ships of 13,000 tons displacement. They are undersized. They are of slow speed and in maneuvering with the fleet they can not keep up with the rest of the fleet, with the result that in attempting to keep these two ships maneuvering with our fleet we must slow down the whole fleet, and to that extent impair and destroy the efficiency of our whole fleet in order to accommodate and adjust the other ships of the fleet to the capabilities of these two ships. Already in our experience heretofore in trying to make these two ships keep up with the fleet they have broken the main shafts four different times, entailing a great cost to the Government.

I wish to call attention to the further fact that these ships have, each of them, four 12-inch guns, besides smaller guns; but the fighting efficiency of every battleship is determined by its big guns. These ships have, each of them, four 12-inch guns.

On a modern dreadnaught such as the *New York*, the *Texas*, the *Pennsylvania*, or the two that have been authorized at the present session, we would have twelve 14-inch guns. I called attention the other night to the statement that was submitted by Admiral Dewey in reply to some questions I submitted, and which are in the Record. Taking the *Delaware*, one of our dreadnaughts, as a standard of 100, the *Idaho* and *Mississippi* combined have a percentage of 35 and a fraction. The *New York* and the *Texas* have a value of 157 and a fraction. Nos. 39, 40, and 41 are more efficient and with better improvements than the *New York* or the *Texas*; so that a ship that would be built with the proceeds of these two ships would have more than double the combined efficiency of the two ships we sell. I have here a memorandum which was sent to me this morning by the Secretary of the Navy, from Admiral Fiske, in which he states that the new ship would have three times the military value of the combined ships, the *Idaho* and the *Mississippi*.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is the gentleman of the opinion that these ships are or are not desirable as a part of our fleet?

Mr. PADGETT. I will state that they are not desirable to maintain if we can substitute better ones in their place.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If we can not substitute them?

Mr. PADGETT. I would not advocate selling them and not replacing the ships.

Mr. FITZGERALD. So that in the opinion of the gentleman from Tennessee these two ships, in spite of all he has said in condemnation of them, are at the present time important factors in our fleet?

Mr. PADGETT. They are of some importance.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Sufficiently important not to be discarded.

Mr. PADGETT. I would not discard them. I have said before, and I repeat now, that they are not useless ships. They are not worthless ships. But let me submit to the gentleman—

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman has answered that question. I want to ask him another. The gentleman's motion authorizes the President to sell these ships on such terms as he may decide?

Mr. PADGETT. At a price not less than the original cost.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And the sale not to be before the 1st of July, 1915—

Mr. PADGETT. Not later than July, 1915.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And after the money is paid into the Treasury there is appropriated out of it by this amendment \$4,600,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Four million six hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Now, if we sell these ships upon terms other than for cash, even under the gentleman's amendment, we would have parted with the ships two or three years before

they could be replaced by the ship which is to be built, and we would still be in the position of having given up what the gentleman deems to be essential and desirable portions of our fleet for a ship that is to be added to our fleet three years thereafter.

Mr. PADGETT. It would take practically three years. They run from 32 to 33 months.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then in the meantime, if unfortunately we should get into a difficulty with any foreign nation where our fleet would be essential, we would have given up two ships that would be of service, and by the time we got this ship that is authorized in this amendment the war might be ended, very much to our disaster.

Mr. PADGETT. Well, the gentleman can go down the road and scare up any number of imaginary difficulties of that kind.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am asking if that is a fact.

Mr. PADGETT. Of course it is a fact that if we should sell the ships we would not have them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. You propose to sell them, so we would not have them.

Mr. PADGETT. But having two ships that are misfits, that do not serve a desirable purpose in our Navy, if we sell them now we can get the original cost for them; but if we keep them, in the natural course of events in a few years they will pass out, and we shall get nothing for them. So I say if we can sell them at the original cost of about \$12,000,000 and use that money to replace them with another ship of more than double the combined military value of the two with which we part it is an opportunity that we ought not to lose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We will put ourselves in a position where for two or three years we shall have disposed of those ships, and will not have them, and we will be waiting for the ship which is to replace them. If that is good policy, it might be a wise thing to negotiate the sale of our entire Navy and provide for better ships to be built in the future.

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. FITZGERALD. So that we might not lose anything by keeping any of them too long? The gentleman would not sell these ships, except to replace them at some time in the future; but under his motion we shall get rid of these ships and wait three years before they can be replaced.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not accept the gentleman's argumentum ad absurdum.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am asking the gentleman if his own motion does not work out in just that way?

Mr. PADGETT. No; my motion is to sell the ships and build another one.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; but it will be three years before that ship can be built to replace the two which you want to get rid of at once.

Mr. PADGETT. That is true.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I understand, then, the gentleman from Tennessee feels this way about this matter, that world conditions to-day are so satisfactory, and the likelihood of any attack upon us by any nation is so little that we can safely reduce our naval strength by parting with these two ships, and be rid of them for the next three years without any peril or danger to the security of the United States.

Mr. PADGETT. I think we are safe in selling them and taking advantage of this opportunity.

Mr. SAUNDERS. And taking the chances without them for the next three years.

Mr. PADGETT. I think so.

Mr. ALEXANDER. What additional sum is it proposed to put into this new ship, in addition to the proceeds of the sale of the two?

Mr. PADGETT. The new ship would cost between \$14,000,000 and \$15,000,000, and these two ships would sell in round numbers for \$12,000,000.

Mr. ALEXANDER. A difference of about \$3,000,000?

Mr. PADGETT. Less than \$3,000,000; about \$2,500,000, I should say.

Mr. GOULDEN. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs what was the influencing factor causing the committee to bring in this recommendation, aside from the question of getting rid of two ships that are perhaps somewhat lacking in speed and not up to date as to armament, and so forth? Was there anything else? I might add, if permitted, that I am in favor of the committee's action.

Mr. PADGETT. Nothing that I know of. The matter was submitted by the department to the Senate and the Senate put this on as an amendment.

Mr. GOULDEN. What is the speed of these ships?

Mr. PADGETT. The original speed was 17 knots, but they have depreciated until they are much below that.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Does the proposition of the gentleman from Tennessee include specific authority for the construction of this new battleship?

Mr. PADGETT. It does; specific authority.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. In other words, it can be constructed without any further authority from Congress?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. Is it a fact that there is a market for obsolete and misfit ships?

Mr. PADGETT. I understand there is an opportunity to sell these ships at a price not less than their original cost.

Mr. SIMS. Are they to be used for warships by the purchasers?

Mr. PADGETT. I suppose they would be used for that purpose.

Mr. SIMS. Then, does the gentleman think that he can get that price for these ships if they are obsolete and useless?

Mr. PADGETT. I have not said that they were obsolete or useless, but I stated that because of the size and the speed they do not fit into or adjust themselves with the other ships in the Navy.

Mr. SIMS. Why not say they are obsolete and useless and get rid of them?

Mr. PADGETT. To say that they were obsolete and useless would not be the fact. I have stated that they are good ships of their class, but their class does not compare with the classes we have in the Navy at the present time. We can convert them into a ship that will fit into our Navy and be two or three times more efficient and valuable than the two ships would be.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Is it not a fact that last year or next year we could not find a market to sell these ships on the terms that we can now sell them for?

Mr. PADGETT. That is my information.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Is it not a fact that, as was suggested by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], it is the opinion of the President and the Secretary of the Navy that we should sell these vessels, as we do not need them?

Mr. PADGETT. I am informed that the President heartily recommends and favors this proposition, and he states that there are no international reasons why it should not be done.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of New York. With reference to the question asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], I want to ask whether these two ships would be specially valuable in a conflict with a first-class power?

Mr. PADGETT. They would not. They could be used for port ships around the home ports, but they would not do to go out into the first line.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Therefore the sale of them would not produce a deterioration in our Navy in case of trouble with a first-class power?

Mr. PADGETT. They are classed to-day in the second line and not in the first line.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. The gentleman has just stated that the President, as reported, urges this proposition, and says that there are no international questions that would prevent it.

Mr. PADGETT. I did not get this from the President, but from a reliable source.

Mr. HARRISON. I saw in this morning's paper that one foreign Government had protested against the sale of these two vessels. May I ask if there is any truth in that statement?

Mr. PADGETT. I am not prepared to answer that yes or no. I do not know as to the correctness or incorrectness of the statement in the paper. I saw it, and it was upon that statement that I made the inquiry and received the information that I have just stated.

Mr. HARRISON. I noticed in the paper also that the sale of these vessels might promote peace among certain nations. Is there any truth in that statement?

Mr. PADGETT. I assume that there is.

Mr. BURNETT. That is on the same theory that we build battleships to secure peace between us and other nations.

Mr. PADGETT. To keep other people from breaking the peace with us.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the committee, if it does not violate any confidence, from whom he received the authoritative information that he speaks about?

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. I am interested in whether there is a possibility of any foreign complication. I would like to ask the gentleman whether there is any violation of international law when countries are at peace for a country to sell a war vessel to another nation?

Mr. PADGETT. It would not be a violation of international law in time of peace. This places it within the discretion of the President, and the President would not violate international law.

Mr. FESS. And consequently the protest which I read of in the paper would simply be a mere matter of opinion?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman stated that these two ships are misfits, and he thinks there is an opportunity to sell them. What is the gentleman's objection to taking the proceeds of the sale and turning them into the Treasury of the United States instead of putting them into another ship?

Mr. PADGETT. The Navy has been charged with these ships in appropriations, and I do not want to take these ships out of the Navy without replacing them with a more valuable ship.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Is it not equivalent, then, to building three dreadnaughts?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but the third one would be built by taking out two and converting them into a better one.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. What is the objection to turning the proceeds into the Treasury and then coming back here and asking Congress whether it wants to build a third dreadnaught?

Mr. PADGETT. That direct question is now before Congress.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARTON. As one who does not understand the ships in the Navy as well as members of the committee, I would like to know more in detail as to what is meant by the statement that these two ships are misfits?

Mr. PADGETT. I stated that in the outset. These two ships are 13,000 tons displacement. The dreadnaughts we are now building are 31,000 tons. These two ships have four 12-inch guns. Ships we are now building have twelve 14-inch guns. These ships have an actual speed of somewhere between 15 and 16 knots. The ships we are building now have a speed of more than 20 knots.

These ships can not keep up with the fleet, they can not go along, and if they go by themselves they will be destroyed if they come up with the enemy. To try and carry them with the fleet is to hold the fleet back with them. Then there is another thing: These ships were built with the low free board aft. They are 12 feet lower in the free board than the ships that were built along at the same time and much more than that when compared with the modern ships. The result is that in a rough sea they wash over, and the aft turrets are useless, largely, in a rough sea.

Mr. BARTON. And their fighting efficiency would not be as great as the battleship that it is proposed to build?

Mr. PADGETT. As I stated a moment ago, the dreadnaught that we propose to build is much more efficient. Take 100 as the standard. These two ships have a percentage of 35 and a fraction. The New York has a percentage of 157 and a fraction, and this new ship would be more improved and of better fighting value than the New York. In other words, it would have more than four times the fighting value of either one of these two ships.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Are there any other misfits that the gentleman knows of in the Navy that we could get rid of while we are in the selling business?

Mr. PADGETT. None that I know of that you would call misfits, but we have some that if we could sell to the same advantage I would advocate selling.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Has any investigation been made to discover whether we have any more misfits that we could sell?

Mr. PADGETT. There are some that we might sell, but we could not get any purchaser for them.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. What is the objection to allowing the amount that will be obtained from the sale of these ships to remain in the Treasury?

Mr. PADGETT. Simply because we want to build another ship.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is the truth?

Mr. PADGETT. That is the plain, unvarnished truth. We want to build another ship and we want to use this money for that purpose. The whole thing is this: If we can swap two old ships for one good ship that is worth four times as much as either one of the old ones, why not make the swap? That is the whole proposition.

Mr. SIMS. Why not build the ship now, regardless of the trade?

Mr. PADGETT. Merely because we have already appropriated for two such ships, and we would have these on our hands, and we have now an opportunity to dispose of them.

Mr. SIMS. That is true; but you have another year in which to appropriate for this, or before this becomes available.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but we may not wait that long. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I consumed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Twenty-three minutes.

Mr. MANN. That is a deadly number.

Mr. PADGETT. I know it is; and I am going to use a few minutes more, and then yield the floor. I want to call attention to the further fact that to man these two ships, the *Idaho* and the *Mississippi*, 755 men each are required, or a total of 1,510 men. On the new ship 970 men would be required. In other words, there would be a saving of 540 men. You have one ship with a fighting value double that of the other two, and you save 540 men to go upon other ships in the Navy. Those men cost at an average of about \$31 a month each, and for the year that would amount to something like \$180,000. Then, the maintenance of these two ships would exceed the maintenance of the one ship, I am informed by the department, by something like \$300,000 a year, so that we would have in addition to these military advantages I have spoken of, with reference to the ships themselves, a saving of over \$400,000 a year in the maintenance of the one ship, as compared with the maintenance and upkeep of the two.

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

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CULLOP. How many ships have we that are smaller than those, and how many that are larger?

Mr. PADGETT. I could not tell the gentleman offhand.

Mr. CULLOP. Approximately?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not remember; but we have several. The *Indiana*, the *Oregon*, and the *Massachusetts* are smaller. I will hand the gentleman the list.

Mr. CULLOP. When were these two ships constructed?

Mr. PADGETT. They were authorized in 1903, and were completed in 1908.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, then along the line of the gentleman's argument, there being a saving in the number of men per vessel, and the average cost of the men being some \$31 a month each, together with the saving in the maintenance, for the period of time it would take to construct the new ship, in salary and maintenance alone, we would save half the money that is necessary to pay the difference between what we will receive for these obsolete ships and what we will have to pay for the construction of the new modern dreadnaught that it is proposed to construct.

Mr. PADGETT. I have not figured that out. It would save something over \$400,000 a year, and there would be a saving of the three years of something over \$1,000,000.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman to say that these two vessels that we are offering for sale are larger than the *Oregon* and the *Indiana*?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Why not sell the smaller vessels and keep these two?

Mr. PADGETT. Simply because we could not get a purchaser for them.

Mr. BOOHER. Then, you have tried to sell the smaller ones, and could not do it?

Mr. PADGETT. Unofficially—and I am not speaking officially—I will say that we have tried to get them to take some of the older and smaller ones in lieu of these two, and we are making the best trade we can make, and I think one that will not come to us again in a quarter of a century.

Mr. BOOHER. Would it not be a good thing for our Navy if it did not?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I think not. If I could swap an old suit of clothes that I have worn for the year for a new suit of clothes that was four times better—

Mr. BOOHER. Yes; but you would not wait three years to get the new suit. If you did, what would be your condition during the three years? [Laughter.]

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, I would do as we are doing in the Navy. I would use the other suits. We have an abundance of other suits, and I would use those suits, and I would be willing to wait three years if I could get a new suit that was worth four times as much as the old one.

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

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. METZ. Has the United States Government ever sold a naval vessel before?

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, yes; we have sold a good many of the condemned vessels at public sale, and we have obtained very little for them.

Mr. METZ. But they never sold a vessel to another power to use it as a warship?

Mr. PADGETT. Not that I recall.

Mr. METZ. In other words, the American flag has not gone down and the foreign flag gone up on the same ship.

Mr. PADGETT. We have sold other ships, but what was done after we got rid of them I do not know.

Mr. METZ. We have gone so far in our economy that we have no further sympathy or sentiment in connection with them.

Mr. PADGETT. I now yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15279) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, had further insisted upon its amendments numbered 1, 20, 78, 79, 85, 101, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 168, 169, 176, 177, 195, 212, 218, 219, 220, and 234, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had asked a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. OVERMAN, and Mr. WARREN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on Senate amendment numbered 33.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of TEXAS). The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

[Mr. BURNETT addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Speaker, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, since the consideration of this proposition last week the atmosphere has cleared considerably. Then it was a matter of vague doubt as to which nation these ships were to be sold. Now it is admitted that the Government intends to sell them to the Government of Greece. A new policy is about to be inaugurated; the Government of the United States is to become a party to entangling alliances abroad; by this act we undertake here to-day to take part in the policy of European affairs. Never before in the history of our Government have we ever so attempted to interfere with the differences between foreign nations as we are in the present instance. It is well recognized that Greece and Turkey are near belligerents. They are on the brink of war, and it is proposed to furnish one of them succor and assistance. If they were actually engaged in war, there would be no question but what it would be regarded as an act of war on the part of our Government to sell ships to either of the contending parties. I have here a well-recognized authority on international law, that by W. E. Hall, and I wish to read to you just a brief sentence that states the essential obligations of a neutral Government in dealing with belligerents.

The general principle that a mercantile act is not a violation of a state neutrality is pressed too far when it is made to cover the sale of munitions or vessels of war by a state. Trade is not one of the common functions of a government, and an extraordinary motive must be supposed to stimulate an extraordinary act. The nation is exceptionally unfortunate which is forced to get rid of surplus stores precisely at the moment when their purchase is useful to a belligerent.

If it would not be an act of war in selling these war vessels to Greece, then I say certainly it would be an unfriendly act. And because Turkey may be a despised nation in the group of European nations, it is no reason why our Government should

tinge its own policy with disrepute by becoming a party to the difficulties existing between Turkey and Greece.

Suppose there existed to-day between China and Japan the same strained relations as between Turkey and Greece, would it for a moment be thought that the Washington administration would think of selling the battleships to China and cast its lot with China in order to give China the balance of equilibrium in the control of the Pacific? Do you not realize that as soon as this Government would undertake that step it would be regarded as an unfriendly act by Japan? Yea, more; it would result in the withdrawal of the ambassadorial representatives of Japan from Washington, and might be considered an act of war by Japan. If it could in that case be considered as an unfriendly act, an act of war, then, I say, why should we, under the existing circumstances, just because Greece and Turkey happen to be insignificant nations and not to be feared, cast our lot with either one of them?

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will.

Mr. FESS. I have read a statement that is supposed to come from the President that this is an act of peace rather than war. Suppose we make the agreement to sell these vessels to Greece, and Turkey declares war, then could we deliver the vessels afterwards?

Mr. STAFFORD. That statement is predicated upon the idea that we are entering upon a determination of foreign questions to ascertain whether the sale of these ships will give to one of the contending nations a preponderating influence in the Aegean Sea. What concern is it to our Government to sell our ships in order to determine the weight of the balance in the determination of the difficulties between Turkey and Greece? Would we consider selling our battleships to either France or Germany if they were in near difficulties, and where it might give an advantage to one nation or the other? The other Government would have the right to consider that an unfriendly act. Better far to keep aloof from participation in the difficulties that confront the Balkan States than to make a good bargain with a nation hard pressed for ships of war. No matter what our feelings are—and personally I believe in the destiny of Greece as the dominating influence in the Aegean—we should maintain that policy of aloofness that even despised Turkey will have no cause for complaint.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like two minutes more.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I can not yield any more time to the gentleman. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP].

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any great occasion for the alarm that is expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] concerning the sale of these ships. This Government has the right to sell its battleships to any country in time of peace wherever it may see fit to do so and can get a suitable price; and that act alone is no declaration of war, and could not be considered as encouraging such nation to declare war. Now, Mr. Speaker, here is a pertinent illustration of the great navy fund which this Government has been indulging in for a number of years. I am in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois and shall vote for it. I hope to see it adopted, in order that we may sell these two battleships and pay the money into the Public Treasury. I trust we all stand for an adequate Navy. For one I do, and the question hard for me to determine is what is an adequate Navy? It seems that each Member is left to solve the problem without much light to aid him. The term is a broad one, and men radically differ about its meaning.

In this House we have two Members who doubtless represent each extreme on this great question. The distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON], who advocates the building of four or five big dreadnaughts every year, and the other, my good friend from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON], who contends one is sufficient, and each of them claim they stand for an adequate Navy. These two clearly illustrate the diversity of opinion over what should be considered as an adequate Navy. There are no better-informed men on this subject in this House, and the opinion of each is worthy of earnest consideration. The advocates of a large Navy say if some country builds four big dreadnaughts we must go it one better and build five. It seems that with them numbers alone is the controlling consideration and requirements are unworthy of consideration. In this view rivalry is the controlling idea alone. Their position reminds one of the ambitious rivalry of two social leaders in the same neighborhood, if one for the social season provides herself with five new gowns the other must get six, for she must not be out-

done by her rival. It is not a question with them of need, but of number. The other side contends that an adequate Navy means only such ships as our necessities require. If we need one, we should build but one; if we need none, we should build none. Economy should in this respect supplant extravagance, and by following this policy we will better serve the people and abundantly safeguard our country from any foreign or domestic foe. It should not be a question, as it seems to have been and is now with some, how many somebody else has or is building, but how many do we need. That seems to me the better and more logical policy and the one which the people of this country will more readily approve. We can not and should not ignore the voice of the people on this subject. They are deeply interested and must pay every dollar of the cost.

That is the proposition that is involved in this big Navy question. Here are two battleships now we propose to sell, constructed recently, authorized in 1903 and completed in 1908, and already they say they are not fit for service in the Navy at all. What is the reason? Does not this appeal for a better policy, a sounder and more economical policy, in the building of our battleships? Here it is proposed to sell two vessels, two of the naval fleet, and with the proceeds build one. In so doing it is proposed to expend \$12,400,000 for the great dreadnaught. True, we are to receive for the two just what they cost and pay out no more for the new one. These two battleships, practically new, are now useless in our fleet, it is asserted. Who is to blame for this? Some one. A great blunder has been made, no doubt about that, and we should know who is responsible for it. Some one has made a mistake in this matter and ought to be held responsible for it. The guilty in this matter should be made to suffer. It will not do to say that improvements have been so great that they have put these great battleships out of commission and they are now obsolete for these reasons. If that argument be true, then it is the strongest reason that could be presented for the adoption of this amendment requiring the sale of the battleships and paying the money into the Treasury, to remain there for future action and perhaps a more profitable use. Twelve million four hundred thousand dollars is a large sum, and one representing much to the people of this Republic. The reason given for the selling of these two battleships at this time should receive the thoughtful consideration of every Member of this House, and that is they are not sufficiently modern to meet the requirements of our great naval fleet. They were completed in 1908, six years ago, and are now out of date. Progress is rapidly working its way in our Navy. The combined cost of the two was about \$12,000,000—six millions each. This was a large expenditure, and care should be exercised in expending the people's money—much more, I am compelled to say, than was exercised in this transaction. We should be careful that we do not duplicate the stupendous blunder. That is what it should be called.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it should be decided that the sum realized from the sale of these two ships, just the amount of the cost to construct them, is to be invested in the construction of a new dreadnaught, when could it be built and ready for use? True, the contract could and doubtless would be let at once, but when would it be built? Not in five years. It is a well-known fact that many great battleships authorized have not been commenced, and will not be for some time yet. Then why authorize what we know can not be built now and not for some time? Where would we build it? The docks and shipyards now have all of this kind of work they can do. Why not wait until it can be built at some yard where they are prepared to build it, and it may be the same can then be constructed on better terms and secure the advantage of improvements, if any are made, in battleship construction? Advantage in prices may be secured. The people should have this advantage. They must pay the bills, and should have every consideration in this regard. Why should it be hurried through now? Haste sometimes makes waste; and from what we already know, our experience in this matter now clearly proves it has occurred here, and may be repeated. Let us not be swept off of our feet by this big Navy propaganda. Much is done to popularize it, but usually by interested parties, who expect to profit thereby. Such persons are most industrious in this regard.

But the proposition of the big Navy, and the only reason, says the chairman of this committee, for the sale of these two vessels is that we want to build another dreadnaught. Why build the dreadnaught? What are we going to do with it? Let it rot at the docks, as a number of others are doing now? Where are we going to use it? When are we going to commence work upon it? Why appropriate the people's money and enter upon this contract until we know the cost of the material and the necessity and the time for building it? If the only reason for the sale of these two ships is to get an excuse to build a new

dreadnaught, I do not indorse it, and I do not believe the people of the country will do so. There should be a better reason than that, and I therefore hope the proposition to build the new one will be voted down.

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

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, this trade delights my Yankee soul. How anyone can haggle over it for a minute I do not know. For two battleships which do not fit into our naval plans we are offered nearly enough money to build a superdreadnaught which will exactly meet our requirements. In other words, we are giving something we can not use in return for something which we need.

I know well enough that it is true, as the gentleman says, that the *Idaho* and the *Mississippi* are fine vessels, but they do not fit into our squadrons and we can not use them to advantage. We are mighty lucky to find a customer who will take them off our hands at cost.

Of course it is an open secret that Greece is our customer, and I am exceedingly glad that she is getting two such splendid ships. What a change has come over the spirit of that nation since Byron wrote:

You have the Pyrrhic dance as yet,  
Where is the Pyrrhic phalanx gone?  
Of two such lessons, why forget  
The nobler and the manlier one?  
You have the letters Cadmus gave—  
Think ye he meant them for a slave?

No; Greece has amply proved that she has not lost her martial spirit. Nobly she broke the chains which galled her, and never again will she be subjugated to that foreign yoke which she threw off in 1821. Perhaps these very battleships may aid her against her former tyrants. Who knows? In any event, the world now knows that the letters Cadmus gave are inherited by a race of freemen.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that the sale of these two ships should be considered from a purely economic standpoint. I do not think there is a Member of this House who would not vote to increase the efficiency and strength of our Navy if it did not cost our Government a dollar, and that is practically the proposition we have before us. We are increasing the efficiency and strength of our Navy, so far as the *Mississippi* and the *Idaho* are concerned, by 300 per cent, and it will require no additional appropriation by this House. I say "no additional appropriation" advisedly, because there is a difference between the amount of money we are going to get for these two ships and a superdreadnaught costing some \$15,000,000. I am told by the Navy Department it is their intention to use guns that have already been manufactured and paid for and are in reserve in our various storehouses for this superdreadnaught when completed, so that it will, in fact, require no additional appropriation.

In other words, we are increasing the efficiency of the Navy, so far as these two ships are concerned, more than 300 per cent at some one's else expense, and that condition is brought about merely through a psychological situation existing in Europe. If it were not for that fact, we could not get \$4,000,000 for these ships. Nobody wants them. They would not be any more apt to buy those two ships than they would be to buy our *Indiana* or *Massachusetts* or *Oregon*. In 10 years from now the Navy would be shooting at these two ships in target practice and sinking them out in the ocean.

The complement of these two ships, the *Idaho* and the *Mississippi*, is about 700 men per ship. The complement of a new superdreadnaught, oil-burning, will be about 800 men. We are saving 600 men and a set of officers by an exchange of this kind. That is what it means.

In gun power one superdreadnaught carries twelve 14-inch guns. Both the *Mississippi* and the *Idaho* combined carry only eight big 12-inch guns, so that there is no question about the superiority so far as guns are concerned. In armor a superdreadnaught carries 12 and 14 inch armor, as against 8 and 9 inch armor on the smaller boats. In the matter of speed the smaller boats will average from 15 to 16 knots per hour. A superdreadnaught will average 21 knots per hour. On a rough sea it is doubtful if the guns on the small boats could be used at all, whereas the great tonnage of the superdreadnaught will travel in any sea and give better target practice and better results in firing upon an enemy.

Slow ships can not possibly be assigned to the first line of battle. While I do not agree with some gentlemen on this side of the House in saying that these ships are obsolete—because

they are not obsolete; they are merely misfits in our first line of battle—yet these ships were the last to be appropriated for after we had launched into our policy of building dreadnaughts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this proposition, taken as a whole, is meritorious and ought to be adopted. I refer to the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

The proposition may be divided into two parts. The first is the proposition whether we should sell these ships, the *Idaho* and the *Mississippi*. The reasons that have been stated so clearly by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], who has just spoken, make the argument for their sale unanswerable. The fact that we are able at all to sell these ships, and at such an advantageous price, arises from an exigency of a foreign power, and may never occur again. There is an opportunity now to sell two ships for their original cost—ships that are not obsolete, and yet for the particular purposes for which they were built they are misfits.

The only argument which I have heard against this sale is that made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], who argued that some international complication might result from our giving authority to sell these two ships. In answer to that it may be said that the amendment simply vests discretion in the Chief Executive. Who is there who is unwilling to place entire confidence in the wisdom and in the discretion of the President? He will not violate any of the rules of neutrality or in any way involve this Government in any complication with any foreign Government. If this discretion is vested in him, we may safely rely upon the proposition that such discretion will be exercised wisely and well.

I understand unofficially that it is proposed to sell these ships to the Government of Greece. Some suggestion is made that it will involve us in complications with the Government of Turkey. So far as I am concerned, I am not only willing, but I am glad if this Government, without inviting international complications, can help Greece in maintaining peace and aid her in the struggle which she is making to maintain her independence and her autonomy and her rights.

Mr. Speaker, on the other proposition it is simply contended that if we are to sell these ships and the opportunity is given that we ought to embrace, then what shall we do with the proceeds? Some gentlemen say we should deposit the money in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs [Mr. PADGETT] and a large majority of the committee, I understand, say that it ought to be invested in a powerful superdreadnaught. If business can be injected into a discussion of this kind, then, as was well said by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], it is a business proposition which ought not to be ignored.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I understood the gentleman to say that a large majority of the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs agreed with the chairman. How can the gentleman say that when the Committee on Naval Affairs has never had a meeting on this proposition and when this matter was never submitted to it?

Mr. SMALL. Does the gentleman state the contrary?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I do not know. I do not state anything.

Mr. SMALL. Then I simply repeat what I have heard unofficially. It may or may not be true.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say if business can be injected into this proposition, it is wise to take this money and invest it in a superdreadnaught. Such a reinvestment fortifies the wisdom of selling them, because if we are to diminish our naval force by the sale of these two ships, then it is wise that we should take the money and invest it in a dreadnaught which would have an efficiency, not alone equal to those two vessels, but three or four times their efficiency.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Speaker, this proposition to sell the *Idaho* and the *Mississippi* and to construct another dreadnaught was discussed in part by me when this conference report was up before the House a few days ago. I had just proceeded to demonstrate that the effect of that proposition, if

carried out as a policy until we disposed of all the 25 battleships that we have, would be to reduce the number of our ships from 39 to 27. I had also shown that the result of it would be to reduce the number of guns on our armored vessels from 926 to 587, and in those two respects put our Navy in a condition of inferiority to that of the German Navy, whereas now in both of these respects it is largely superior to it.

One of the tests laid down by these naval experts that my friends on the other side profess to go by in all other things is that superiority in a navy is determined by the weight of the metal in a broadside. Now, I want to call the attention of the House to the effect that this policy will have upon our Navy according to that test; and in order that I may give the exact figures I will read the facts in that regard, as you will find them stated in the Record of to-day, where I extended my remarks.

If we were to make the proposed exchange, we would, as already suggested, gain four 12-inch guns, and the weight of the metal in a broadside from these four guns is 3,480 pounds; but we would lose sixteen 8-inch guns, whose projectiles weigh 260 pounds each, making 4,160 pounds, and sixteen 7-inch guns, whose projectiles weigh 165 pounds, making 2,640 pounds. In other words, the weight of the metal in a broadside from the thirty-two 8-inch and 7-inch guns which we will lose by the exchange would be 8,800 pounds, or 5,320 pounds more than the weight of the metal in a broadside from the four 12-inch guns which we would gain. And if we were to continue this policy until we shall have sold all of our 25 battleships, and with the proceeds of each two built a dreadnaught, the total weight of the metal in a broadside from all our armored vessels would be reduced 63,840 pounds. The total weight of the metal of a broadside from all our armored vessels is now 45,954 pounds greater than that of the German armored ships; but if this new policy is carried out it will be 17,886 pounds less than that of the German armored vessels. If, therefore, the weight of the metal in a broadside is any measure of naval power, the inevitable effect of the proposed policy will be to transfer the relative superiority of our fleet over the Germans to a condition of decided inferiority.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry right there, to refresh my memory?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. No, sir; I have not time to yield, and I want to present my views.

Mr. BRITTEN. I merely want to inquire—

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will respect my rights when I tell him I decline to yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of Texas). The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. That comparison is based on the assumption that with the proceeds of these two ships we could build a dreadnaught that would have upon it twelve 12-inch guns, and I make that assumption.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman is in error there.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the irrepressible gentleman from Illinois will respect my rights on this floor when I tell him I decline to yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman wants to be correct about it. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. And if I did want to be corrected, I would never go to such a man as he is.

Mr. BRITTEN. I did not say corrected. I said correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is out of order.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I base this comparison upon the assumption that with the proceeds of this sale we could build a dreadnaught with twelve 12-inch guns on it. I make that assumption for the reason that a dreadnaught upon which you could put 12 such guns has exactly the same tonnage as the tonnage of these two ships combined. The tonnage of a ship depends upon its size and the weight of the material in it. That is what determines how much water it will displace, and I feel sure that you could not with the proceeds of the sale of these ships build any dreadnaught that would have a tonnage superior to the combined tonnage of these two.

Now, of course, it is easy to assert, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] has asserted here repeatedly, that you could build a battleship or dreadnaught like the *Pennsylvania*, that has a tonnage of 31,400 tons, or 5,400 tons more than the combined tonnage of these two ships. Anybody can assert that, but I tell you that, in my judgment, it is an impossibility. And this illustrates forcibly the folly of this House undertaking to decide a matter of naval policy, a matter that involves the efficiency and power of the Navy, upon state-



ments made here on the floor of this House by gentlemen. The gentleman from Tennessee asserts one thing, and I assert that it is not true. How do you know which of us is telling the truth? How can you tell who is mistaken? You have no way to tell, and it just shows what I contend—that this matter ought to be referred to the Naval Affairs Committee, who ought to investigate it and report to this House the real facts before you act upon it.

There is another test of the effect that this would have upon our Navy, and this test is said by the experts to be more accurate than the test of the weight of the metal in a broadside. That is the muzzle energy of the guns. As I have said repeatedly, the effect of this proposition would be to exchange eight 12-inch guns on these two ships for twelve 12-inch guns on the dreadnaught we propose to build with the proceeds. In other words, we will gain four 12-inch guns. But these two ships have upon them sixteen 8-inch guns and sixteen 7-inch guns which you would lose. Now, the muzzle energy of those 32 guns is far superior to the muzzle energy of the four 12-inch guns which you would gain.

Mr. Speaker, I will ask you to notify me when I have used all my time except five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will do that.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Now, these are the facts with regard to that proposition:

"The fourth effect of the change proposed in the Senate amendment is to greatly lessen the muzzle energy of our fleet; and our naval experts tell us that this is the better test.

"The four 12-inch guns which we would gain by the exchange each have a muzzle energy of 48,984 foot-tons, or a total muzzle energy for the four 195,936 foot-tons; while the sixteen 8-inch guns which we lose each have a muzzle energy of 13,715 foot-tons and the sixteen have a total muzzle energy of 200,440 foot-tons, and the sixteen 7-inch guns, each having a muzzle energy of 8,338 foot-tons, have a total of 133,408, which makes a total muzzle energy for the thirty-two 8 and 7 inch guns of 342,849 foot-tons which we would lose, against the 195,936 foot-tons we would gain. In other words, the proposed change would lessen the muzzle energy of our guns 146,912 foot-tons."

At present the muzzle energy of the entire armored vessels in our fleet is 441,000 foot-tons more than the muzzle energy of the German navy. If you carry out this foolish, silly policy, when you get to the end of it the muzzle energy of our fleet will be 1,722,000 tons less than that of the German navy.

Why do you want to make our Navy so inferior to that of Germany? Can any of you suggest any reason for it? If you can not, I can. I can tell you the reason why they would like to have our Navy inferior to that of Germany. One of the strongest pleas they have made in this whole fight to waste the money of the people on more battleships is that our Navy is inferior to that of Germany. We have shown conclusively that it is superior, and have overthrown that argument. Now, if they can adopt a policy that will make it inferior to that of Germany, you have supplied them with an argument that they have been contending for to waste the people's money.

In number of ships, in number of guns, in weight of metal, in muzzle energy, in every other respect this foolish policy will lessen and decrease the efficiency and power of the American Navy. These are the facts which I have ascertained and which I can prove by any expert in the Navy if you will bring him before the Naval Affairs Committee and let me cross-examine him. How can you reconcile those facts with the contention that we ought to do this thing? There is only one way to reconcile it in accordance with common honesty and patriotism, and that is upon the idea that has been repeated so often, until a great many good people believe it, that the dreadnaught is for some unexplained reason so superior to a battleship that any amount of sacrifice would be justifiable in order to get a dreadnaught.

I want to call your attention to the facts about that. It is a discarded idea, an idea that has been overthrown by naval experts and disproved by facts, as I can show you by the highest authority. The idea of the dreadnaught is that having superior speed it has the power to select the range of the battle at which it will fight, and that it can select a range of battle so distant as to put it out of the reach of the smaller guns of the battleship. So it could destroy a battleship before it could ever get close enough to do it any harm.

Now, there are several facts that I want you to consider in regard to this proposition. In the first place, that is an impossibility, because when the dreadnaught begins to fight at a range of battle beyond the reach of the smaller guns of the battleship it is so far away that it is impossible for it to hit. The experience of war is, the only wars we have had where

battleships were engaged, that they had to shoot 100 times in order to hit 7. All these battles from which that fact has been developed were battles fought at such close range that the small guns were effective. Now, if you select the battle range so distant that the small guns can not reach the dreadnaughts, you are going to make the number of hits less than they would be if they fought at close range, as they did in all these battles.

According to the experience of war a dreadnaught would have to shoot 1,400 times to make 100 hits, and it takes 100 hits on an average to destroy a battleship, according to the authorities. The reason why it takes so many hits to destroy a battleship is because the points that the shell must strike in order to destroy it are very small—about 8 per cent of the battleship. The experience is that it takes 100 hits on an average before one of these big shells will hit in the point that will destroy the ship.

Now, take these two facts into consideration—that it must on an average hit 100 times and that it has to shoot 1,400 times to make 100 hits, and the dreadnaught could not do it, because the life of its guns are such that every one would be worn out and useless before it could fire that many shots. The life of one of these big guns is 175 shots. We use them in target practice 12 times a year, and when you have shot them 75 times they are relined, which makes them as good as new. So if we had a war every gun in our Navy would have 100 shots. Now, you take a dreadnaught with 12 guns on it and let them shoot 100 times, and that is all they could shoot if you give them necessary target practice, and that would make 1,200 shots, 200 less than, according to the authorities, is necessary to destroy a ship.

Of course, that will increase with the distance. That would be the effect if there was fighting at close range, but when you put them farther away that would enhance it.

The dreadnaught idea is impossible on account of the human vision. You can not shoot with any kind of a gun and hit a thing unless you can see it, and that makes the dreadnaught idea impossible. A naval battle is apt to occur at night when it is dark when you can not see a battleship a mile. That, then, becomes of the theory of the dreadnaught that it can stand off 8 or 9 miles and destroy a battleship? How could it do that at night when you can not see it? Not only at night but in the daytime the fog on the ocean is frequently so dense that a man on a battleship could not see another ship at all until it had got so close to it that there was danger of collision, which frequently happens. Even when there is no fog there is a mist most of the time which makes it impossible to see a battleship at any such distance as this dreadnaught idea assumes. I have spent seven days on the ocean watching the target practice of our Navy and they were shooting at a target 7 miles away.

And I feel perfectly safe in saying that nine-tenths of that time in the daytime they were not able to see the target or the battleship, and had to suspend the shooting on that account. The dreadnaught idea could have no force or place except in those rare periods of time when the atmospheric conditions happen to be such as to enable those on board to take a long range and fight at that distance if their guns were sufficient to carry out that theory. There is the greatest difference of opinion among the highest authorities on this question, and that difference grows out of these two ideas. The idea of the dreadnaught is to strike an enemy's ship near the water line, where, if it perforates the ship and makes a big hole in it, the water will be let in and sink the ship. The idea of the dreadnaught is to destroy the enemy's ship; but there is another way to overcome the enemy without destroying his ship, and it is just as effective as the destruction of the ship, and that is to kill the men, to put his guns out of action, to disorganize his communications, and destroy his firing stations. It is a fact that in every naval battle both in the Russo-Japanese War and in the Spanish-American War every ship that was overcome was defeated in this latter way, and not one of them was destroyed according to the dreadnaught idea. In that war you had no dreadnaughts, but you had battleships, and every battleship had four of these big guns and a much larger number of smaller guns, and you had them side by side to show which was the most effective. In none of those battles did one of the shells from the big guns ever strike the ship at the water line and perforate it so as to let the water in and sink the ship; but every single one that was overcome was overcome by the smaller guns, by killing the men, putting the guns out of action, destroying their communications and firing stations; and the very highest authorities, writing on this subject, as you will see from those I will cite in my speech in the Record, say that the easiest way to overcome an enemy is not by destroying the ship, but that it is by killing his men with these small guns and putting the big guns out of action.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ANSBERRY). Fifteen minutes.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Speaker, I wish the Chair would notify me when I have only 5 minutes left. I desire to call attention now to the facts which have convinced the best authorities on this subject that a battleship, armed with a few big guns and a great number of small guns is more effective than the dreadnaught. One of those facts is that there are very few points in a ship where you can so disable it or destroy it. You have either to hit it at the water line where it will let the water in and sink it, or you have to strike the barrels of its guns, or you have to strike a firing station, or destroy its communication, or kill the men. You have got to hit it in some of those points. Those points are very few in a battleship or dreadnaught. The consequence is that you have to fire a great many shells before you can count on hitting it in a vital point. To show the difference between these two ships that we have, the *Idaho* and the *Mississippi*, and the one that we propose to get, these two ships have 40 guns and your dreadnaught will have 12. They have 28 more guns than your dreadnaught. The big guns on your dreadnaught will shoot twice a minute. In other words, these four 12-inch guns that we will gain would shoot 8 times a minute. The 8-inch guns will shoot 6 times a minute, and the 7-inch guns will shoot 8 times a minute, and the thirty-two 7 and 8-inch guns will shoot 224 times in a minute. In other words, they will shoot just 28 shells every time these four guns that you will gain will shoot 1. Therefore, the chance of one of those shells hitting the ship in a vital point is 28 times as great as the chance of the four guns that you are going to gain hitting at a point that will destroy the ship.

If the Members of the House will take the *British Navy Annual* and read an article from Reginald Custance, on this very question as to whether the dreadnaught or the battleship is the more effective, if you will just take the trouble to read that through, and before you read it you will not make up your mind that you are not going to be convinced, you will be convinced by it. His argument is unanswerable. It is based on facts, and this proposition of ours to dispose of our battleships and convert them into dreadnaughts will be a great mistake. I want to submit this to you. This is not just a matter of argument, it is not just a matter of reason, but it is substantiated by history. Naval warfare shows that in every battle every ship that has been overcome has been overcome by the small guns, and the whole world has now recognized that this dreadnaught idea was a mistake. At the time we began to build dreadnaughts England had 41 battleships armed each with four large guns and a much larger number of small guns. Germany had 20 and we had 25. England has built, I believe, 17 dreadnaughts that are completed. Every one of those dreadnaughts that England has completed was built on this dreadnaught idea of all big guns, and they are armed exclusively with big guns, but every single ship that Great Britain is building to-day is being built on the old battleship idea of having each vessel armed partly with big guns and partly with a much larger number of small guns. Great Britain is not building a single ship on this dreadnaught idea. Take the *Rio de Janeiro*, which is perhaps the most heavily armed ship under construction except the *Pennsylvania*.

That ship has fourteen 12-inch guns and twenty 6-inch guns, and you may get the books and read the description of all the modern ships, and you will find that the world has abandoned this old-fashioned idea of the all-big-gun ship; and yet we are asleep, unconscious of what the world is doing, and we propose to take our battleships and convert them into dreadnaughts, when the world acknowledges that that is a mistake.

Of course we could sell these two battleships, and we could add enough money to what we get to build a battleship that would perhaps be more powerful than both of these that we are going to sell. We can do that. We can do that without selling them. We have plenty of money, and we can build any kind of a ship that we want; but the proposition to sell these two battleships and add enough money to what we get, as the chairman of the committee says, to build a dreadnaught that will be four times as great as these reminds me of the fellow that swapped the \$100 horse for a \$50 horse even, and then contended that he had made a good trade because he took \$100 out of his pocket and with this money and the \$50 horse got a better one than he had at first. That is the proposition you have here.

I hope this House will consider this fact, that it is a new proposition which never has been investigated. The committee has never had it up before it. It is a proposition that affects the very vitals of our Navy, and before any such proposition is adopted, I appeal to the Members of this House to give the Committee on Naval Affairs an opportunity to examine into it and find out whether the object of it is to improve our Navy or

not, or whether it is to provide a contract for another corporation. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Forty minutes of the gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. I would like to inquire how many speeches there are to be on the other side?

Mr. PADGETT. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], and I have had a page looking for him, but I can not find him on the floor at present.

Mr. MANN. He was here a moment ago.

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITEN] one minute.

Mr. BRITEN. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON] refused to yield to me for a question a few minutes ago. I merely wanted to call the attention of the House to the fact that his entire argument and his entire comparison is based on a ship we do not expect to build. His entire argument is based on a 26,000-ton ship, carrying as its heaviest armament twelve 12-inch guns, which the Navy Department has no intention whatever of building. I wanted to correct the gentleman in regard to that, but he would not permit it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee has 23 minutes left.

Mr. PADGETT. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, the proposition that the House has to consider to-day is a very simple one, and, in my judgment, the House ought not to hesitate to act upon it, and act favorably on the recommendation of the chairman of the committee, and therefore I shall favor and support the amendment which is offered by him. We have the administration saying to the Congress, having considered the matter carefully, that this change ought to be made. It is declared and believed that this is a great opportunity, that a chance is offered us now to materially improve and strengthen the Navy, and why should we hesitate to do this? Is it because we do not want an efficient navy? Is it because we would rather see it weakened than strengthened? I can well understand the attitude of the gentleman from Mississippi; he is not anxious for a strong navy; he is opposed to it, and there are other gentlemen who are opposed to any proposition to strengthen the Navy. I can very easily understand that point of view; but for those of us who believe that this country ought to maintain an adequate navy there ought to be no question regarding it. Are we sufficient in information and in judgment to say that this change ought not to be made?

The gentleman from Mississippi alleges that as a matter of technical policy it is not a good thing to have dreadnaughts; that it is better to have a large number of smaller battleships; but the judgment of the world is otherwise. He says that experts differ. It may be that some experts agree with the position that he takes, but the nations of the world do not so agree. They are building large ships, effective battleships, dreadnaught battleships, because they believe that by that means they can best strengthen their navies. We would be going against the admitted judgment of the world if we would change our policy. If dreadnaughts are a bad policy, we ought not to follow this bad system; if it is a good policy, we ought to strengthen our Navy on this line if we can do so by this action. The Secretary of the Navy says this ought to be done. The naval experts say that this ought to be done. They say this because we will thus obtain one battleship that, in efficiency, as they believe, in the point of strengthening the Navy will make the Navy three times as effective and strong as it will to retain the two battleships. We are told that to this extent it will make our Navy a better and stronger one, and why ought not we to do it? There is no question in my mind but what it is our duty, if we believe that our Navy ought to be strengthened and can be strengthened thus advantageously and cheaply, that we should do it now. Here we have two small battleships that they say are not in consonance with the upbuilding of a harmonious Navy, that we can advantageously dispose of them, that we can thus strengthen it as a whole, and this opportunity comes to us now when we can sell those two old ships for all that they cost us and build a new and better and stronger battleship than any we have now by the expenditure of a very small amount in addition to what we will receive from them. Why should not we do it? You gentlemen in a business of your own would be glad of such a chance, if it were offered, and such an opportunity will not likely occur again. Circumstances such as these do not arise every day.

We have a chance now to do that which will not come to us again probably in the history of the life of any man who is now

here present. So I am in favor of this proposition. I am not in favor of selling these battleships and putting the money into the Treasury, because that would be weakening the Navy, and I am not in favor of weakening it. I am not in favor of any proposition that will make the Navy of the United States less effective than it is now. I am not a big Navy advocate, but I do believe that the United States is compelled, in view of existing conditions, to maintain a fairly adequate Navy, and it should be made just as efficacious, just as strong as we possibly can with the means and with the policy we have now with regard to how much money we should expend in the development of our Navy.

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

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. ADAIR. If these two ships should be sold, how long would it be before a dreadnaught could be built?

Mr. TOWNER. I think about three years.

Mr. ADAIR. Then, for at least three years it would weaken the Navy just that much, would it not?

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman is entirely correct about that. And if there were such conditions existing as made it unwise for us to weaken our Navy, I would not be in favor of this change or of disposing of the vessels at all.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I yield.

Mr. FESS. What is the incident in your mind where you say, if we do not do it now, probably the opportunity will not come to us again?

Mr. TOWNER. For the reason that there is a nation now ready and willing to take these ships at the price that we paid for them. Certainly those circumstances do not ordinarily arise.

Mr. FESS. What is the presumption on the part of Greece, that wants them?

Mr. TOWNER. Because of the fact that she is engaged, or probably soon will be engaged, in war with a nation that has a stronger navy than she has.

Mr. FESS. Is there any danger, with that point of view in our mind, in our transferring these ships to that country?

Mr. TOWNER. Oh, no.

Mr. FESS. Does the protest from Turkey mean anything to you at all?

Mr. TOWNER. The protest from Turkey, as we understand it, is made merely upon the ordinary ground that might exist when any nation would not desire to see a rival nation strengthened. But we have a perfect right to sell to Greece, as we would have a perfect right to sell to Turkey, under existing conditions. We are not violating any international agreement or international right. And certainly the gentleman does not believe for a moment that we are in any danger of any offensive demonstrations against this country by Turkey?

Mr. FESS. No. My point is, Are we undignified by selling at this time, when we know that the reason for the purchase is the acute situation between Turkey and Greece?

Mr. TOWNER. No, I will say to the gentleman; because it is done often, and has been done always. At the commencement of the Spanish-American War we did it. Other nations have frequently done it. They buy ships when they need them, when they think they ought to do so.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. Suppose that the sale, or the proposition to sell, would be taken as an occasion for Turkey to declare war against Greece, and this is done before we have delivered the ships; can we complete the contract under international law if war has been declared by Turkey?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly; if the agreement is made prior to the declaration of war.

Mr. FESS. I would say to the gentleman that I am up in the air on this question. I do not know how to vote.

Mr. SAUNDERS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I understood from what you said to the gentleman from Ohio that you think this country with perfect safety can do without these two ships for three years?

Mr. TOWNER. I certainly think so.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Why do you think that at the end of three years we will have need of an equivalent of these two ships? Why look that far into the future? Where is there any danger to our self-defense that will make it impossible for us to dispense with them for three years?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] how many more speeches he has on his side?

Mr. PADGETT. I understand you have only one, and I expect to have only one.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. You have only one more?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am disposed, so far as I am concerned, to take the discretion of the President in regard to the sale of these battleships, though I think it were better for the United States not to become engaged in any entangling alliances or to interfere for the purpose of bringing about or preventing war between two European powers. But with me that is not the question involved here.

Ever since I have been a Member of this House I have sought to uphold the dignity and power of the House as against the constant assaults upon it both from the Senate and from the Government departments. [Applause.] If we have two battleships which are now merely old junk, so far as business is concerned, it would be advisable to sell them if we can get a high price for them. If we can sell 50 cents' worth of battleship for \$2, as far as the business is concerned it would be advisable to sell. But what I object to in the matter is the lack of confidence on the part of the Navy officers in Congress. If we ought to sell the battleships both as a matter of business and diplomacy, let us sell them and put the money into the Treasury, where it belongs, and then let Congress in its power determine whether that money shall be used to build another battleship or be used for some other purpose. In no other way can we uphold either the dignity or the power of the House of Representatives. We are the body which proposes appropriations, and if we permit a department of the Government to come to us and say, "I have something in my department which I do not need, which I have not much use for, which I will dispose of if you will let me trade it for something else," we have lost our power and degraded our dignity. Why, if this money when deposited ought to be used for the construction of a new battleship—and I do not say it ought not to be so used—allow Congress to determine that fact when it has the money. Why should the department so lack confidence in the House of Representatives that it will not make the sale unless it knows in advance what it can do with that money, and that it can not trust Congress to properly appropriate the money? I think we still have knowledge and wisdom enough in the House of Representatives to know, when the proper time comes, whether we wish to appropriate money for one purpose or to use the same money for another purpose. And unless we uphold our power and our dignity, we might as well resign and be wiped off the face of the map. The amendment which I have proposed would permit, so far as the rest of it is concerned, the sale of these battleships in the discretion of the President and provide that the proceeds of the sale should be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, like the proceeds of the sale of everything else which the Government sells.

If we sell Panama Canal material, it is paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. We may appropriate the money next year for new construction on the canal, but if Col. Goethals had come to Congress and said, "I would like to sell some of these old French machines as junk provided you will let me have the money to buy something else," we would have said to him what we ought to say now to the Navy Department, "You may sell the material and turn the money into the Treasury, and we shall determine what will be done with that money." [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] is recognized for 13 minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to say in behalf of the Navy Department that there is no intention on the part of the department to dicker with Congress. The department has simply submitted, as was its duty and its prerogative to do, a plain business proposition, and has asked the approval and the authority of the Congress. They have simply said, "We have an opportunity to sell two ships that are not serviceable to us. They are not adapted to our conditions; they do not fit in with the remainder of our fleet; they are an impediment to the fleet. We can sell them at the original cost, and we ask authority to sell them and to use this money to build another ship."

Now, that is a plain proposition without any dicker or anything of the kind; and the criticism of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], I think, grows out of his habit of hunting and finding an opportunity to try to criticize the administration at every opportunity he gets. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I wish to call attention also to some of the statements of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON], who can make more peculiar arguments than any man that I have ever seen. [Laughter.] He has argued here before you, time and again and to-day, seriously that a little ship with little guns is better than a big ship with big guns, and he goes on to say that the nations of the world are adopting that policy. I have here the building programs of the nations. Let me call your attention to them. Great Britain is building 14 dreadnaughts, and not a single one of the old-type battleships that the gentleman was talking about. Germany is building 6 dreadnaughts, and not a single one of the battleships.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I will yield for a question.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Will the gentleman state to this House, for instance, that the *Queen Elizabeth*, one of those ships that England is building, has not gotten on her sixteen 6-inch guns?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and all of ours have got more than that. I will take up this question with you in a minute.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. We have not any such thing.

Mr. PADGETT. Let us take up one thing at a time. The United States is building five dreadnaughts, and not a single one of the old-type battleships. Japan is building four dreadnaughts, and not one of the old-type battleships. Italy is building seven dreadnaughts, and not one of the old-type battleships. And yet the gentleman from Mississippi comes here before us and argues that the policy of the nations of the world is to build little ships with little guns instead of big ships with big guns. Here are the facts.

Then the gentleman said here that these two ships had four 12-inch guns, and I have forgotten how many—28, I believe it was, he said—of the small guns, and that the dreadnaughts had 12 big guns and no little guns. The gentleman does not investigate. He simply looks at first impressions. Take the *Oklahoma*. That has ten 14-inch guns. It has also twenty-one 5-inch guns. The *Pennsylvania* has twelve 14-inch guns and twenty-two 5-inch guns. The *Texas* has ten 14-inch guns and twenty-one 5-inch guns. And then, besides, the *Oklahoma* has four 3-pounders, the *Pennsylvania* has four 3-pounders, and the *Texas* has four 3-pounders.

Here is a table which shows that every dreadnaught that we have not only has a main battery of big guns but every one of them has a subordinate battery of small guns. Yet the gentleman from Mississippi comes here and states to you and seriously argues that a dreadnaught could fire about so many guns a minute—two, I believe he said, a minute with the big guns—and it would be swamped with the little guns from the other ship. Each one of these dreadnaughts has more little guns, I think, than any of these old-type battleships. They have simply two batteries—first the main battery, and then the subordinate battery for torpedo attacks.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; certainly.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I do not deny the fact that all our battleships, dreadnaughts and every other kind, have a lot of small guns; but do not you know as a fact that these little guns that you are talking about are guns that are put on all the ships for the purpose of saluting the Committee on Naval Affairs when its members go aboard? [Laughter.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I can only answer that question by saying that that statement of the gentleman has as much accuracy in it as any other statement he has made about the Navy. [Renewed laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall detain the House but little longer. Here is a plain business proposition that comes to us at this time, and it is simply this: That we have two ships that do not fit in our program of the Navy. Our dreadnaughts are of 20,000 to 30,000 tons displacement, each carrying 14-inch guns, and here are ships of 13,000 tons, each carrying four 12-inch guns. Our dreadnaughts have a speed of 20 or more knots. These smaller ships are down to between 15 and 16 knots. Here is a proposition to convert these two ships into money, without the loss of a single cent, and get the original cost, and convert the proceeds into a ship up to date, that has more than four times the military and fighting value of either one of those ships, or more than twice the value of both of them combined. [Applause.]

Now, then, the simple question is, we can make this trade now. If we let it go by, the opportunity will not come again, and in a few years the gentleman will be complaining that these ships go into the junk pile. Let us be business men. Let us deal with a business proposition in a business way and sell these ships and get the money and replace them. They say it will take three years yet to build another ship. The sooner we begin building it, the sooner we will have it completed.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said, "Put the money into the Treasury and then come back next year and authorize the proposition." Here is a proposition to do both in the same amendment—sell the two ships and build a new one.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one other thing to which I wish to call attention. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is simply a shrewd proposition designed to kill this whole provision. I ask that his amendment be voted down and that the House concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment which I have sent to the desk, which is simply to sell these ships and use the money to build another one; in other words, to convert these two ships into one that is worth four times as much as either one of them. I ask for a vote.

Mr. HARDEY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MANN. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—yeas 64, noes 66.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 104, nays 153, answered "present" 7, not voting 169, as follows:

YEAS—104.

Abercrombie	Cullop	Helgesen	Plumley
Aiken	Danjorth	Helm	Prouty
Aswell	Davis	Hensley	Quin
Bailey	Dickinson	Hinebaugh	Kahey
Barton	Defenderfer	Howard	Rauch
Beall, Tex.	Dillon	Howell	Kayburn
Booher	Donovan	Igoe	Relly, Wis.
Buchanan, Ill.	Doolittle	Jacoway	Ruby
Buchanan, Tex.	Doughton	Johnson, S. C.	Rucker
Burgess	Edmonds	Johnson, Utah	Russell
Burnett	Faison	Keating	Saunders
Byrnes, S. C.	Ferris	Kelly, Ia.	Shreve
Byrns, Tenn.	Fitzgerald	Kennedy, Iowa	Sisson
Candler, Miss.	FitzHenry	Kindel	Smith, Saml. W.
Caraway	Floyd, Ark.	Kreider	Stafford
Carter	Foster	Leshner	Stephens, Miss.
Casey	Garrett, Tex.	Lever	Stephens, Nebr.
Cary	Good	Lewis, Md.	Stephens, Tex.
Clark, Fla.	Goodwin, Ark.	Lindbergh	Summers
Claypool	Graham, Pa.	Maguire, Nebr.	Tavener
Cline	Gray	Mann	Thompson, Okla.
Collier	Green, Iowa	Morgan, Okla.	Treadway
Connelly, Kans.	Gregg	Morrison	Vollmer
Cox	Hamlin	Moss, Ind.	Voitstead
Cramton	Hardy	Page, N. C.	Wingo
Crosser	Haugen	Peterson	Witherspoon

NAYS—153.

Adair	Dixon	Hawley	McCoy
Alexander	Donohoe	Hayes	McDermott
Allen	Dupré	Hedin	McGillcuddy
Ansberry	Eagle	Helvering	McKellar
Ashbrook	Elder	Hill	McLaughlin
Baker	Esch	Holland	Maps
Baltz	Estopinal	Houston	Mitchell
Barkley	Evans	Hughes, Ga.	Montague
Bathrick	Falconer	Hulings	Moore
Beakes	Farr	Hull	Murdock
Bell, Cal.	Fergusson	Humphrey, Wash.	Murray, Mass.
Blackmon	Fess	Johnson, Ky.	Murray, Okla.
Borchers	Finley	Johnson, Wash.	Nolan, J. I.
Bowdle	Flood, Va.	Jones	O'Hair
Britten	Francis	Kahn	Oldfield
Brodbeck	French	Kelley, Mich.	O'Leary
Broussard	Gallagher	Kettner	Padgett
Brown, N. Y.	Gardner	Key, Ohio	Park
Bryan	Garner	Kirkald, Nebr.	Parker
Bulkeley	Garrett, Tenn.	Kirkpatrick	Payne
Campbell	Gill	Korbly	Post
Coady	Godwin, N. C.	La Follette	Pou
Connelly, Iowa	Goetz	Lazaro	Ragsdale
Conry	Goulden	Lee, Ga.	Raker
Cooper	Graham, Ill.	Lee, Pa.	Reilly, Conn.
Covington	Greene, Mass.	Linthicum	Roberts, Mass.
Curry	Gudger	Lloyd	Roberts, Nev.
Detrick	Hamill	Logne	Rouse
Dent	Hamilton, Mich.	Loneragan	Rupley
Dershem	Harris	McClellan	Scott

Seldomridge	Stout	Thacher	Watson
Sinnott	Sutherland	Towner	Webb
Small	Taggart	Tribble	Whaley
Smith, Md.	Talbot, Md.	Tuttle	Williams
Smith, N. Y.	Talcoot, N. Y.	Underhill	Wilson, N. Y.
Sparkman	Taylor, Ark.	Underwood	Woodruff
Steenerson	Taylor, Colo.	Walker	
Stephens, Cal.	Temple	Walters	
Stone	Ten Eyck	Watkins	
ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.			
Adamson	Burke, S. Dak.	Metz	Sloan
Bartlett	Burke, Wis.	Slomp	
NOT VOTING—169.			
Aincy	Fordney	L'Engle	Riordan
Anderson	Fowler	Lenroot	Rogers
Anthony	Frear	Levy	Rothermel
Austin	Gallivan	Lewis, Pa.	Sabath
Avis	Gard	Lieb	Scully
Barchfeld	George	Lindquist	Sells
Barnhart	Gerry	Lobeck	Shackleford
Bartholdt	Gillett	Loft	Sharp
Bell, Ga.	Gilmore	McAndrews	Sherley
Borland	Gittins	McGuire, Okla.	Sherwood
Brockson	Glass	McKenzie	Sims
Brown, W. Va.	Goldfogle	MacDonald	Slayden
Browne, Wis.	Gordon	Madden	Smith, Idaho
Browning	Gorman	Mahan	Smith, J. M. C.
Bruckner	Greene, Vt.	Maher	Smith, Minn.
Brumbaugh	Griest	Manahan	Smith, Tex.
Burke, Pa.	Griffin	Martin	Stanley
Butler	Guernsey	Merritt	Stedman
Caldor	Hamilton, N. Y.	Miller	Stevens, Minn.
Callaway	Hammond	Mondell	Stevens, N. H.
Cantor	Hardwick	Moon	Stringer
Cantrill	Harrison	Morgan, La.	Switzer
Carew	Hart	Morin	Taylor, Ala.
Carlin	Hay	Moss, W. Va.	Taylor, N. Y.
Carr	Hayden	Mott	Thomas
Chandler, N. Y.	Henry	Neeley, Kans.	Thomson, Ill.
Church	Hinds	Neely, W. Va.	Townsend
Clancy	Hobson	Nelson	Vare
Copley	Hoxworth	Norton	Vaughan
Crisp	Hughes, W. Va.	O'Brien	Wallin
Dale	Humphreys, Miss.	Oglesby	Walsh
Davenport	Keister	O'Shaunessy	Weaver
Decker	Kennedy, Conn.	Paige, Mass.	Whitacre
Dies	Kennedy, R. I.	Palmer	White
Doelling	Kent	Patten, N. Y.	Willis
Doremus	Kiess, Pa.	Patton, Pa.	Wilson, Fla.
Driscoll	Kinkead, N. J.	Peters, Mass.	Winslow
Drukker	Kitchin	Peters, Me.	Woods
Dunn	Knowland, J. R.	Phelan	Young, N. Dak.
Eagan	Konop	Platt	Young, Tex.
Edwards	Lafferty	Porter	
Fairchild	Langham	Powers	
Fields	Langley	Reed	

So the amendment of Mr. MANN was rejected. The Clerk announced the following pairs: For the session: Mr. FIELDS with Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. BUTLER. Mr. ADAMSON with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. METZ with Mr. WALLIN. Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING. Until further notice: Mr. BROCKSON with Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. YOUNG of Texas with Mr. WOODS. Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. VAUGHAN with Mr. THOMSON of Illinois. Mr. TOWNSEND with Mr. SWITZER. Mr. THOMAS with Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. STRINGER with Mr. SELLS. Mr. SMITH of Texas with Mr. WILLIS. Mr. SIMS with Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. SHERWOOD with Mr. ROGERS. Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. PLATT. Mr. ROTHERMEL with Mr. PORTER. Mr. REED with Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. PHELAN with Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts. Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. NORTON. Mr. PALMER with Mr. VARE. Mr. NEELEY of Kansas with Mr. MOTT. Mr. MOON with Mr. NELSON. Mr. LOBECK with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia. Mr. KONOP with Mr. MONDELL. Mr. LIEB with Mr. MORIN. Mr. LEVY with Mr. POWERS. Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey with Mr. MILLER. Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut with Mr. MERRITT. Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi with Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. HAYDEN with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. HAY with Mr. LINDQUIST. Mr. GORMAN with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania. Mr. GORDON with Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. LANGHAM. Mr. GILMORE with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania. Mr. GEORGE with Mr. DUNN. Mr. GARD with Mr. KEISTER.

Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. GUERNSEY. Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. GRIEST. Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. DIES with Mr. CALDER. Mr. HARRISON with Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. DECKER with Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. GERRY with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. CAER with Mr. BARCHFELD. Mr. CARLIN with Mr. AVIS. Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. BROWN of West Virginia with Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. BORLAND with Mr. AINEY. Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. CLANCY with Mr. HAMILTON of New York. Mr. GLASS with Mr. SLEMP. Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana with Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. MADDEN. Mr. HARDWICK with Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. COPLEY. Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. STEDMAN with Mr. PETERS of Maine. Mr. HENRY with Mr. HINDS. Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. GILLET. Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Mr. SABATH with Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Mr. DALE with Mr. MARTIN. Mr. BARNHART with Mr. DRUKKER. Until August 4: Mr. WEAVER with Mr. SLOAN. On this vote: Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin (against Mann amendment) with Mr. FREAR (for Mann amendment). Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recorded present. The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall and listening? Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. I was not. The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule. Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I desire to inquire if the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. BELL, voted? The SPEAKER. He is not recorded. Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I voted "aye," but I wish to withdraw my vote and to answer "present." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. The SPEAKER. The question now recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] to concur in Senate amendment 71, with an amendment. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STAFFORD) there were 124 yeas and 81 noes. Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered. The question was taken; and there were—yeas 175, nays 89, answered "present" 5, not voting 164, as follows:

YEAS—175.

Abercrombie	Deitrick	Hamill	McCoy
Adamson	Dent	Hamilton, Mich.	McDermott
Aiken	Dershem	Harris	McGillicuddy
Allen	Dixon	Harrison	McKellar
Ansberry	Donohoe	Hawley	McLaughlin
Ashbrook	Donovan	Hayden	Mann
Aswell	Doolittle	Hayes	Mitchell
Baker	Dupré	Hedlin	Montague
Barkley	Eagle	Hinebaugh	Moore
Batbrick	Elder	Holland	Morgan, Okla.
Beakes	Esch	Houston	Murdock
Bell, Cal.	Estopinal	Hulings	Murray, Mass.
Blackmon	Evans	Hull	Murray, Okla.
Borchers	Faison	Humphrey, Wash.	Nolan, J. I.
Bowdle	Falconer	Johnson, Ky.	O'Hair
Britten	Farr	Johnson, Wash.	Oldfield
Brodbeck	Fergusson	Jones	O'Leary
Broussard	Flood, Va.	Kahn	Padgett
Brown, N. Y.	Finley	Kelly, Pa.	Park
Bryan	Francis	Kettner	Parker
Buchanan, Tex.	French	Key, Ohio	Payne
Bulkeley	Gallagher	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Plumley
Burgess	Gardner	Kirkpatrick	Post
Campbell	Garner	Korby	Pou
Cary	Garrett, Tenn.	Kreider	Ragsdale
Casey	Gill	La Follette	Raker
Church	Godwin, N. C.	Lazaro	Relly, Conn.
Coady	Goeke	Lee, Ga.	Roberts, Mass.
Connolly, Iowa	Goulden	Lee, Pa.	Roberts, Nev.
Conry	Graham, Ill.	Lesher	Rouse
Cooper	Graham, Pa.	Linthicum	Rupley
Cullop	Green, Iowa	Logue	Scott
Curry	Greene, Mass.	Loneragan	Seldomridge
Danforth	Gudger	McClellan	Shreve

Sinnott	Stout	Ten Eyck	Walsh
Small	Sutherland	Thacher	Walters
Smith, Md.	Switzer	Towner	Watkins
Smith, N. Y.	Taggart	Treadway	Watson
Smith, Saml. W.	Talbot, Md.	Tribble	Webb
Sparkman	Talcott, N. Y.	Tuttle	Whaley
Steenerson	Tavener	Underhill	Williams
Stephens, Cal.	Tejlor, Ark.	Underwood	Wilson, N. Y.
Stevens, Minn.	Taylor, Colo.	Vollmer	Woodruff
Stone	Temple	Walker	

NAYS—89.

Adair	Difenderfer	Hill	Prouty
Bailey	Dillon	Howard	Quin
Baltz	Doughton	Hughes, Ga.	Rainey
Barton	Drukker	Igoe	Rauch
Beall, Tex.	Edmonds	Jacoway	Rayburn
Bocher	Ferris	Johnson, S. C.	Rellly, Wt
Brumbaugh	Fess	Johnson, Utah	Rubey
Buchanan, III.	Fitzgerald	Keating	Rucker
Burnett	FitzHenry	Kelley, Mich.	Russell
Byrnes, S. C.	Floyd, Ark.	Kennedy, Iowa	Sims
Byrns, Tenn.	Foster	Kindel	Sisson
Candler, Miss.	Garrett, Tex.	Lenroot	Stafford
Caraway	Good	Lever	Stephens, Miss.
Carter	Goodwin, Ark.	Lewis, Md.	Stephens, Nebr.
Caypool	Gray	Lindbergh	Stephens, Tex.
Cline	Gregg	Maguire, Nebr.	Sumners
Collier	Hamlin	Mapes	Thompson, Okla.
Connelly, Kans.	Hardy	Miller	Volstead
Cox	Haugen	Mondell	Wingo
Cramton	Helgesen	Morrison	Witherspoon
Crosser	Helm	Moss, Ind.	
Davis	Holtering	Pace, N. C.	
Dickinson	Hensley	Peterson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

Partlett	Burke, Wis.	Metz	Sloan
----------	-------------	------	-------

NOT VOTING—164.

Ainey	Fairchild	Lafferty	Porter
Alexander	Fields	Langham	Powers
Anderson	Fordney	Langley	Reed
Antony	Fowler	L'Engle	Riordan
Austin	Frear	Levy	Rogers
Avis	Gallivan	Lewis, Pa.	Rothermel
Barchfeld	Gard	Lieb	Sabath
Barnhart	George	Lindquist	Saunders
Bartholdt	Gerry	Lloyd	Scully
Bell, Ga.	Gillett	Lobeck	Sells
Borland	Gilmore	Loft	Shackelford
Brockson	Gittins	McAndrews	Sharp
Brown, W. Va.	Glass	McGuire, Okla.	Sherley
Browne, Wis.	Goldfogle	McKenzie	Sherwood
Browning	Gordon	MacDonald	Slayden
Bruckner	Gorman	Madden	Slemp
Burke, Pa.	Greene, Vt.	Mahan	Smith, Idaho
Butler	Griest	Maher	Smith, J. M. C.
Calder	Griffin	Manahan	Smith, Minn.
Callaway	Guernsey	Martin	Smith, Tex.
Cantor	Hamilton, N. Y.	Merritt	Stanley
Cantrill	Hammond	Moon	Stedman
Carew	Hardwick	Morgan, La.	Stevens, N. H.
Carlin	Hart	Morin	Stringer
Carr	Hay	Moss, W. Va.	Taylor, Ala.
Chandler, N. Y.	Henry	Mott	Taylor, N. Y.
Clancy	Hinds	Neeley, Kans.	Thomas
Clark, Fla.	Hobson	Neely, W. Va.	Thomas, III.
Copiey	Howell	Nelson	Townsend
Covington	Hoxworth	Norton	Vare
Crisp	Hughes, W. Va.	O'Brien	Vaughan
Dale	Humphreys, Miss.	Oglesby	Wallin
Davenport	Keister	O'Shaunessy	Weaver
Decker	Kennedy, Conn.	Palce, Mass.	Whitacre
Dies	Kennedy, R. I.	Palmer	White
Doolling	Kent	Patten, N. Y.	Willis
Doremus	Kloss, Pa.	Pattin, Pa.	Wilson, Fla.
Driscoll	Kinhead, N. J.	Peters, Mass.	Winslow
Dunn	Kitchin	Peters, Me.	Woods
Eagan	Knowland, J. R.	Phelan	Young, N. Dak.
Edwards	Koop	Platt	Young, Tex.

So the motion of Mr. PADGETT to concur with an amendment was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. McANDREWS with Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. BARNHART with Mr. HOWELL.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin with Mr. FREAR.

On this vote:

Mr. ALEXANDER (for Padgett motion) with Mr. SAUNDERS (against).

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. PADGETT, Mr. TALEOTT of Maryland, and Mr. BUTLER.

SUSPENSION DAY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, next Monday is the fifth Monday in the month. It belongs neither to the District Committee nor to the Unanimous Consent Calendar. There are a number of bills where applications have been made to suspend the rules and pass them. I ask unanimous consent that motions

to suspend the rules and pass bills may be in order next Monday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that on next Monday motions to suspend the rules shall be in order.

Mr. BURNETT. Reserving the right to object, is not that unanimous-consent day?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; it does not belong to anybody.

Mr. MURDOCK. Reserving the right to object, have we had any suspension days this session?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There have been a good many suspension days, but no suspensions.

Mr. MURDOCK. What are these bills?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Speaker has the power of recognition for suspension of the rules, and I am not proposing anybody's bill. I am merely proposing an opportunity for gentlemen who desire to be recognized for suspension of the rules to get a chance to get those bills up.

Mr. MURDOCK. How does recognition come on suspension day?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is entirely in the hands of the Speaker.

Mr. MURDOCK. Members who have bills on the calendar who desire to move to suspend the rules to pass those bills must see the Speaker and arrange for recognition?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That has always been the custom.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Does that apply to any bill that is on the calendar?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman to couple with his request a proviso that the sundry civil bill be disposed of.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman from Alabama say to that?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire in the world to interfere with the sundry civil appropriation bill, because I recognize that it is more important than the other bills, and ought to go through. I equally have no doubt that the sundry civil bill will be disposed of by that time, but I will modify my request to that extent that next Monday it may be in order for the Speaker to recognize gentlemen to pass bills under suspension of the rules, not to interfere with the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama will remember that the rule on suspension is something like this, that suspension of the rules shall be in order twice a month, on the first and third Mondays, preference to be given to committees on one Monday and to membership on the other.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. How will that rule operate on this fifth Monday?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, my request was not to consider committees or individuals, but to allow the Speaker to recognize either committee or individual suspensions. It takes a two-thirds vote to pass the bills that will come up, and those that will come up will not be partisan measures.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that on next Monday, being the fifth Monday in the month and not being claimed especially by either the Committee on the District of Columbia or the Unanimous Consent Calendar, motions to suspend the rules shall be in order, not to interfere with the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there will not be notice to the House, will there, of what bills will be called up on that day? There will be no calendar?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There never is. The Unanimous Consent Calendar has grown so large that it has crowded out motions to suspend the rules. The Speaker has recognized the Unanimous Consent Calendar over motions to suspend the rules, although I believe that it is within the power of the Speaker to recognize motions to suspend the rules in preference to the Unanimous Consent Calendar, if he so desires. The Unanimous Consent Calendar, however, has shoved suspension out of the way, and this will be an opportunity to let Members call up bills that are not of a partisan nature, but are of public moment. Of course, it will require a two-thirds vote to pass any of them.

Mr. COOPER. Is it proposed on Monday to bring up the water-power bill that has been made a special order?

Mr. GARNER. That is with the Speaker.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am personally very much interested in the passage of that bill, I will say to the gentleman—

Mr. MANN. But that will not come up under suspension of the rules.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state for the information of Members that no one has ever applied to the Chair to suspend the rules on that bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that there is an order of the House now in existence giving privilege to that water-power bill, and if this request be objected to, the water-power bill would come up on that day, but this would give suspension a preference to the water-power bill. I am in hopes that that bill will come up before that time.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman will remember that the Moon bill has preference.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask with reference to the reclamation extension bill. Would there be any objection to its coming up if the other Land Department bills came up?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think there is a possibility of the reclamation extension bill coming up before that time.

Mr. BRYAN. That bill may come up to-morrow on the regular call of committees.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It might. I am not attempting to make any order in reference to what bills shall come up.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Alabama will permit me, I would state that there is no intention at all, if this consent be given, to attempt to call up the bill to amend the general dam act.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman means under suspension of the rules?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes; because it already has been made privileged by consent of the House.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER. What will be the regular order of business on Monday next without this special order?

The SPEAKER. It would be an ordinary legislative day; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] would have the right of way with his appropriation bill. It is the fifth Monday of the month.

Mr. COOPER. But suppose that bill were passed before Monday, what would be the regular order?

The SPEAKER. The bill the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] refers to—the dam bill—because that, by unanimous consent, has been made a privileged matter.

Mr. ADAMSON. And some folks have damned it; but I think we will turn it loose when we can get it on the floor.

The SPEAKER. And when this appropriation bill is out of the way, and no conference report or privileged matter is called up, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Georgia, or some one for him, to call that bill up, because the House gave it a privileged status by unanimous consent three or four weeks ago, and it would have been disposed of long ago if it had not been for that special order that was brought in by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. COOPER. I understood the gentleman from Georgia to say it is not his purpose to take up that bill on next Monday.

Mr. MANN. He could not pass one end of it.

Mr. ADAMSON. I expect to call it up as soon as the sundry civil bill is out of the way.

Mr. COOPER. I understood the gentleman from Georgia to say, a few moments ago, he would not take it up.

Mr. ADAMSON. I will not ask recognition to suspend the rules; no, sir. I will not do that. I have a much better chance the other way.

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

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask something easy, and that is to lay two bills on the table, because identical bills have already passed the House.

The SPEAKER. What are the numbers?

Mr. ADAMSON. One is H. R. 1922, on the Union Calendar, and the other is H. R. 16133, on the House Calendar. Identical bills have already passed and these ought to be laid on the table.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 16133. A bill to amend section 20 of an act to regulate commerce.

H. R. 1922. A bill to repeal that part of the act entitled "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal, and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone," approved August 24, 1912, which exempts vessels engaged in the coastwise trade from tolls at the Panama Canal.

Mr. ADAMSON. One of those is the canal tolls repeal and the other is the stocks and bonds bill, both of which have passed the House.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman got through with the canal tolls repeal now?

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not think the gentleman will ever be able to resurrect that iniquity in the world any more.

Mr. MANN. The next Congress will repeal what has been done this time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, these two bills will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS IN THE RECORD.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker—  
The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Nebraska rise?

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. I rise to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the naval bill we had under discussion a short time ago.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the naval bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CONNOLLY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. On what? I shall object if gentlemen do not state the subject.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Iowa. On the naval bill, on the battleship question.

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

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois did not know I wanted to extend my remarks on the naval bill, and that is why he objected.

The SPEAKER. Each gentleman ought to state on what subject he desires to extend his remarks, and it would save a great deal of trouble. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the naval bill. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask the privilege of making an announcement of about two sentences. I want to call attention—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DONOVAN (continuing). To the fact that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] is present—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects.

Mr. DONOVAN. Who?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois. While there is a good membership present the Chair wants to remind Members of two or three of the minor rules. One is that when a gentleman has the floor and another gentleman wants to interrupt him he ought to address the Chair. The reasons for that rule are good. Another one is that Members must not crowd around this desk when the roll is being called. It pesters the clerks and fuddles them so they do not know what they are doing; and the third rule, that is being violated right straight along, is that Members sitting in their seats should not inject remarks into a gentleman's speech. It is not fair or conducive to order. And the fourth, that is violated constantly, is that Members address each other as "you," and so forth, which is prohibited by the rule.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, what became of my request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] objected to the gentleman's request.

Mr. DONOVAN. The minority leader.

Mr. MANN. The request was not submitted to the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. MANN. I objected to the gentleman talking without any attention being paid to his request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from Connecticut speaking for two minutes?

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what became of my request?

The SPEAKER. Why, it was granted.

Mr. MANN. No.

The SPEAKER. That is true; it was not.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to make a statement to the Speaker.

The Speaker made a very essential statement here a few minutes ago to the effect that men who interrupt should address the Speaker, and that is true, and yet no man since has addressed the Speaker.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman himself is speaking out of order.

Mr. MURDOCK. Of course I am; I am trying to get in order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin to extend his remarks on the naval appropriation bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Is there objection to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN] addressing the House for two minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. [Applause.]

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I only wanted to call attention to this fact, that one of the most intellectual Members of this body has put in an appearance to-day at this session. I refer to the college president from Ohio [Mr. FESS]. He very kindly called attention to the attendance of this body before he departed, and after doing it we have not been able to look upon his face until to-day. [Applause.] We hope he will continue to perform the duties pertaining to a Representative in Congress and will not set such a bad example as to hie himself away three weeks at a time, as he has of late. [Laughter.]

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate concurrent resolution of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

#### Senate concurrent resolution 22.

Whereas the Government of the United States has erected a monument in Hollywood Cemetery at Richmond, Va., over the grave of President John Tyler; and

Whereas exercises will be held very soon to unveil the said monument and it being considered very appropriate that the Senate and House of Representatives should be properly represented on this occasion: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That a committee of 10 members be appointed, 5 by the President of the Senate and 5 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to represent the Congress of the United States to attend said ceremonies, and authority is hereby given to expend \$250 from the contingent fund of the Senate and \$250 from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives to defray the expenses of said committee, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and the Committee on Accounts of the House of Representatives, respectively—

to the Committee on the Library.

#### FORTIFICATIONS.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 12235—the fortifications appropriation bill—and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] calls up the conference report on the fortifications bill and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The conference report is as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 551).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12235) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, and 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

SWAGAR SHERLEY,  
GEO. WHITE,  
WM. M. CALDER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

N. P. BRYAN,  
GEO. C. PERKINS,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

The Clerk read the statement, as follows:

#### STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12235) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of the amendments of the Senate, namely:

On amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$450,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$900,000, as proposed by the Senate, for purchase, manufacture, and test of mountain, field, and siege cannon.

On amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$1,200,000, instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$900,000 as proposed by the House, for ammunition for mountain, field, and siege cannon.

On amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$45,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$55,000, as proposed by the Senate, for alteration and maintenance of mobile artillery in the United States.

On amendments Nos. 4 and 5, relating to protection, preservation, and repair of fortification in the insular possessions: Appropriates \$1,000, instead of \$1,500 as proposed by the Senate and \$500 as proposed by the House, for the Hawaiian Islands and strikes out the appropriation of \$7,000 for the Philippine Islands.

On amendments Nos. 6, 7, and 8, relating to preservation and repair of torpedo structures in the insular possessions: Appropriates \$2,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$500, as proposed by the House, for the Hawaiian Islands and \$1,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$750, as proposed by the House, for the Philippine Islands.

On amendments Nos. 9, 10, and 11, relating to reserve equipment in the insular possessions: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, \$50,000 for the Hawaiian Islands and \$100,000 for the Philippine Islands.

On amendments Nos. 12 and 13: Appropriates \$1,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$750, as proposed by the House, for tools and appliances for maintaining and operating searchlights and electric light and power plants in the Hawaiian Islands.

The bill as passed by the Senate appropriated \$6,895,200, which sum exceeded the bill as passed by the House by \$1,720,000. In conference the Senate receded from \$1,267,500, which makes the bill as agreed upon carry a total of \$5,627,700.

SWAGAR SHERLEY,  
GEO. WHITE,  
WM. M. CALDER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

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

#### PENSIONS.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 12045—the omnibus pension bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri calls up the conference report on the bill H. R. 12045, of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12045) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.



The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.  
The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 843).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12045) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 8, 16, 18, 21.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, and agree to the same.

JOE J. RUSSELL,  
J. A. M. ADAIR,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

CHARLES F. JOHNSON,  
REED SMOOT,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. RUSSELL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 17041, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, pending that motion, I wish to give notice that I will ask the House to sit the same as last night.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] gives notice that he will ask the House to sit to-night until 11 o'clock p. m. or somewhere along there.

Mr. MANN. Not as late as that.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 17041, the sundry civil bill, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I think under the agreement we made the other day that we now revert to the Frankford Arsenal item, on page 52.

The CHAIRMAN. There is pending a point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], which the Chair is ready to dispose of and rule upon, unless some gentlemen desire to be heard upon it. The Chair will indicate now before anyone is heard, in order that they may have full knowledge, that he is inclined to think this vote should be taken over again.

Mr. DONOHUE. I would ask the Chair what would be the situation in case we had reached the end of a paragraph without any opposition being offered to that paragraph and a Member then made the point of no quorum? Would we have to go back over that paragraph again?

The CHAIRMAN. Not under the practice of the House.

Mr. DONOHUE. Now, Mr. Chairman, this particular item was disposed of by the ruling of the Chair:

The committee divided; and on a division there were—ayes 35, noes 31.

The Chairman said:

On this question the ayes are 35, the noes are 31. The amendment is agreed to.

After that the point of order was made.

The CHAIRMAN. The situation was this: The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE] offered the amendment, and it was voted upon first by a viva voce vote, and then a division was demanded, and it was voted upon by the committee by a division. Upon that vote less than a quorum voted. The Chair announced the result in accordance with the custom which usually prevails in the Committee of the Whole, and immediately

after the announcement of the result the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] made the point that there was no quorum present. A count was immediately taken, which developed that there was no quorum present. Now, the Constitution provides that a majority of each House shall constitute a quorum to do business. The rules of the House provide that 100 shall constitute a quorum in the Committee of the Whole. The Chair believes that either in the House or in the Committee of the Whole where that point is made within a reasonable time, and it develops within a reasonable time, without any effort at filibustering, that there is not a quorum present, there ought to be a quorum pass upon that question of business before the House. The Chair may be wrong about it. The Chair, of course, will entertain an appeal. The Chair does sustain the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and the question is on the amendment.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, before the amendment is voted upon, I think it would be fair that gentlemen who are present now and who were not here when the motion was offered should know something of the circumstances and conditions of the case. I have here, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment reported before the gentleman proceeds?

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, after line 17, insert the following:  
"For extension of metal storehouse, \$13,500."

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation provides for the extension of a metal storehouse at Frankford Arsenal. I have here some photographs that were taken within the last 10 days showing the congested condition with regard to the storage of metals and other materials at the arsenal. I feel that there is scarcely a gentleman present who, if he will look over these photographs, would be unwilling to vote for this amendment, especially when he considers that the Frankford Arsenal saved to the Government last year in the manufacture of small-arms and artillery ammunition almost \$2,000,000, considering what the Government would have to pay if they had bought the ammunition on the outside. I have here one view of a loading platform, showing the congestion due to the storage of valuable brass and german-silver scrap. Here is another photograph showing an accumulation of scrap on the platform which should be stored under cover, and hundreds of boxes on the outside exposed to the elements. Another photograph shows the interior of the tin shop, where most of these boxes are made.

The box linings and boxes should be stored in a proper storehouse instead of being stored in the shop where they are made and where there is not room for them. Another view here is the small-arms ammunition boxes, for which there is no room on the inside. Thousands of these boxes, made of metal, are exposed to the elements because of the fact that there is no storage room for them.

Now, the department estimated for two storerooms, but the committee in their wisdom failed to put them in the bill. I am now appealing to the committee to put them in. Here are valuable boxes, costing the Government 60 cents each, stored in the open because of lack of room in the metal ammunition storehouse. Here is also a photograph showing thousands of these boxes outside, exposed to the weather, perhaps rusting.

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

Mr. DONOHUE. I do.

Mr. GOULDEN. What is the size of the present storehouse?

Mr. DONOHUE. I have not the dimensions.

Mr. GOULDEN. Approximately what is the length and breadth of it?

Mr. DONOHUE. I can not say.

Mr. GOULDEN. It is comparatively small, however?

Mr. DONOHUE. Yes; it is comparatively small. Here are views of the interior of the metal storehouse, showing the present crowded condition, with boxes of valuable material, brass and german silver and other metals, piled up almost to the rafters. Here is another view of the metal storehouse showing very much the same thing.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I trust the members of the committee will consider that Frankford Arsenal is one of the most economical workshops of the Government and provide for this small storehouse that the arsenal urgently and absolutely needs for the protection of the valuable material that is now on the outside exposed to the weather.

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

Mr. DONOHUE. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. This is urgently recommended by the department?

Mr. DONOHOE. Yes; it is urgently recommended by the department.

Mr. HOWARD. But it is not recommended by the committee?

Mr. DONOHOE. Mr. Chairman, on June 12, when these items were first reached, several Members of the House pointed out the urgent necessity of acquiring for Frankford Arsenal some 25 acres of adjoining land. Eloquent and, to my mind, convincing arguments were presented by several Representatives in support of my amendment providing \$100,000 for the purchase of the land in question. Compared with the Government arsenals at Rock Island, Watervliet, Springfield, and Watertown, it was pointed out that in proportion to the size of its working force, the amount of its annual disbursements, or the value of its manufactured product, Frankford Arsenal is badly hampered for room and has far outgrown in these respects its present area of 63 acres. In short, it was clearly shown that in the interest of the safety of the employees of the arsenal, as well as in the interest of economy and good business policy, the additional land—the last piece available—should be purchased before it is too late.

But a majority of the gentlemen who were present were evidently carried away by the statements of Chairman FITZGERALD, of the Appropriations Committee, who said in substance, first, that the item has not been estimated for by the War Department; second, that it is not necessary to enlarge the facilities of Frankford Arsenal; and, third, that we should not buy land at Frankford when we have unlimited land and abundant water power at Rock Island.

While it is true that the War Department has not recently estimated for the purchase of this land, it is also true that the department did heretofore estimate for it, that it still favors the proposition, and that the item has been left out of the estimates this year, not because it is not deemed advantageous, but "because other needs of the department have been so immediately pressing." Under date of April 14, 1914, Hon. Lindley M. Garrison, Secretary of War, wrote to Senator SWANSON, the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the United States Senate, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: I return herewith the bill (S. 5055) to provide for the acquisition of about 25 acres of land adjoining the Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia.

The principal reasons for the purchase of this property by the Government are as follows:

1. To avoid the serious situation which would arise if this property should be purchased by parties who would desire to utilize it for dwellings or factory purposes, since there is no doubt that in case such buildings should be erected upon the property the occupants would object to the experimental firings and other tests involving the use of high explosives which are conducted at the Frankford Arsenal.

2. The utilization of the property for the storage of explosives so as to remove them a safe distance from the present shop buildings.

3. To utilize the property for the construction of certain storehouses and shop buildings, which will undoubtedly be necessary in the expansion of the manufacturing plant at the Frankford Arsenal in the future and for which it would be impossible to secure grounds if this piece of property shall irrevocably pass to other uses.

The War Department has in the past submitted estimates for the purchase of this property, but I have not repeated the estimate; not because the purchase would not be advantageous and such as would be made by any efficient corporation in a similar position, but because other needs of the War Department have been so immediately pressing that I have been obliged to let this particular matter rest, although I recognize that in doing so the danger is incurred of the passage of the opportunity to make the purchase advantageously.

I believe that the land is now practically owned by the University of Pennsylvania, having been left to it as a part of an estate. I think a fair price would be somewhere between \$140,000 to \$150,000, so that the amount carried in the bill—\$154,000—should be sufficient to include the cost of condemnation proceedings should such be necessary, as contemplated by the bill.

Sincerely, yours,

LINDLEY M. GARRISON,  
Secretary of War.

This letter indicates how the Secretary of War feels regarding the necessity of purchasing this land and the advisability of increasing the facilities of the Frankford Arsenal. And I have personal knowledge that similar views on the subject are entertained by Gen. Crozier, the Chief of Ordnance, and by other prominent officials of the War Department. Gen. Crozier knows and admits that Frankford Arsenal is one of the most profitable of the Government's manufacturing establishments. In his last annual report the general says of it:

In the manufacture of artillery ammunition and small-arms ammunition at that arsenal a saving of over \$1,500,000 was made during the year as compared with what the same ammunition would have cost if procured from private establishments at the best prices which were offered. Also, in the manufacture under contract of these same two classes of ammunition, \$400,000 more were paid than it would have cost to make it at the arsenal.

Gen. Crozier, with his long experience in the Ordnance Department, realizes that the economies at Frankford Arsenal are due in large measure to its ideal location within the limits of a great manufacturing city, whose population is now 1,600,000.

On January 29 of this year, during the debate on the fortifications bill, I said on this point:

Its location as a manufacturing plant is most favorable. This fact was recognized as far back as 1875, when a board of ordnance officers recommended that the plant be enlarged and that 75 acres of additional land be purchased for that purpose.

Being within the city of Philadelphia, it is easily accessible for 250,000 skilled workmen. It is within 275 miles of the soft-coal fields of Pennsylvania, the source of its fuel supply; within 150 miles of Connecticut, from which it draws its brass for manufacturing; within 57 miles of Bethlehem, Pa., 58 miles of Reading, Pa., and 350 miles of Pittsburgh, Pa., from which points, as well as from Philadelphia, it procures its steel; within 30 miles of Carneys Point, N. J., and 136 miles of Picatinny Arsenal, N. J., from which it gets its explosives for the manufacture of ammunition.

Its shipping facilities are unsurpassed. It has direct railroad connection with the Pennsylvania Railroad, while the other railway lines that enter Philadelphia, the Reading and the Baltimore & Ohio, are within easy reach. In that great railroad center a supply of suitable cars for all purposes is procurable at all times on short notice. \* \* \*

These advantages of location—unrivaled labor market, proximity to supplies, and adequate transportation facilities—are the main factors in the development of the remarkable economies of Frankford Arsenal.

Members of this House who have inspected the plant, including some members of the Committee on Appropriations, are of one mind in favor of the purchase of the adjoining 25 acres of land. On the other hand, the chairman and some other members of the Committee on Appropriations seem to think that it would be unwise to enlarge the Frankford Arsenal while we have plenty of unused land and an abundance of cheap water power at the Rock Island Arsenal. But free land and cheap power would not be sufficient inducement for a sensible manufacturer to abandon a plant that has been paying for itself in profits every 30 months. Almost every argument that has been advanced in support of the proposition that the Government shall manufacture all of its requirements in ammunition is based on economies that have been effected at Frankford Arsenal.

We have heard much about the wonderful water power at Rock Island and how cheaply it is produced. We have also been told that the Government sells to the Moline Water Power Co. surplus power at four-tenths of a cent per kilowatt hour. I find that the Government sells just \$150 worth of that power annually, and that when the water is low it buys from the Moline Water Power Co. about \$2,000 worth per annum. This latter power is generated by steam and costs 1 cent per kilowatt hour.

The assumption that because we sell power at an unusually low price it is produced cheaply is a false one. I can show from facts and figures that have been carefully gathered from the War Department that it costs the Government much more than four-tenths of a cent per kilowatt hour to produce the power at Rock Island. Indeed, I can show that it costs less per kilowatt hour for power generated by steam at Frankford Arsenal than for power generated by water at Rock Island.

Let us see what the Rock Island water-power plant has cost the Government. On March 2, 1867, Congress authorized the purchase from the Moline Water Power Co. of its title to the water power which it had acquired two years previously. The condition of purchase was that the United States would develop the water power and furnish one-fourth of it to the Moline Water Power Co. free of charge.

Congress has already appropriated for the development of this power \$1,624,750; for extraordinary repairs, \$246,150, and annually for maintenance, \$12,500. The interest at 3 per cent on the cost of development is \$48,742, which, with the maintenance charge of \$12,500, makes a total annual charge of \$61,242.

The maximum power that can be developed by the Rock Island Dam is 1,450 horsepower. I understand that the arsenal requires 1,400 horsepower. Assuming that 1,400 horsepower is taken daily throughout the year, it follows that 2,590,000 kilowatt hours in electrical energy are taken annually from the Rock Island water-power plant. The annual charge for this amount of energy being \$61,242, then the cost of a kilowatt hour at Rock Island is over 2.4 cents. At Frankford Arsenal the power is generated by steam at a cost of slightly more than 1 cent, or, to be accurate, 1.008 cents, per kilowatt hour.

There is a general impression that because there is no charge for the water in a water-power plant the cost of the electrical energy derived from such a plant is merely nominal. Some Members of this House are evidently not free from that erroneous notion. As a matter of fact, an up-to-date steam plant having a capacity of 2,000 kilowatts can be installed complete for \$200,000. If these figures are correct, as I believe them to be, then it must be admitted that a steam-power plant of 2,000 kilowatt capacity at a cost of \$200,000 would have been a much better investment at Rock Island Arsenal than the water-power plant of 1,450 kilowatt capacity that has cost the Government \$1,624,750.

We must remember, too, that the shop buildings at Rock Island Arsenal are heated not by electricity but by a steam plant which requires about 5,000 tons of coal annually at a cost of \$12,500. Then there are bridges leading to Rock Island for which Congress has made appropriations since 1869 amounting to over \$800,000, besides annual appropriations in recent years of \$12,500 for the maintenance of these bridges.

From this it is clear that the alleged advantages of the so-called free water power at Rock Island are largely mythical. In fact, Rock Island Arsenal possesses no economical advantages by reason of its water power when the cost and maintenance charges of that power are considered. And if Rock Island really possessed economical advantages in its water-power plant, which I can not admit, such advantages would be more than offset by its inaccessibility to a large number of skilled artisans, its long distance from the sources of its supplies, and the delay and expense involved in having its products tested at the Government proving grounds at Sandy Hook.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to minimize the importance or injure the prospects of the Rock Island Arsenal. My aim is merely to correct or remove the misimpressions that gentlemen may have received from the statements of the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations, Mr. FITZGERALD, whose remarks are always eloquent, always impressive, and usually accurate.

While admitting that the Rock Island plant is well equipped to produce its present lines of manufacture, I still contend that Frankford Arsenal possesses many superior advantages, that those advantages have already resulted in large savings to the Government, and that still greater economies can be effected by the expenditure of a comparatively small sum in the enlargement and improvement of its manufacturing and storage facilities. The failure to further develop this great arsenal on the poor plea that development should be made only where the Government owns land and water power is at least starving, if not killing, the goose that lays the golden eggs.

In the past 10 years the Rock Island Arsenal has received appropriations for repairs and improvements aggregating \$975,000, while during the same period the total appropriations for Frankford Arsenal amounted to only \$350,000.

Why this difference in the appropriations for two plants the value of whose annual output is practically equal? I do not know; but I might suggest that it was an advantage to the Rock Island Arsenal to have both Democrats and Republicans fighting its battles in Congress, while our arsenal had until recently only one brand of champions. It can not be denied that the claims of Frankford Arsenal have of late been kept well to the front, and I am confident that the efforts now being put forth will soon bear fruit.

*Acts of Congress making appropriations for the development of the water power at the Rock Island Arsenal.*

Act of June 27, 1866	\$100,000
Act of June 8, 1868	80,000
Act of Mar. 3, 1869	150,000
Act of July 15, 1870	200,000
Act of Mar. 3, 1871	200,000
Act of June 10, 1872	110,000
Act of Mar. 3, 1873	18,000
Act of June 23, 1874	5,400
Act of Mar. 3, 1881	50,000
Act of Aug. 7, 1882	100,000
Act of Mar. 3, 1883	20,000
Act of July 7, 1884	18,506
Act of Oct. 2, 1888	275,000
Act of Aug. 30, 1890	101,000
Act of July 1, 1898	45,000
Act of Mar. 3, 1899	21,350
Act of Mar. 3, 1901	130,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,624,750</b>

*Acts of Congress making appropriations for extraordinary repairs to the Rock Island Arsenal water power.*

Act of Oct. 2, 1888	\$25,000
Act of Aug. 18, 1894	30,000
Act of Mar. 2, 1895	37,500
Act of June 4, 1897	28,150
Act of June 6, 1900	97,000
Act of May 27, 1908	28,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>246,150</b>

*Acts of Congress making appropriations on account of the bridges at the Rock Island Arsenal.*

Act of Mar. 2, 1867	\$200,000
Act of July 25, 1868	100,000
Act of Mar. 3, 1869	500,000
Act of July 15, 1870	300,000
Act of Mar. 2, 1889	35,000
Act of Mar. 28, 1898	96,000
Act of June 11, 1896	10,200
Act of May 27, 1903	9,350
Act of Mar. 4, 1909	60,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,310,550</b>

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the department estimated for improvements at Frankford Arsenal aggregating

about \$72,000. The committee recommended items carrying \$57,000. One of the items carried upon the recommendation of the committee is for a high-explosive loading shop and its equipment, to cost \$32,000.

This metal storehouse, which has been discussed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE], was erected originally for the storage of scrap, but has been utilized for the storage of metals in an unmanufactured shape. Gen. Crozier was asked why he could not use the building that would be abandoned when the high-explosive loading shop provided in this bill should be erected as a storage house, and he said that that could be done. That building will be abandoned, and it should be utilized for some purpose.

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

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. In a second. The committee believed that for the present that building could be utilized for these storage purposes.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE. Gen. Crozier, in his testimony before the committee, was asked by the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]—

Why could not you use this building which you are going to abandon? Gen. CROZIER. Maybe we shall—that is possible—for scrap.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, it is possible for brass or iron or other material.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from New York then asked:

For either?

And Gen. Crozier replied:

One objection would be that it is not in such a place where a car can come alongside of it, though we have a railroad track running past the end of it. Of course its inflammable character would not make so much difference then.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Of course.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman will appreciate that these high explosives are out in the open air. I do not know what the effect of the sun's rays are upon them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This shop is to be put in an entirely different location. The railroad track runs past the building that is to be abandoned. A car can be brought there and unloaded. There is no siding there, but there is a track that runs through the yard, and the committee believed that it was proper to utilize the building for some purpose rather than simply to destroy it. The committee believed that after it had been abandoned for one use it could be utilized for a storehouse for these materials.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. DONOHUE. I would call the gentleman's attention to these photographs.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have seen them.

Mr. DONOHUE. I do not know how the chairman arrives at the conclusion that these additional storage facilities are not needed immediately. Several Members of this House have been up there and have seen the crowded condition of this place.

Mr. FITZGERALD. You are going to have a new building there.

Mr. DONOHUE. As a matter of fact, they are going to be called upon to manufacture three times as much material this year as heretofore.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But this storehouse would not be built in time for use this year. That is a high-explosive shop, and those things can be moved out from the present shop to the other shop for storage purposes.

Mr. DONOHUE. It has been widely advertised that more room is urgently needed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They assumed that this recommendation would become law.

Mr. DONOHUE. Well, the chairman's recommendation is almost equivalent to a law with us.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the committee in going over the recommendations for these various arsenals undertook to select those items that were imperatively required and recommended.

For the Frankford Arsenal they provided a high-explosive loading shop and its equipment, magazine protection, and increased facilities for fire protection, including the installation of a motor-driven pump and the construction of a building to contain the same.

If the committee were to recommend every improvement at every place suggested by the department, it would require the appropriation of a sum of money that would stagger the House; and if the committee were to bring in a bill containing all such recommendations, this House itself would promptly eliminate

many of them from the bill. We have recommended those things that are essential at this time for the proper development of the Frankford Arsenal. This abandoned building will be available for storage, and the committee believe they have done all they are justified in doing at this time. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE].

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 43, noes 15.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused, 12 Members, not a sufficient number, seconding the demand.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that that is dilatory.

Mr. DONOHUE. I suggest that that is not in order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I suggest that it is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order has not been made before. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make the point. The gentleman need not argue about it.

Mr. MONDELL. Very well; I will not argue with the gentleman; but I suggest that the gentleman is delaying the passage of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-nine Members in their seats, and the Chairman is present, making 100. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE]. As many as favor the amendment will rise and stand until they are counted.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 51, noes 26.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. FITZGERALD and Mr. DONOHUE.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 54, noes 35.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. DONOHUE:  
Page 52, after line 17, insert the following:  
"For extension of artillery storehouse, \$17,500."

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I offered an amendment the other day for this matter, but it was ruled out on a point of order because it provided for a new building. This is for an extension of the artillery ammunition storehouse. I could say nothing on this that I have not said on the proposition for a metal storehouse, and I have said nothing on the latter that I could not say on this. It is urgently needed for the protection of the high-explosive materials at the Frankford Arsenal. If we do not appropriate this small amount, it will be a serious mistake.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, there is no such building at the Frankford Arsenal. The gentleman has put his amendment in a form so that even if the money were appropriated it could not be utilized. The other day he offered an amendment to provide for a new building for that purpose. Now, he hopes to get an amendment adopted which, even if adopted, would be of no value, because the money could not be spent. I repeat that the Committee on Appropriations in making recommendations for this arsenal and for the other arsenals picked out the items that were important; that were essential for the proper conduct of the business at these places at this time, and recommended them. I hope that the committee will not adopt this amendment.

Mr. DONOHUE. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DONOHUE. Does the gentleman contend that there are no facilities for the storage of ammunition?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I contend that there is no such building as that for which the gentleman proposes to appropriate \$17,000 for an extension. This House would put itself in a ridiculous position to vote money to extend a building that does not exist. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak on this amendment. I suggest to my colleague from Pennsylvania that he move to strike out the words "for the extension of."

Mr. DONOHUE. I could not do that because it would then be subject to a point of order.

Mr. MOORE. I think the gentleman has a right to offer an amendment for a building.

Mr. DONOHUE. No; my other amendment was ruled out on that ground. This is for the extension of facilities for the storage of ammunition. If the chairman of the committee says there are no facilities at the arsenal for the storage of ammunition, I must be wrong, but I understand there are some limited facilities for such a purpose, and my amendment provides for an extension of those facilities.

Mr. MOORE. We have a statement from the Chief of Ordnance on that point, and if the gentleman insists on the amendment going up as it is, we will have to argue it out on that line. However, Mr. Chairman, we have to have Artillery ammunition at that arsenal. It is stored there in the best way that it can be stored. We have a perfect right to extend the storage facilities as proposed in the amendment, if it is to be considered in its present form. That there is a necessity for the present extension is made clear by the statement of the Chief of Ordnance in advocating the estimate submitted to the committee. The matter came up before the committee in regular order, and the Chief of Ordnance testified that there was great necessity for this extension of facilities. Now, what did the Chief of Ordnance say about it?

Gen. CROZIER. Here [exhibiting] is a plan of the building which it is proposed to erect under this estimate. The dimensions are about 133 by 45 feet. It is also a one-story brick building. As explained by the note, it is intended to be utilized for storing portions of ammunition under manufacture; that is, components of the ammunition under manufacture, ready for assembling in complete rounds, and we also have use for it in storing ammunition which is oftentimes turned in from the service for overhauling. I will not say oftentimes, but once in a while something deteriorates about it, and it is sent back to the arsenal to be overhauled and made anew, and we need a place to put it while it is awaiting overhauling.

The CHAIRMAN. What building do you use for that purpose now?

Gen. CROZIER. There is no building. The components are scattered all around the place, not in any special building. These components oftentimes stand on the floor, where they should not stand—it is not very safe—and oftentimes they are gathered into this little frame loading shop, which is already too small, and where they increase the danger from any accidental explosion which might occur in there. It would be located quite near the new loading shop, so as to form a convenient portion of the artillery manufacturing plant—the site I just pointed out to you as the new position for this artillery loading shop—and across the end here [indicating] will be placed this storage building which I am speaking of now. These buildings [indicating] constitute the artillery ammunition plant of the arsenal, these buildings [indicating] the small-arms manufacturing plant, and this group [indicating] the fire-control instruments plant.

Mr. Chairman, there is a little frame loading shop in existence in which this artillery ammunition is stored. There are other buildings in which it is stored and there is ground upon which it is stored, and it would seem that if there are buildings and grounds upon which this ammunition is stored it is fair to assume that we have the right to extend the storage facilities; that is what the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE] proposes to do. It seems to me the amendment would be in order, taking it as it is, because there is this little frame loading shop, in which artillery ammunition is stored, and also there are other buildings. It is proposed to extend the storage facilities by erecting another building in the nature of an extension, and that brings us under the rule.

Mr. LOGUE. Mr. Chairman, this is a manufacturing plant for artillery ammunition which is not shipped out of the place at once. It is a notorious fact that the product of that arsenal lies around temporarily stored, as stated by my colleague, either in rooms or outside. Storage is a necessary incident to the conduct of this arsenal, and therefore I contend that without the additional words and not arguing against the wording of the amendment we have it substantially established as an existing condition, and providing for it is within the spirit of legislation that we are now considering. Regarding the existing needs of it, I think the argument by the gentleman from Pennsylvania as to the other amendments well establishes this. The photograph that he has exhibited establishes it, and gentlemen who have visited the Frankford Arsenal know the inadequacy of the buildings and the absolute necessity for the one at present in question.

The present amendment, offered by my colleague [Mr. MOORE], is directed toward the acquisition of additional land adjacent to the present Frankford Arsenal.

There are many reasons why this amendment should prevail and the opportunity embraced to acquire additional land for the further development of the arsenal. That there will be need for extension in future none will deny, and it may be stated that the acquisition of the land at the present time is absolutely necessary to provide in the near future for the extension of the Frankford Arsenal plans which must necessarily follow.

This arsenal is fortunately located. The acquirement of additional land would give it greater river frontage on the Delaware, affording the Government opportunity for shipment either by rail or water. Located in Philadelphia it has the best labor in the United States to draw from. The transportation facilities assure economy not only in procuring supplies and material, but in the shipment of manufactured goods. Much of its supplies can be obtained from Philadelphia, a great commercial center, and for those that are needed from more distant points excellent railroad and water facilities insure cheap handling.

I have considered to this point only the question of the advantages arising from the location and the necessity for the extension of the tract of land for future development. There are other considerations that come into play, and that show the need for the extension of the arsenal. A very important one is the economy maintained at this arsenal and the great saving to the Government in the manufacture of ammunition. Between July 1, 1912, and April 25, 1913, the cost of manufacture of the output at Frankford Arsenal was \$1,900,000, and the same output purchased by the Government under contracts would have cost \$2,879,000, showing a saving to the Government of \$979,000.

What has been saved between the periods stated has been done in other years and will be accomplished again in future and to a greater extent, if the arsenal is further developed. And an additional and most potent reason for the extension of the Frankford Arsenal is one that should appeal to all. It is the great aid these improvements will be to the safety of the employees. The work carried on is to a degree hazardous and dangerous. There are large buildings in which many people are employed. Near them are located high-explosive shops, and no matter to what degree human skill may go in work such as this accidents will occur, and while misfortune must necessarily follow to the people engaged directly in this dangerous work, the lives of many men and women not so engaged should not be put in danger.

The additional tract of land would furnish sites to a degree isolated from the large shops where the high-explosive work could be carried on with greater safety to the general employees of the arsenal and a lessening of the dangers that exist at the present time.

Therefore, the extension of the plant in question will be for the benefit of the Government on the score of economy. This extension makes necessary the purchase of additional land and associated with the saving to the Government is assured the safety of employees by the removal to a more distant point of the very dangerous and hazardous work now carried on in close proximity to buildings housing hundreds of employees.

I contend, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the interests of the Government and the welfare and safety of its employees will be furthered and assured by the present acquisition of additional land, and I trust, therefore, that the amendment offered by my colleague will be adopted.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have endeavored to be consistent and entirely fair in the matter of these appropriations. I did not vote for the amendment voted on a moment ago because, from the impression that I gained at the hearing, it was not an item that was of immediate and absolute necessity. But I did gain the impression during the hearings that this artillery ammunition storehouse was needed, and needed badly. I think the statement made by Gen. Crozier makes it very clear that there is a condition there that is dangerous, and a condition under which the property of the Government deteriorates, by reason of the fact that there is no storehouse for a certain class of material, and that a condition exists with regard to this material that should not exist, but should be remedied at the earliest possible moment.

This item is for an extension of this arsenal that is badly needed. I regret that the gentleman did not put his amendment in a little different form, and yet there is a little frame building now used to a certain extent for this storage purpose. Therefore I support his amendment, although I do not believe it would have been subject to a point of order and would have been in better form if he had provided absolutely for a new building. That is what would be constructed if this amendment is adopted. It ought to be provided for the safety of the

employees and for the preservation and protection of the Government property.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if it were possible for the committee to visit the Frankford Arsenal further objection to these appropriations would be withdrawn. Those in our delegation who have had the opportunity of going over this institution, with its three shifts working continuously through the 24 hours, working in a frame building, I am sure are convinced that if the members of this committee had the opportunity to visit the institution and to compare the efficiency of the service there with that in other institutions of similar size, whether private or part of the Government, then the opposition to these great public improvements for the Frankford Arsenal would be withdrawn. This amendment is in order. It simply means to extend existing buildings, and it is for the general benefit of the Government, and tends toward insuring the lives of the employees and the property of the Government. I trust the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DONOHUE and Mr. MOORE) there were—ayes 41, noes 25.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE] to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 43, noes 23.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, after line 17, insert a new paragraph, as follows:  
"For the purchase of land adjoining the Frankford Arsenal, for the extension of the facilities thereof, Philadelphia, Pa., \$100,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the committee has already disposed of that amendment, and it is not in order to pass upon it at this time. The same amendment was offered and voted down.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment was not offered in this form. The amendment that was offered was in an entirely different form. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE] offered an amendment against which the point of order was made.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no.

Mr. MOORE. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We voted on the question of the purchase of this land.

Mr. MOORE. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE] contained a provision for condemnation, and the point of order was made against that, and the point of order was sustained.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the committee voted down this amendment to purchase \$100,000 worth of this land.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I will say to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] that I had my amendment modified by unanimous consent, striking out the condemnatory provisions.

Mr. MOORE. I recall the gentleman did; but his amendment did not provide for the extension of the facilities of the arsenal which this amendment does. I have no pride of authorship in this, and I would be very glad to have the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE] offer this amendment, if he cared to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Pennsylvania the RECORD of Friday, June 12, before him?

Mr. MOORE. I do not have it before me, but my recollection is very clear as to the form the amendment took. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE] offered an amendment which contemplated condemnation. The point of order was made against that, and the gentleman then asked unanimous consent to strike out the provision for condemnation and the amendment went back to a direct appropriation for the purchase of land; but there was no provision in his amendment for the extension of the facilities of the arsenal, which there is in the one I now present.

The CHAIRMAN. On page 10351 of the RECORD of June 12 there appears the following:

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE] asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:  
"Strike out the words 'for acquirement by condemnation proceedings' and add, on line 17, page 52, the following as a new paragraph:  
"For the purchase of about 25 acres of land adjoining the arsenal grounds on the northeast side thereof, \$100,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the amendment being modified as requested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 27, noes 32.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The amendment which was rejected was in this form:

For the purchase of about 25 acres of land adjoining the arsenal grounds on the northeast side thereof, \$100,000.

The amendment which is proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is for the acquiring of land adjoining the existing arsenal property, \$100,000.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair permit me to interrupt him for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. The Chair has read the amendment as modified by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE], providing for the purchase of 25 acres of land adjoining the arsenal grounds. That is a provision that is not contained in the amendment I have offered. I have not indicated the quantity of land to be purchased. Objection was made to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE] by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] upon the ground that the price was not satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania permit the Chair in the interest of expedition—

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is with the gentleman from Pennsylvania as to the point of order. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE] was specific as to where the land should be taken. This amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is not, and the Chair has no possible way of determining where it would be, and so he overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make this point of order, that such an amendment as this was not contemplated in the agreement made at the time these items were passed over. The question of land was settled and determined by the committee. Then it was said that gentlemen wished to offer amendments for other purposes.

If the gentleman thinks he can have a rehearing of the question at this time, it seems to me it is not within the agreement. It is certainly a breach of faith. The question of this purchase of land was disposed of. This amendment will not be passed on by a slim House.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman charges a breach of faith when there is no breach of faith. When the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE] failed because of its specific character and because of the objection of the gentleman from New York, then I devised another amendment which did not specify any particular land except land adjoining the arsenal, which did not specify any particular quantity of land but such land as might be purchased for \$100,000. I tried to offer the amendment at the time and it was clearly part of the understanding to permit this matter to go over until Saturday last, and then again to the first day on which the sundry civil bill should be taken up. There was absolutely no breach of faith or of understanding, and the gentleman from New York is entirely in error in that respect.

Mr. LOGUE. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. LOGUE. Does the gentleman mean the amendment he is now offering is the same one that was sent up by him to the Clerk's desk when the point of order was made?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; it is the same amendment.

Mr. LOGUE. So it was offered on that day?

Mr. MOORE. Of course, and if the RECORD is consulted it will be found I was on my feet several times. Subsequently the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who had indulged in the colloquy, specially stipulated in the understanding with the gentleman from New York—and those two gentlemen frequently have understandings—

Mr. FITZGERALD. There was no such understanding—

Mr. MOORE. And that understanding should be maintained.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There was no understanding that the gentleman's amendment should be offered. The amendments were in reference to items for which estimates had been submitted and which were not recommended by the committee. This matter was discussed and decided unfavorably to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state, and the Chair desires to make himself perfectly clear, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania had shown that it was

the same proposition offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. DONOHUE, on a former day, he would without hesitation have sustained the point of order made by the gentleman from New York; but it does not so show, and the Chair has no way of determining how that is. Now, in reference to the other point of order made by the gentleman from New York, the Chair has been trying to find the record of that, and the Chair's recollection is that in its final settlement the request was that the Frankford Arsenal item be passed without prejudice. Now, the Chair's recollection may be at fault about that. It must be in Saturday's RECORD. On the question of fact the Chair is in doubt.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no doubt it is the identical amendment, because there is only one tract adjacent to the arsenal that can be purchased.

The CHAIRMAN. That, of course, it is impossible for the Chair, with his limited knowledge, to know.

Mr. MOORE. I make the declaration, to which I hope the gentleman from New York will listen, that I do not know whether \$100,000 will buy the 25 acres of land specified in the defeated Donohoe amendment. The gentleman from New York seems to indicate it would be sufficient—

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I did not; I think that is extravagant.

Mr. MOORE. Well, then, he seemed to indicate it would be extravagant, and some others to think it would not be enough. It might be we could purchase only 10 acres with \$100,000. Everyone knows we need more land adjoining that arsenal. We ought to have land adjoining that arsenal, and I have framed this amendment so it will not be specific, as the other amendment was, and so they may have this same money to buy such land as the department wants adjoining the arsenal for the extension of the facilities of that arsenal.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a point of order pending, made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. The agreement which was entered into was on Saturday, June 13, beginning on page 10437 of the RECORD.

Mr. MOORE. I think it was Saturday's RECORD, but I do not have it before me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that it will probably expedite matters more to rule without waiting to look up the RECORD. The Chair, from his recollection of what occurred, overrules the last motion of the gentleman from New York, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to discuss the amendment.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Has not the debate on this amendment been exhausted under the five-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has been addressing himself to the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, there is no good excuse for not authorizing the purchase of this land. The Frankford Arsenal is one of the profit-making establishments of the Government. It has proven that Government manufacture can be done much cheaper than it can be done privately. It is shown that within a year it can save upward of a million dollars over and above what would have been paid by the Government for goods purchased from outside manufacturers. It is an institution that ought to be encouraged. It is limited to 62 acres of ground. The other day the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER] offered an amendment on which there was much discussion to increase the appropriation for the manufacture of ammunition at Rock Island to the extent of \$225,000. They have over 800 acres out at that arsenal, with plenty of room for expansion and plenty of room for ordnance tests. In this bill the Frankford Arsenal, with its splendid record for service and its splendid record for money-saving, is allotted only \$57,000, as against \$127,322 for the Rock Island Arsenal. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars was voted for that arsenal last year, as against \$4,000 to the arsenal at Philadelphia. Now we are cramped for room. We have the labor and raw material and cheap fuel cost, and we conclude that our fuel cost is less than that of Rock Island, and I think less than that of any other arsenal in the country. It needs encouragement not only for the protection of the lives of the men who are employed there, but for the expeditious movement of the business of the Government.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] indicated that we did not come before the committee in the regular way, with an estimate from the department. I inquired of the gentleman when the matter was up before if Gen. Crozier had not frequently made estimates for the purchase of this land at Frank-

ford Arsenal, and the gentleman from New York indicated that he had not done so.

Now, I have conversed with Gen. Crozier frequently, and I know he desires this land to be purchased. I am informed that estimates have gone to the Committee on Appropriations time and time again for the purchase of that land, and in proof of it I submit a letter from the Secretary of War, Mr. Lindley M. Garrison, to one of the Senators, chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds on the other side of the Capitol, in which it is clearly stated that this land ought to be acquired for reasons which I shall read. The Secretary of War says the acquisition of the land is advisable because—

1. To avoid the serious situation which would arise if this property should be purchased by parties who would desire to utilize it for dwellings or factory purposes, since there is no doubt that in case such buildings should be erected upon the property the occupants would object to the experimental firings and other tests involving the use of high explosives which are conducted at the Frankford Arsenal.

2. The utilization of the property for the storage of explosives, so as to remove them a safe distance from the present shop buildings.

3. To utilize the property for the construction of certain storehouses and shop buildings which will undoubtedly be necessary in the expansion of the manufacturing plant at the Frankford Arsenal in the future and for which it would be impossible to secure ground if this piece of property shall irrevocably pass to other uses.

The War Department—

Says the Secretary—

has in the past submitted estimates for the purchase of this property, but I have not repeated the estimate, not because the purchase would not be advantageous, and such as would be made by any efficient corporation in a similar position, but because other needs of the War Department have been so immediately pressing that I have been obliged to let this particular matter rest, although I recognize that in doing so the danger is incurred of the passage of the opportunity to make the purchase advantageously.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] seems to have the notion that the value of that land is going to decrease. Why, gradually New York and Philadelphia are getting together; they are building up toward each other; and the Frankford Arsenal is in between. Is land going to become less valuable between those two great cities? Is land going to become less valuable when there are hundreds and thousands of homes and factories in the vicinity?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. The Secretary of War indicates that it would be to the advantage of the Government to buy now. He indicates what most business men would suggest with reference to matters like this—that to wait would mean simply to increase the price that the Government will have to pay some day when it takes that property over. Now, here is an opportunity to take what we can get of it for \$100,000. It does not specify that we shall take 25 acres or any particular piece of land, except that it shall adjoin the arsenal, but it does give direction to the Secretary of War to take as much land as he can get advantageously and relieve this situation, at a cost of \$100,000. It seems to me that this is a vital amendment to this whole arsenal proposition. We have been treated unfairly at the Frankford Arsenal. The Rock Island Arsenal has been built up, while the appropriations at the Frankford Arsenal have been cut, and the time has come now when the House, in fairness to one of its best institutions and in response to the direct suggestion and recommendations of the Secretary of War, should pass this amendment and put this great profit-making institution of the Government on a solid and a safe basis.

Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOGUE. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request, to save time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LOGUE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this matter was before the committee on the 12th of June, and the letter of the Secretary of War, referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] was read at that time. I stated then, and I repeat now—and my recollection has since been refreshed by a very careful search by a very accurate man—that there has been no formal estimate submitted for the purchase of this land by the War Department during the 15 years that I have

been a Member of Congress, and the Secretary of War, when he makes the statement that such an estimate has been submitted is making a statement that is inaccurate.

This proposition first came to my attention, as I have already stated, in 1909, when a bill was introduced to appropriate \$181,000 to purchase 31½ acres of land and 2½ acres of land outside the bulkhead on the Delaware River. The following year a bill was introduced to appropriate \$175,000 to buy the same land. This year a bill was introduced to appropriate \$154,000 to purchase 25½ acres of land; 12½ acres have already been taken up in some other way.

In the letter to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has referred, and which he has just read, the Secretary of War stated that, in his opinion, from \$145,000 to \$150,000 would be a fair price for the land.

I have a letter in my possession, written by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS], dated within the last few weeks, in which he said that after conferring with those who now control the land, they would take \$125,000 for it; so that the Secretary of War could not have been very well informed, or could not have made very much inquiry when he said that \$145,000 would be a fair price.

Now, the department has never formally requested that this land be purchased. We have 896 acres of land at the Rock Island Arsenal. We have two buildings there, each of them practically as large as the House Office Building, utilized for storage purposes alone. We get power there from a water power at about four-tenths of a cent per kilowatt hour.

Mr. MOORE and Mr. DONOHUE rose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I can not yield.

Mr. MOORE. We are ready for you on that proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield, and to whom?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will not yield to either.

Mr. DONOHUE. Yield to one.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I will not yield to either. Perhaps I should be permitted to make a consecutive statement without being jumped at—yes; jumped at—from both sides before I can get a sentence out of my mouth. [Applause.] We can develop power from water power at the Rock Island Arsenal at about four-tenths of a cent per kilowatt hour, and when we have an excess we can sell it.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York declines to yield.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman will not tell the history of that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I knew, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS] knew, and other gentlemen from Pennsylvania knew, that this corporation would desire to turn this unremunerative land into money, so that it can invest the money and get some return upon it, and would turn this property over to the Government for \$125,000; and now they desire to get \$100,000 from the Government and surrender just as little of the 25½ acres as they can do.

This property can not be utilized for residential purposes. It is property that should be utilized for manufacturing purposes. There is great fear on the part of these gentlemen that unless the Government takes this land now, it will lose this great opportunity to enlarge this arsenal. Yet since 1875 the owners of this property have been endeavoring to induce the Government to purchase it and to take it off their hands—not because the Government requires it, not because the Government needs it, but because it is so much easier to dispose of worthless property to the Government than to dispose of it to anyone else when there is no market for it.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will ask unanimous consent that my time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Secretary of War said, "I think a fair price would be somewhere between \$140,000 and \$150,000," so that the amount carried in the bill which is pending should be sufficient to include the cost of condemnation proceedings. And yet the owners of the property—the Pennsylvania Co. of Philadelphia, executor of the estate of Charles Levy—wrote a letter to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS] that they would take \$125,000 for it.

If we were to accept the recommendation of the War Department, we would have appropriated \$145,000 to purchase property the owners of which are anxious to dispose of for \$125,000. Why should we buy additional land at Philadelphia? We have in our arsenals ample facilities to do what the Government requires. We have Frankford, Springfield, Watertown,

Watervliet, and Rock Island. Rock Island is situated between the two rivers, isolated from great centers of population, at a place where the dangers in manufacturing high explosives can be minimized.

Mr. DONOHOE. Will the gentleman yield for one question there?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Just a minute. The gentleman desires to extend and to build up a plant for the manufacture of high explosives almost in the heart of the city of Philadelphia, where, if unfortunately there should be an accident, the danger to large numbers of innocent persons would be very great. There is no excuse for carrying on these highly dangerous manufacturing operations in such a place. There is no justification to add this land to this place merely so that this institution, the beneficiary of the will of this deceased person, may turn an unremunerative property into a paying investment, and let the Government carry property costing from \$100,000 to \$125,000 upon the theory that it is needed to enlarge the facilities of this arsenal. Now I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for a question.

Mr. DONOHOE. I know the gentleman does not contend that the Frankford Arsenal is not an economical workshop of the Government.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not contended that it is not an economical workshop, because I am one of those who have forced into the appropriation bills provisions that make it possible to utilize the Frankford Arsenal to its full capacity.

Mr. DONOHOE. Three shifts a day?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; three shifts a day, but that is no reason why it should be so enlarged, with this growing population around it, that it will endanger the lives of people in the vicinity. What is the fact? We carry in the fortification bill an appropriation of \$1,200,000 for the manufacture of ammunition, and in the Army bill we carry an appropriation of \$3,000,000 for the manufacture of ammunition, or \$4,200,000 in all. At the same ratio for four years more the reserve ammunition required for the Army will be up to its full amount, and thereafter, instead of appropriating \$4,200,000 a year, it will only be necessary to appropriate half a million dollars a year to manufacture ammunition. Then these plants that we now have and that will be busy and fully occupied for the next four years will no longer be required, because we will have gotten up and have kept up to the requirement of the Government.

I have no prejudice in favor of or against any of these arsenals, but if it be necessary to expand our facilities in these arsenals and, as a common-sense business proposition, the place to develop and extend and enlarge is not at Watervliet, which is in my State, not at Springfield or Watertown, in Massachusetts, not at Frankford, in the city of Philadelphia, but at Rock Island, a place which is naturally fitted for the manufacturing of these high explosives and dangerous materials. [Applause.] It is naturally fitted for the manufacture of high explosives not only because isolated from centers of population, but because geographically so situated that the shipment of this material east, west, north, or south will be the most economical shipments that can be made. We manufacture now at Frankford Arsenal to ship to San Francisco. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should not be adopted, and I hope it will not be adopted.

Mr. DONOHOE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I dislike to disagree with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who is usually very accurate, but I want to take exception to some statements that he has made in connection with these two arsenals. The fact that Frankford Arsenal is within the limits of Philadelphia, a city of 1,600,000 inhabitants, should not be regarded as a disadvantage to it. On the other hand, we contend that it is one of its greatest advantages, because it brings the arsenal within the reach of 250,000 skilled mechanics. Again, we hear of water power being produced at four-tenths of a cent per kilowatt hour. That is the price at which the Government sells its surplus water power. And how much surplus water power does our Government sell per annum? It sells \$150 worth. What does it cost the Government to produce water power at Rock Island?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to his colleague?

Mr. MOORE. I just want the gentleman to bring out the water-power facts.

Mr. DONOHOE. Yes; I will do so. The fact that we have free water does not mean that we have cheap water power. The fact that water costs nothing does not prove that we can generate water power at a low price. As a matter of fact, when you consider the investment at Rock Island for the development of water power, all that it cost the Government to develop it

and to maintain it since, it is costing us to-day 2.4 cents per kilowatt hour for power at that arsenal.

At Frankford Arsenal it is costing a small fraction over 1 cent a kilowatt-hour to develop power by steam. We can install to-day for \$200,000 a steam plant that will develop 2,000 electrical horsepower while Rock Island is getting only 1,600 horsepower from the power plant which cost the Government over a million and a half dollars to develop. Two hundred thousand dollars will cover the installation of a 2,000-horsepower plant.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOHOE. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is it the gentleman's contention that we can develop electric power more economically by steam than by water power at Rock Island?

Mr. DONOHOE. I contend that we are doing it at Frankford. I contend that the water power at Rock Island costs 2.4 cents per kilowatt-hour considering the investment made for its development, whereas we develop power at Frankford for 1.008 cents.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. DONOHOE. I get my figures from the War Department. Mr. Chairman, I will not take up the time of the committee on this point any further, as I have already covered the ground rather fully.

Mr. MOORE. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOHOE. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman recall the estimated value of the property at the Frankford Arsenal?

Mr. DONOHOE. Three and a half million dollars.

Mr. MOORE. And the appropriations for Rock Island up to date, buildings, bridges, water power, and so forth, and from the plant of a defunct dam company—does not that run up to about \$9,000,000?

Mr. DONOHOE. It does; yes.

Mr. MOORE. That is the situation; and the Government, which is getting water power so "cheaply" at Rock Island, is actually paying 2½ cents per kilowatt hour.

Mr. DONOHOE. Yes; it costs five times as much per kilowatt hour as we get for the surplus.

Mr. MOORE. And the Government has made appropriations aggregating \$9,000,000 at Rock Island as against the total valuation of \$3,500,000 at the Frankford Arsenal for the most productive manufacturing plant of the United States.

Mr. DONOHOE. Yes. Now, one other point—as to the shipping of the goods. Goods can be shipped from the Frankford Arsenal along the coast by water around to Seattle at a lower rate than the freight from Rock Island to the seaboard.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. DONOHOE. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman know that the appropriations made for the development of water power at Rock Island since 1866 amount to \$1,624,750?

Mr. DONOHOE. I believe the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MOORE. And for extraordinary repairs for the preservation of water power, which sometimes runs out, so that they have to buy it elsewhere, \$246,150 since 1888?

Mr. DONOHOE. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. And \$1,310,550 has been appropriated by Congress on account of bridges and roads to Rock Island, which totals over \$3,000,000 for the purpose of getting this cheap water power that we hear so much about?

Mr. DONOHOE. My colleague is usually very accurate, and I think he is quite so to-day.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have three minutes to answer the remarks of the gentleman from New York. This land belonged to a man by the name of Lennig. It had no connection with his manufactory; it is a piece of ground that he bought that does not touch the ground that he uses for the manufacturing plant. Mr. Lennig intended to leave it to the University of Pennsylvania as part of his residuary estate. He always held the price at \$150,000 when anybody asked him about it. He died. The gentlemen who examined the land were connected with the Pennsylvania company for insuring lives. The Pennsylvania company in taking their appraisal of his estate made the price of the ground \$150,000, but one of the appraisers objected, and said it was worth less—\$125,000. When I called upon them they agreed with me that they would take \$125,000 for the land. The estate is in this shape: When the last heir dies, if this land is not sold it goes to the University of Pennsylvania. It is a simple case of necessity that this land should be taken for the benefit of the Frankford Arsenal in accordance with this amendment.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my colleague to yield to me for a moment.



Mr. EDMONDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not a fact that the present tract of the Frankford Arsenal is very much of a triangle and makes the river front of practically no service?

Mr. EDMONDS. That is true.

Mr. MOORE. And is it not a fact that the ground that adjoins the arsenal which the gentleman from New York thinks so valueless runs along the river front for a quarter of a mile?

Mr. EDMONDS. Yes. That tract would give the arsenal a water frontage so that they could load ships that might go to the Philippine Islands or anywhere else—the safest kind of transportation.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am not opposed to needed improvements and extensions at the Frankford Arsenal—I just voted for two of them—but, on the other hand, am enthusiastically in favor of the Government manufacturing its own munitions of war, all of them, including armor plate and battleships, regardless of whether it is done at the Rock Island Arsenal or the Frankford Arsenal or in the Hawaiian Islands, so long as the Government does it itself and takes the profit out of war and the preparation for war.

If I did not have to run for reelection this fall I would surely go to Stockholm, Sweden, to attend the meeting of the Inter-parliamentary Union for International Peace, to be held in August, and advocate the principle that all nations manufacture their own munitions of war as the most practical step that can be taken in the interest of reduction of armament and international peace. When all profit is taken out of war, the amounts to be carried in the Army and Navy appropriation bills will be decided on the merits of the question as to the needs of the Government from a military standpoint, instead of by the greed of the armor ring, the ammunition ring, and the Shipbuilding Trust.

As to the question of the ability of the Government to manufacture economically at Rock Island Arsenal, I went down to the War Department one day and inquired at which arsenal the Government could do its manufacturing the cheapest, and I was informed that there was no question about it, that the Government can manufacture more cheaply at Rock Island Arsenal than at any other place.

I do not know where the gentlemen who have spoken get their figures as to the cost of power at Rock Island, but in reaching their conclusions they have evidently added all the sums ever spent on the power plant and charged interest on these sums, and they make it appear that the power developed there is very expensive. I may be wrong about it, but I contend the Government does not pay interest on this investment. But even if this power plant has been very costly in the past, I submit that that is no reason, now that the Government has the plant, why it should not take advantage of it.

There are at Rock Island two large stone buildings originally erected for manufacturing purposes at a cost of approximately \$400,000 each, which are not now being used except for storage purposes. If Congress will equip these two buildings for manufacturing, it will not cost any additional money for power, because, with the small-arms plant closed down, there is sufficient power not being used to operate plants in these buildings. While I have no objection to the Frankford Arsenal being enlarged, I can hardly see as a business proposition why the Government should buy land in Philadelphia, when it has 896 acres of land at Rock Island and two large stone buildings already there. There is plenty of room to expand there.

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

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. DONOHUE. I want to ask the gentleman, in his argument in favor of the Government manufacturing its own ammunition, where he got his figures?

Mr. TAVENNER. I got them from the Rock Island Arsenal and from the Frankford Arsenal, and I will say that in every Government arsenal the Government is manufacturing at from 20 to 60 per cent below the prices of the private manufacturers. This is only partly due to the efficiency of the arsenals. The real explanation is that the ammunition ring has been gouging the Government; both Army and Navy officers have been permitting private manufacturers to overcharge the Government for munitions of war. The Frankford Arsenal and every Government arsenal is doing work at from 20 to 60 per cent below the prices of the private manufacturers.

The chairman of the great Appropriations Committee, Mr. FITZGERALD, has just stated that when the Government gets ready to centralize the manufacture of its war munitions in one great national military manufacturing plant it will not select Frankford Arsenal; it will not select Springfield Arsenal; it will not select Watertown Arsenal; but that it will select

Rock Island Arsenal, where the Government can do its manufacturing the cheapest.

I only wish every Member of this body could come to Rock Island and see what a magnificent property the Government owns there. The tract covers 896 acres of a beautiful rock island in the Mississippi River, every acre a natural park, with beautiful shade trees and stately drives in evidence on every side.

The island is adjacent to the enterprising and thriving cities of Rock Island, Moline, East Moline, and Davenport, which cities have a combined population in excess of 100,000 and in the very heart of one of the most promising manufacturing cities in the Middle West.

The arsenal plant, including buildings, machinery, and so forth, is worth \$9,492,329. Approximately \$2,500,000 worth of work was turned out of the arsenal last year. On November 30 last 1,569 men were being employed.

I am firmly convinced that this piece of property offers the best site that can be found for the proposed \$7,000,000 Government armor-plate factory, and I have introduced a resolution (H. Res. 306) requiring the Secretary of the Navy to carefully consider the advantages of Rock Island before determining upon any other site. I wish to extend an invitation to Members of Congress who may be passing through the fourteenth congressional district, "the garden spot of Illinois," to stop off at Rock Island and meet the commandant, Col. George W. Burr, who will be glad to show you what a magnificent and advantageous site Uncle Sam already has for a great central military manufacturing plant without going to the unnecessary expense of purchasing additional ground elsewhere for this purpose.

I have prepared for the consideration of Chairman PADGETT, of the Naval Affairs Committee, who is to be one of a committee of three to investigate and report on the question of a suitable site for the proposed armor plant, the following rough draft of the principal advantages of Rock Island Arsenal:

"First. Cheap water-power possibilities, the Government owning its own plant in the Mississippi River.

"Second. Its central location geographically, making it convenient to ship the finished product to either the Pacific, Atlantic, or Gulf coast with economy in both time and transportation costs.

"Third. Its strategic location from a military standpoint. Being well in the interior of the country, it would be much safer from attack and possible capture by an enemy in time of war than would a site on or near either coast.

"Fourth. Should coal be needed, there is a great abundance of excellent coal being mined almost at the very door of Rock Island, and it is at the same time convenient to the ore fields of the north.

"Fifth. By utilizing a part of the 896 acres in the Rock Island military tract several hundred thousand dollars which would probably be necessary to purchase site elsewhere would be saved to the Government.

"Sixth. The advantages of Rock Island as a manufacturing center, as demonstrated by the fact that at the Rock Island Arsenal shops the Government is now manufacturing rifles, field artillery gun carriages, and other war equipment at from 20 to 30 per cent below the prices of private manufacturers. For instance, 3-inch caissons, consisting of a wagon for carrying ammunition chests, are being produced at Rock Island for \$1,081, as against a cost of \$1,708 when purchased from private manufacturers; 3-inch gun carriages proper—the vehicle on which the gun rests and from which it is fired—are being produced for \$2,341, as against the private contractors' price of \$3,268, and so forth.

"Seventh. The location of the military tract in the heart of a great manufacturing center, being within 2 miles of Rock Island, Moline, and East Moline, Ill., and Davenport, Iowa, all of which are essentially manufacturing cities, embracing a combined population of more than 100,000 people, affording employment to thousands of mechanics and furnishing an ideal field from which the Government may draw its skilled labor and other help, a very important consideration in such an industrial enterprise as a Government armor plant."

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I was present a short time ago when a delegation of Philadelphians appeared before that committee and explained in detail the many reasons why the Government should purchase this land. I am very sorry that the chairman of the committee does not seem to be in the Chamber at this time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, I am here.

Mr. VARE. A few moments ago the gentleman referred to the great University of Pennsylvania in a tone that did not

appear to be that of commending what we regard as one of the greatest educational institutions in the country.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VARE. I want the gentlemen of this House to know that the management of that institution has never at any time taken advantage of our city, State, or National Government. I want the gentlemen to know that that management is comprised of men who have devoted their lives and have given their means to help educational purposes in our section. Under the will of the late Charles Tennig, that institution seems to have control over this land. I want this committee to understand that the great University of Pennsylvania will cooperate with the Government and do its part toward building up the Frankford Arsenal, without any excessive charge for the land, but with a desire to help that great institution. There are two things that ought to govern the minds of this committee in passing upon this question: First, is it necessary; and, second, have you confidence in Secretary Garrison, the Secretary of War? In my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of the committee, the necessity for this extension has been shown, and if that be true, there is only one question left for us to decide and that is, Have we confidence in the business judgment and ability of the Secretary of War? And I believe that the answer of this committee will be that we have.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOORE. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—eyes 22, noes 44.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, it is evident there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. MOORE. I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraws the point of order.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order is pending to the last paragraph that was read the other night, at the top of page 128. It was not disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the point of order?

Mr. MANN. The point of order was reserved to the paragraph at the top of page 128. May I ask the gentleman what is the reason for fixing the rate to be paid for the per capita cost of persons committed from the District of Columbia and maintained at the National Training School for Boys at \$4.50 per week?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It developed in the examination that while it was costing \$4.50 a week to maintain these boys in the institution, that those committed from the District of Columbia were being charged for at the rate of \$3, I think it was.

Mr. MANN. What constitutes the cost of \$4.50 a week—what does that cover?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They take everything going into the cost of maintaining the institution and average the per capita cost from that. The average is \$234 per year. All overhead expenses are included in the charge, and this is to compel the District boys to be paid for at the actual cost to the institution.

Mr. MANN. Well, this institution is not maintained for the benefit of the District of Columbia, is it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; it is not.

Mr. MANN. Is the cost of \$4.50 per capita for the boys committed from the District of Columbia?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They say that the per capita cost is \$4.50 a week, and they are paid for the District boys \$3, I think it is, a week.

Mr. MANN. It seemed to me that \$4.50 a week was a rather high cost.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think so. It is \$234 a year, and it includes the maintenance of some stock, school, upkeep of the grounds, and everything else. The only object the committee had in view was that the actual cost of maintaining a boy in that institution should be paid for out of the appropriation for the purpose for the District of Columbia. We pay for the District boys' half, and if they charge less than the actual cost the Federal Government pays a much larger proportion than half.

Mr. MANN. I think they ought to pay the actual cost. I am not so sure we ought to pay the per capita cost figured upon the number of people there, figuring in all sorts of expenses which will be given there by the Government anyhow.

Mr. FITZGERALD. For instance, we made some inquiries as to what they included in the figures that make up the per capita cost. We inquired whether if there were special appropriations for improvements they were included, and they said they were not, but merely the ordinary maintenance charges.

Mr. MANN. How are the boys admitted or committed to this institution?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They are committed by the courts, I understand.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are there any boys committed from outside the District of Columbia to this institution?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think so.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think there was something in the hearings disclosing that there were some from the outside.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand that the Federal courts can commit to this institution. That is mostly for violations, I am informed, of the postal laws that the Federal courts commit young boys to this institution.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand, this is a reformatory school for youths and it is not limited to the District only, but is for youths that are committed for offending any of the Federal laws.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is a Federal institution and boys committed in the District are sent there.

Mr. STAFFORD. As to the support of those boys sent from outside, who pays for their sustenance?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The United States. They are committed by the Federal courts the same as we provide for Federal prisoners.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why would it not be better if it provides that we should charge the actual cost instead of fixing a certain amount?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The difficulty of it is this, that it would be necessary to wait until the end of the fiscal year to determine what the cost had been. They say from their books it figures \$4.50 a week.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is more to charge the District a proportionate part of the expense for maintaining the youths committed from the District?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is all. For instance, in the District of Columbia bill appropriations have been made for this purpose, half out of the Federal Treasury and half out of the District revenues. Unless they pay what it actually cost we supplement from the Federal Treasury the difference.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. GOULDEN. How many boys are in this institution?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There are 371 there, I think.

Mr. GOULDEN. The figures for maintenance are certainly high, gauged by an institution of which I happen to be connected as a manager in the city of New York. It costs \$135 a year there. It is known as the Catholic Protectors, with which the gentleman is familiar, one of our best institutions.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The New York protectors is an institution conducted by Brothers of the Christian Schools, and there are 1,500 boys there, and none of the instructors receive compensation.

Mr. GOULDEN. They receive \$200 a year, a mere bagatelle, for the splendid services rendered.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, under the new arrangement they can manage an institution of that character for a less amount.

Mr. GOULDEN. I believe that the expense of this institution, of nearly twice the amount, is too expensive and should be reduced. However, I will trust the judgment of the committee, and do not believe they would authorize a matter of this character if it was not somewhere near right.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I recall that in the past I thought that 52 or 53 cents a day was somewhat high, but they seemed to need the money they got, and they seemed to use it.

Mr. GOULDEN. Public institutions always can use it. I will say to the gentleman, no matter how large it may be. There is no trouble about that. Now, in the State Soldiers' and Sailors' Home at Bath, N. Y., the cost is about \$147 per year for each member, which includes clothing. Of course that does not include schools, as that is not required.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Here they have both schools and shops, and the number of inmates is not so large as to make it most economical to utilize these shops. For instance, in the Catholic

Protectory the different shops are highly productive. And there is a very considerable revenue from the output of the shops.

Mr. GOULDEN. Is there no net revenue from the output of these shops? Or are they an actual expense?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is not a great deal of revenue. They utilize these boys, as I recall, largely in extending the institution itself, for erecting the small buildings, or any buildings they have to erect there. They utilize this boy labor in that way.

Mr. GOULDEN. They have no trade schools in the sense that we have them in the Catholic Protectory?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not in the sense they have them there.

Mr. GOULDEN. We have bricklaying, plumbing, printing, harness and shoe making, and other trades at the protectory. The boys are equipped and fitted to go out into the world and take care of themselves. In addition to the trade schools we have 250 boys at the Lincolndale Agricultural School, where they become practical farmers, gardeners, and dairymen.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The boys in this institution are small boys, of 12 or 13 years of age. Not many of them are employed in the shops.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

LIGHTHOUSES, BEACONS, FOG SIGNALS, LIGHT VESSELS, AND OTHER WORKS UNDER THE LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

Staten Island (N. Y.) Lighthouse Depot: To erect a carpenter shop at the general lighthouse depot, Tompkinsville, Staten Island, N. Y., \$23,000.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman—

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserves the point of order.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if all of these three items under the Lighthouse Bureau are provided for by law?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. My recollection is that all the items in the bill under the Lighthouse Department are authorized. There is a great list of estimates, where items were not included because they were not authorized.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This item is to take the place of the carpenter shop that has already existed.

Mr. MANN. I hold the point of order for a moment, then. Is this carpenter shop authorized by law?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is a carpenter shop there at present.

Mr. MANN. That is not what I asked the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. There is an old carpenter shop, and it is proposed to tear that down and erect a new building.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know that there is any specific provision in any of these bills that authorizes the erection of a new carpenter shop.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that for years they have been seeking to obtain additional buildings at this depot and various other buildings elsewhere, and those matters have been up before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has jurisdiction of the matter, and that that committee has reported bills and the bills were passed not very long ago making additions to the Lighthouse Service. Now, why does the Committee on Appropriations undertake to stick in an item for an appropriation that is not authorized by law?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The committee is not doing that. This shop is authorized. The first item is No. 1, Staten Island, N. Y., lighthouse depot: To erect a carpenter shop at the general lighthouse depot, Tompkinsville, Staten Island, N. Y., \$23,000; and when asked whether this was authorized, Secretary Redfield answered, "Yes, sir." My recollection is that this item was authorized by one of the bills reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and was not included last year.

Mr. MANN. On that statement I will withdraw the point of order that I reserved.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The policy of the committee has been not to include any items for the Lighthouse Service for new projects unless they have been specifically authorized by law.

Mr. MANN. That is what I understood.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Secretary said this was authorized by statute.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if he has any special rule for determining the propriety of making appropriations for the construction of buildings? What is the standard fixed which induces the committee to report an item for the construction of a building?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Speaking for myself, with reference to these items that are estimated for, I undertake to get as much information as I can about them and then I exercise my own judgment as to the desirability of recommending appropriations for them. For instance, there were three or four items estimated for the Frankford Arsenal which I deemed necessary and in recommending which I joined with the rest of the committee. There were other items for which we did not join in recommending appropriations.

Mr. MOORE. I was about to refer to those items. I will say to the gentleman from New York, and to contrast them with—

Mr. FITZGERALD. The committee recommended improvements at Frankford Arsenal aggregating \$57,000 out of a total estimate of \$88,000. That is a large percentage, as a rule.

Mr. MOORE. Did not the committee have before it a statement that there was great danger of explosions, due to the congestion and character of buildings at Frankford Arsenal, and yet did it feel warranted in making recommendations for appropriations for Frankford Arsenal? The appropriations were denied, but when we come to Staten Island, close to New York, it appears that another standard is set up by which we view appropriations favorably. That is to say, the word of Secretary Garrison, the Secretary of War, to the effect that buildings are necessary at Frankford Arsenal because of danger to life and property is not as strong with the committee as Secretary Redfield's opinion appears to be with regard to a carpenter shop on Staten Island, N. Y. We can not seem to get these buildings in Philadelphia, but you can get them in New York. I was just wondering what sort of argument the Secretary of Commerce used in order to make so favorable an impression on the committee. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman can get the argument that Secretary Redfield made in the hearings.

Mr. MOORE. The Secretary of War made such recommendations because of the danger to life in Frankford Arsenal—recommendations which the committee did not seem to approve; but—

Mr. FITZGERALD. In this case Secretary Redfield personally visited this depot and made a personal examination, and then came before the Committee on Appropriations and gave the committee the benefit of the information he had obtained. In the instance of the recommendation of the Secretary of War relative to Frankford Arsenal, to which the gentleman refers, there is no information that the Secretary of War ever visited the arsenal or ever made any personal investigation, and he certainly never came before the Committee on Appropriations and suggested the desirability of the buildings about which he wrote letters to somebody else.

Mr. MOORE. When he is at home the Secretary of War lives just across the river from the Frankford Arsenal, and he probably knows all about it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me suggest to the gentleman that, having some knowledge as to the manner in which heads of departments sign letters to be sent to some persons, I do not place quite as much weight upon such communications as do gentlemen who are vitally interested in obtaining appropriations for the things so recommended.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to say this about the item: The requests for this carpenter shop were made for four or five years on the ground that the conditions there were highly dangerous. The committee refused to recommend the appropriation.

Mr. MOORE. Was it the danger of explosion or because the element of danger of fire entered?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me finish this statement. The committee refused to recommend the appropriation because there was no authority for the shop; and then after the law was passed authorizing the construction of this shop, the committee still refused to include the item to construct it, and it was not until the head of the department personally visited the depot and ascertained the conditions at first hand and gave the committee the benefit of that information that the committee could be induced to incorporate it in the bill. The chairman of the committee does not come from the vicinity of this depot—neither is it in his district or his county.

Mr. MOORE. I withdraw that suggestion. Now, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Inasmuch as Secretary Redfield has visited Staten Island and has inspected this carpenter shop, and has reported that there is danger of fire and that it would be well to have an appropriation for a new building, would it now be in order for us to induce Secretary Garrison to go to Frankford Arsenal and report that there is danger of an explosion, in order to get a new building?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; the first thing for the Secretary of War to do would be to submit an estimate in accordance with the law for additional facilities for land at the Frankford Arsenal. The law requires that those estimates shall be included in the annual Book of Estimates, unless they are submitted to carry out some law subsequently enacted by Congress or by reason of the happening of some unusual emergency that could not have been anticipated at the time the annual estimates were submitted. I do not think at this time, at this session, the Secretary of War can bring himself within the law.

Mr. MOORE. It was decidedly to the advantage of Staten Island station to have the Secretary of Commerce visit it and then report to the committee that there was danger of fire because there were shavings in the carpenter shop there.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think the committee had more confidence in a statement of that kind after a personal visit than it would have when the information was based on the statement of a person who had communicated to an official who had brought it to the attention of some one else.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut. On what subject?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. On the tariff—on the state of the Union.

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut objects.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 11, page 128, add the following paragraph: "Monhegan Island (Me.) light vessel: To erect and equip a light vessel to be placed near Monhegan Island, entrance Penobscot Bay, Me., \$125,000."

Mr. MANN. I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. Mr. Chairman, there is no man in this House who is more in sympathy with the purposes of the Committee on Appropriations to keep these appropriations down to the lowest possible point consistent with the safe and practical transaction of the public business than I am. If this amendment had reference to matters of dollars and cents or property alone, I certainly should not offer it in face of the failure of the committee to insert it in the original bill. But the purpose of this amendment is not dollars and cents or property. The purpose of this amendment is to save human life, and not money alone. The purpose of it is to prevent another of the terrible sea disasters that have so recently shocked the civilized world.

I desire to present very briefly to the committee the facts which make this appropriation an absolute necessity for the purpose of saving the lives of innocent people who travel at sea. Monhegan Island is practically a huge rock rising out of the ocean about 9 miles off the Maine coast. The very nature of its coast makes it absolutely a danger to navigation; but that is not its worst danger. In this section of the North Atlantic coast we have at certain seasons of the year very great banks of fog that rest upon and absolutely envelop this island and the surrounding country. I doubt if there is another place on the Atlantic coast where they have such banks of fog prevalent at certain seasons of the year, of such density, and so absolutely impenetrable. This island is directly in the pathway of navigation, between Boston and Maine and Nova Scotia and all that northeastern country. Now, the only protection to travel and navigation by way of signals is, first, the lighthouse on Monhegan Island. It is a good lighthouse, properly equipped, but the trouble is that in certain months of the year, particularly July, August, and September, the fog banks are so dense that they completely envelop this island, and it is absolutely impossible to see this light.

For that reason the lighthouse in these months is practically useless to navigation. Now, outside of that, and made necessary because of that condition, the only other signal is about 2 or 3 miles out, near a small island called Manana—a buoy

and submarine bell. You gentlemen know that a signal of that character is operated by the motion of the ocean. In rough water it operates fairly well, and the buoy and submarine bell, which is about 20 or 25 feet below the surface, operates with pretty fair satisfaction. But the time of dense fog is also the time of calm on that coast, and when it is calm the sea does not move as it does in rough condition, and there are no conditions which cause the bell to ring. The calm always accompanies the fog. If there was wind enough to stir up the sea and cause the bell to ring, it would drive the fog away, but the very fact that the fog is there is almost positive proof of calm weather, and when it is calm there is no sea to cause the bell to ring so that it can be heard.

In many vessels they have an apparatus to receive the sound from the submarine bell. In this particular vicinity the boats are light draft, only about 9 or 9½ feet in depth, and they do not satisfactorily receive, even on the receiving apparatus, the sound from the submarine bell. The result is that as a matter of practical experience the navigator is in a worse condition with the bell during a fog and in the calm than he would be if it was not there at all, because he relies upon it to ring and it does not ring. He does not get the signal and he is misled into the very danger that he is trying to avoid.

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

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have said that this island, with its unusual conditions, is right in the pathway of navigation between Boston and our whole northeastern country. There are 300,000 people every year taken up by that dangerous point in these vessels. The main part of that travel is in the summer months—July, August, and September—and those are the exact months when fog most prevails on that coast.

I know and appreciate the condition in which the Committee on Appropriations finds itself. I believe that the committee realizes this danger that exists there, because already there have been three vessels run onto this coast, and one of them was a steamer containing between 500 and 600 passengers. The vessel was wrecked, but providentially no lives were lost in that disaster.

Now, as I say, the committee is I know somewhat embarrassed with reference to this situation, because the commissioner of lighthouses, as I understand, has opposed the adoption of this amendment or this appropriation for the building of a light vessel which would overcome all this difficulty and make the place safe. Ordinarily it is natural and proper, of course, that the committee should receive recommendation of the heads of departments, but the trouble in this case is the heads of the department have completely and absolutely changed ground. The last time this measure was up and these dangerous conditions were brought before the committee the Commissioner of Lighthouses and the Secretary of Commerce both agreed with our recommendation and they themselves recommended that this appropriation ought to pass.

Here are their letters:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 2, 1912.

Hon. S. W. GOULD,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to the question of the establishment of a light vessel at Monhegan Island, Me.

I beg to state that the bureau has this day recommended to the department that in view of the urgent representations which have been made by shipping interests the department withdraw its recommendation to Congress that House bill 20422 and Senate bill 5387 be not passed.

It is understood that the department will communicate with the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce recommending that these two bills be passed.

Yours, very truly,

G. R. PUTNAM, Commissioner.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Washington, May 3, 1912.

DEAR SIR: Referring to previous correspondence relative to the establishment of a light vessel at Monhegan Island, Me.

In view of the urgent representations which have been made by shipping interests the department has this day addressed letters to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce withdrawing its recommendation that Senate bill 5387 and House bill 20422 of the present session of Congress be not passed.

After further investigation of the matter, the department concludes that the establishment of a light vessel off Monhegan Island would be of material benefit to navigation, and it has, therefore, recommended to the two committees mentioned that the bills be passed.

Respectfully,

B. S. CABLE, Assistant Secretary.

Hon. O. GARDNER,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On my return from Maine the 12th instant, I found your favor of August 24, to which by message of the 11th you kindly direct my attention. Instructions have been given to the Bureau of Lighthouses to include in their estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, \$125,000 for the construction of the lightship which was authorized as stated in your favor.

Yours, truly,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD.

So at that time the department through its head recommended as a proper piece of legislation this appropriation which we now ask. At the present time I understand the attitude of the gentlemen to be this: They do not deny the existence of the danger to innocent travelers, they do not deny but that a lightship would overcome this danger; but they say that there are some other projects that they have in mind that are more urgent than this. I know nothing about what those other projects are, but if there are any projects that are more urgent than this, where there are more dangers than there are at this point, it is the duty of the committee not only to pass this appropriation and take care of these dangers, but also to take care of all these other dangers, so that the innocent traveling public can be assured at least of their lives.

Mr. Chairman, I understand they want to try it as it is a little longer. They say they have put this submarine bell there, and they want to see how it will work another year. Suppose in the meantime another steamer, with innocent, precious lives upon it, runs upon that coast and goes to the bottom while you are experimenting with a submarine bell? Remember three vessels have already gone ashore at this point. Do you want to wait for another one to go there to save a paltry \$125,000? That is all there is to this proposition. It is a question of life. It is a question of safety for the innocent traveling public. We can not afford to experiment with life and death. I say that you and I can not afford to take that responsibility. When the dangers have been brought home to us and we have full knowledge of them we can not, with our eyes open, fail to exercise this precaution for the safety of the public.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this lightship was authorized in the act approved March 4, 1913. When the Secretary of Commerce and the Commissioner of Lighthouses were before the Committee on Appropriations they said that, although they had submitted the estimates for the money to provide the lightship in accordance with the law, they had done so because it was authorized and had been strongly recommended by the Senators and Representatives from that section of the country, but they were not in favor of the appropriation being made. Monhegan Island has upon it a lighthouse. Two or three miles off from this island is a gas buoy, with a whistle and a submarine bell. In the fall of 1913 an improved gas buoy was placed at this point. The department believes that the aids to navigation now at this point are sufficient. They say that unquestionably a light vessel would be superior to the aids now located there, but that, everything considered, in their opinion, the existing aids are sufficient for the safe navigation of the sea; and they did not recommend the light vessel.

Three vessels were lost in this vicinity, as stated by the gentleman from Maine, but they are not recent disasters. One occurred in 1886 and one in 1902 and one in 1905.

Mr. MONDELL. But there was only one vessel lost.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There were three disasters.

Mr. MONDELL. And the other two went ashore.

Mr. FITZGERALD. My recollection is that one was a total loss. The committee gave a hearing to a former Member of the House—Mr. Littlefield—and the Representative from Maine, Mr. McGILLICUDDY; to Mr. Gilbert Austin, president of the Eastern Steamship Corporation, of Boston; to Capt. Rawley; and to Capt. Crowley, the general manager and treasurer of the Coastwise Transportation Co. These gentlemen very strongly contended that as a matter of safety the lightship should be built and placed at this point. They contend, for instance, that they can not approach Monhegan Island and locate the buoy as they might at some other point.

The island has precipitous shores, and there is deep water right up to it, and so they can not tell by soundings or by the shoals on the bottom that they are approaching the island. They insist that the submarine bell is of no benefit to them. The chief reason why it is of no benefit is that the vessels which they navigate are not equipped with the apparatus required in order to obtain the warning of the submarine bell. Then, they contend, in addition, that even if their vessels were equipped with this apparatus, still the bell would be very unsatisfactory and unreliable, and that, as stated by the gentleman from Maine, their vessels are not deep-draft vessels and

draw only from 9 to 12 feet of water, and one of these captains stated that in his experience satisfactory results have not been so far obtained with the apparatus installed for the purpose of receiving the warnings from the submarine bells upon vessels of light draft; that unless the receiving apparatus be placed quite low, some 20 or 22 feet below the surface of the water, very frequently the warnings were not received.

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

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that they can not use the deep-draft vessels for the reason that they have to run up the rivers where the waters are shoal?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will make that plain. I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his time for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was further stated that the company was preparing apparatus or endeavoring to perfect apparatus which, if installed on light-draft vessels, would detect the warning of the submarine bell. Now, as the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCGILLICUDDY] stated, the representatives of these corporations said that they could not use deep-draft vessels because they visited places where the depth of water was such that the vessel drawing more than 9, 10, or 12 feet could not be taken. I have endeavored, Mr. Chairman, to state comprehensively that which was presented to the committee. The responsible officials of the Government in charge of the Lighthouse Service stated that they were now expending \$800,000 a year for the maintenance of light vessels; that it is not desirable to increase the number of these vessels unless it be imperatively demanded; that it costs about \$15,000 a year to maintain them; without further knowledge of the situation, that with the existing aids to navigation all the reasonable precautions have been taken by the Government to make navigation of these waters safe. The committee discussed the matter somewhat at length, and finally reached the conclusion that it was compelled at least to place some reliance upon the officials responsible for the administration of this service, and if they were of the opinion that, under all the circumstances, the existing aids were adequate, until they were tried further it would be unwise and unjustifiable to incur the expenditure necessary for building a lightship. The committee therefore acquiesced in the recommendation of the department, and did not include the item in the bill. The committee has all the information in its possession. For the reason stated, I voted in the committee not to make the appropriation for this ship at this time.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the Members of Congress from the State of Maine and the people interested in shipping there have been very earnest and very anxious in support of the proposition for a lightship off Monhegan Island. Quite a number of gentlemen interested in shipping appeared before the committee and made very complete statements with regard to the matter. Messrs. GUERNSEY and PETERS, of the Maine delegation, have been greatly interested in it and have urged the committee to support it. It is one of that sort of appropriations that we would like to support, and certainly would support if we believed under all the circumstances and conditions we were justified in doing so. Monhegan Island is on the steamer route from Portland to Nova Scotia, from Boston to all Maine points. It is a point of departure. Off Monhegan Island vessels take their course to the north when they are going north and in the other direction going down the coast. There is a first-class lighthouse on Monhegan, and on the island of Manana, immediately adjacent, is a first-class air siren. Some two and a half miles off the island of Manana is a gas buoy, with whistle and submarine bell. The coast and the sea about the island is subject to fogs, as the gentleman from Maine has stated, and those fogs are so dense that it is impossible to get the flash of the lighthouse on Monhegan Island; hence the air siren on Manana and the gas buoy two miles and a half farther out in the direction from which steamers approach coming from the south. There has been some difficulty there. Steamers frequently have to lay by in certain weather. There have been in the last 25 years three serious accidents in that vicinity. I do not recall that any lives were lost, but a good deal of property was destroyed in each case. Within the last year three improvements have been made in the situation.

First, the lighthouse on Monhegan Island has been very greatly improved. Second, the air siren on the island of Manana has been greatly improved and in place of the old buoy 2½ miles out there is a first-class light of 700 candlepower, with a submarine bell. There is a lightship off the port of Portland, I believe. That lightship does not carry a stronger light than

this gas buoy does. Of course the lightship could be equipped with a stronger light, but the new light of this gas buoy is as strong a light as is now carried on the lightship off the port of Portland.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. May I interrupt the gentleman there?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. It is not altogether the light on the lightship that would be of aid to navigation, but also the lightship locates the sound signals of the bell and it is not dependent upon the motion of the ocean, but is regulated by the crew and consequently would be reliable.

Mr. MONDELL. I realize the fact on a lightship the sound signals would be stronger.

Mr. MANN. They do not have bells on lightships.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. Yes; they do.

Mr. MANN. And they are not rung by the crew, either.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. They certainly have them.

Mr. MONDELL. A lightship would carry an air siren. This buoy carries a whistle, and it would be possible with a first-class lightship to afford better aid to navigation than they have there now.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have three minutes.

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

Mr. MONDELL. It costs \$125,000 to build a lightship. It costs \$15,000 a year to maintain it. The aids to navigation we now have on that coast and in the vicinity of that island are better than we have on our coasts generally, and the committee, much as it is inclined to make the best possible provision for our coasts, hardly felt justified, anxious as they were to meet the views of the gentleman from Maine, in providing for a lightship until we shall have had a longer period of experience and trial of the very excellent aids to navigation which have been recently installed there.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. Just a word to the gentleman. This is not so much a matter of interest to the people of Maine as it is to the traveling public from other parts of the country to and from Maine.

Mr. MONDELL. I understand that, and I understand that when the gentleman from Maine is speaking for this project he is speaking in the interests of the people who travel the Maine coast, large numbers of whom come from all up and down the coast and from all over the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCGILLICUDDY].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I served for a good many years on the committee that had jurisdiction over aids to navigation, and for a good many years reported to the House all the bills that carried authorization for aids to navigation, which is the only excuse I have for knowing anything about the subject. I think there is no coast anywhere in the world that is better supplied with aids to navigation than the coast of Maine, that State having for many years enjoyed the distinction of having Senator Frye represent them in the Senate, and Senator Frye was chairman of the Senate committee which had jurisdiction over aids to navigation.

We ought to be a little careful about providing a lightship anywhere. The original cost of a lightship upon the ocean is in the neighborhood of \$125,000. Probably it will soon be \$150,000. If it were only the original cost it would not make so much difference, but the cost of maintenance of a lightship is from \$15,000 to \$18,000 a year. In most of the places where they now have lightships an acetylene-gas buoy with a bell would answer the purpose just as well as the lightship, and the cost is merely nominal as compared with the cost of a lightship. It may be cheaper now, but you could buy such a gas buoy at from \$8,000 to \$10,000 a few years ago. I think we used to provide not to exceed \$15,000 for two. A few years ago Congress decided, so far as committees could decide, that they would be very chary about providing new lightships on account of the cost of maintenance. Of course, it goes without saying that everywhere the mariners—the men who navigate the ships—would like to have an additional aid to navigation here and there and elsewhere. They pay no taxes, they make no contribution toward the support of the aids to navigation, and practically not anything toward the support of the Government.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. But they pay tolls.

Mr. MANN. Through the Panama Canal they pay tolls, or will, much to my regret, so far as the legislation is concerned. But that has nothing to do with this matter. Of course, they want these aids to navigation. And I have repeatedly known it to happen that where the mariners had never thought of an

aid to navigation being needed, some of them would start a petition or a letter, urging that an aid to navigation be placed at some particular place, and out of courtesy to the one all the others would insist that it was unsafe to navigate in that locality without the particular aid to navigation being provided, although they had been navigating there practically a lifetime and never dreamed of it before. And I think we ought to be a little cautious before we entail upon the Government a permanent expense of \$15,000 to \$18,000 a year, when the chances are that a proper buoy at this place would answer all the purposes of a lightship, even if they need anything at all.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. ADAMSON. I know it will be a comfort to him to remind him, after his just tribute to the late Senator Frye, that the interests of Maine have by no means suffered by the death of that distinguished statesman, but that a multitude have arisen in his stead, and every Representative and Senator is wholly alive in securing everything possible in the way of authorization, and getting it.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt they are still alive and active in urging these things. You can pass the word to any State delegation in this House with reference to anything that some one wants in the State and get every one of them active in favor of the proposition, swearing that the State can not exist and the Government will fall if they do not get them, and yet they never heard of it before.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. In answer to that proposition, I want to say that I have been here for three years, and our delegation has never done anything of the kind, and has never asked for anything up to to-night.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken. This particular item has been before the House since the gentleman came here.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. I say outside of this item.

Mr. MANN. And if he does not know it, he has forgotten.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. I say outside of this item.

Mr. MANN. This is not the only item that the gentleman from Maine has been for since he has come here.

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

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

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 6, yeas 21.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Alaska, aids to navigation: For the establishment of aids to navigation and improvement of existing aids in Alaska, \$60,000.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee what consideration was given to the recommendation of the Department of Commerce for a lighthouse tender for Alaska? I understand the Department of Commerce recommended an appropriation of \$325,000 for a lighthouse tender for Alaskan waters.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We have no jurisdiction over that. Unless the vessel is authorized by law, we have no right to recommend an appropriation.

Mr. FALCONER. There is an authorization for this lighthouse tender to the extent of \$250,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Department of Commerce wants to have the limit of cost increased to \$325,000, but this committee has no authority to recommend appropriations for any of these vessels in the absence of legislation previously enacted authorizing them, which legislation belongs to the jurisdiction of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON].

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I will say that the committee which has jurisdiction voted to increase that authorization and put the bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent. It was objected to, and we then put the bill passed by the Senate for the same purpose on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent, and now we have been notified that it will be objected to when next called up. I thought I was going to get recognition to move to suspend the rules on next Monday, but I am now notified that I did get it on the list. I want the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to understand that, notwithstanding the fact that I earnestly favor the appropriation, I am chairman of one of the great committees of the House, and as such will not move to amend the pending bill, but I suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that he has authority to make a motion to increase it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia can not lead me into offering amendments to this bill for matters not authorized and over which his committee has

jurisdiction and in which he may be interested, while insisting that under no circumstances shall I carry in this bill items over which his committee has jurisdiction unless they are authorized by law.

Now, if the bars are to be taken down and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce can exercise discretion regarding the matters which he will recommend, regardless of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that is one thing; but I think that the wisest and best and most orderly way to conduct the business of the House is to let the gentleman's committee exercise its jurisdiction and let the Committee on Appropriations recommend appropriations in accordance with the law. Then we shall have much better results.

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

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

Mr. FALCONER. I yield.

Mr. ADAMSON. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am not trying to lead the gentleman from New York. I would not offer any amendment to his bill so long as I am one of the chairmen of the great Democratic committees of this House; but, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman can not plead around an item in that way, because the committee of which I am chairman has done its best to make that authorization. It has reported its own bill, which was objected to on the floor, and it has reported the Senate bill and tried to get consideration of it. We thought we would have consideration for it next Monday, but I find upon inquiry that we are not to have it. I request, inasmuch as we have not been able under the parliamentary situation to get consideration of a bill that ought to pass, that the gentleman from New York recognize the fact that the Senate has passed the bill and the House committee has recommended both bills, and that he is at liberty to offer an amendment to put that item in the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman must realize that I merely represent our committee. I have no authority to assume the right to offer amendments to this bill that would be subject to points of order, and then, in carrying out the instructions of the committee, raise points of order against amendments that other gentlemen would offer.

Mr. ADAMSON. I only wanted the gentleman to understand that he would not be tramping on anybody's toes if he offers such an amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Washington be extended for five minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FALCONER. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment I offer be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FALCONER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 128, after line 18, by inserting the following: "For lighthouse tender for Alaskan waters, \$325,000."

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. I reserve a point of order, Mr. Chairman, until I hear what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from the State of Maine [Mr. MCGILLICUDDY] a few moments ago gave something of the history of wrecks on the coast of Maine. I want to say to the Members of the House that Alaskan waters, since the United States Government bought Alaska, have presented a string of wrecks and sea horrors that is very extraordinary.

I have in my hand a list of ships that have been lost since Alaska came into the possession of the United States. Eighty-three ships have been entirely destroyed and wrecked in Alaskan waters in that time, and the value reaches to something like \$7,500,000.

The Department of Commerce, having had the matter under consideration, and having had the data presented to it by the chambers of commerce and by the seafaring men of the Pacific coast, recommended an appropriation of \$325,000 for a lighthouse tender ship to replace the *America*.

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALCONER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ESCH. The vessel to which the gentleman refers was wrecked off the Alaska coast in May, 1912, and this tender is to supplant the one that was lost.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to place before Congress some facts bearing on the amendment, and also call

the attention of the House to the necessity for this and other appropriations in order that some of the dangers now existing may be eliminated.

In 1913 three ships were lost. I am not speaking of those that were partially wrecked, and repaired at an expense of from \$5,000 to \$25,000 for each ship, but lost in 1913. The *Yukon* sank off Sanak Island. She was worth \$170,000. The *State of California* sank in Gambler Bay in 1913, with a loss of 34 lives. The value of that ship was \$225,000. The *Curacao* was lost in 1913 off Warm Chuck. She was worth \$225,000. I could go on back to the year 1878 and include some 80 ships. It seems to me that the committee having this matter in charge ought to have given more consideration to the dangerous conditions obtaining out there, and have made an appropriation for this lighthouse tender. Anyone who knows anything about the Pacific coast—and I am sure there are many gentlemen on the floor who know as much about it as Pacific coast members—must appreciate the fact that something ought to be done at this session of Congress, and I hope no objection will be raised to the amendment, but that we may have this appropriation.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALCONER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. I notice in the hearings conducted before the committee that when this matter was presented the Secretary of Commerce inserted in the record a letter which he had written to the gentleman from Illinois with reference to this matter, in which the statement is made that the Government has paid out during the last four years something like \$84,000 in the way of charters for vessels to carry supplies to and from the Pribilof Islands, which supplies could be carried on this tender, and that the Government is now paying at the rate of \$200 a day as a charter for a private steamer to do work that could be performed by this vessel.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him who is the gentleman from Illinois referred to?

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] who is now addressing me.

Mr. MANN. Is that the way the Secretary manufactures evidence, to write a letter to somebody and then get it published in the hearings?

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. It is published in the hearings.

Mr. MANN. I do not think it adds anything to it. It is news to me.

Mr. FALCONER. As regards this matter, and bearing directly upon it, Secretary Redfield has urged this appropriation; and as the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON], has just said, it is the opinion of the men who have given most consideration to the question that the ship ought to be built and that the appropriation should be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given five minutes more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FALCONER] be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALCONER. The people of the country generally, and particularly those who are in direct touch with this question, fail to understand why this great loss of life and property should be continued, when it is due, as is suggested, to the indifference of the Congress.

A most extraordinary seacoast formation obtains in the inside passage to Alaska. And I wish here to read a communication received from the Seattle Commercial Club reciting facts relative to the necessity for some action:

Whereas the club has already gone on record as advocating the plan of immediately sweeping the rocky channel of the coast of Alaska to discover and locate uncharted obstructions to navigation; and Whereas Congress is asked to appropriate money for a number of new survey boats needed to satisfactorily and completely chart the waters of the Alaska coast.

Five times Congress has been asked to make these appropriations. Four times the request has been ignored. Some action by Congress is expected this year. It would be well to consider the facts in the situation and have them properly placed before Congress, so that whatever action is taken it may be taken intelligently.

The rocky formation of the coast line and the great depth of water in most of the channels and approaches, together with numerous underwater peaks of hills projecting upward sometimes nearly to the surface without showing above, makes it necessary that the position of these underwater peaks be accurately determined and charted for safety to navigation.

The old-time and usual method of learning the depth of water has been to attach a sinker to a long line and by lowering the sinker to the bottom of the water determine the depth by measuring the distance from top of the water to bottom. This method only discloses the depth at the point where the measurement is taken, which may be within 50 feet of the perpendicular side of a rocky peak extending upward to within a few feet of the surface of the water and yet not be discernible, although it be a most dangerous menace to

the safety of ships navigating the sea in that vicinity. All such underwater peaks can be discovered by drawing a long line at a graduated depth below the surface of the water along the channels and approaches frequented by shipping, say, 40 feet deep at low water.

The nature of this service is such that a small wire cable, probably one-half inch in diameter and one or more miles in length, suspended from buoys or small boats, with one or two occupants in each, would seem to be most suitable; drawn through the channels and along the routes frequented by shipping, all obstructions rising near enough to the surface of the water would be discovered and promptly marked by buoys placed in the boats for the purpose, and the continuation of the search would be kept up without delay, thus making it possible to cover a space 20 to 50 square miles daily in ordinary summer weather.

The class of shipping best adapted to this service is the 75 to 100 foot power fishing craft, because their power is not sufficient to break the cable if obstructions are met suddenly; they can proceed at a speed of 3 to 5 miles per hour, which is ample; they can carry all the boats and men required to perform the service efficiently under the supervision of officers of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey or naval officers.

They can easily cover 500 square miles of ocean service monthly, or 3,000 square miles per season of six months yearly; five outfits of two power craft to each could be working at once, making it possible to survey 15,000 square miles of surface waters of the coast yearly for less expense to the Nation than it would cost to build two specially designed crafts, which might, after all, be poorly adapted to the purpose.

The cost for charter of suitable boats and crews would be less than \$3,000 per month for each craft, or \$18,000 for six months' service of each vessel and crew; 10 vessels (5 outfits) would cost the Nation less than \$180,000 for the 3,000 square miles of estimated area of survey.

When the survey for the location of all undiscovered projections into the path of navigation is completed and their position discovered and marked the hydrographic officer can complete the service by placing the positions on the charts accurately. Any appropriations for the purpose exceeding in amount the above-named estimates are excessive, since there is plenty of material, both vessels and men, at present available for the purpose: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That a letter embodying the terms of this communication be forwarded to Members of Congress from this coast.

OTTE CASE, Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I want to insert an article, inspired by the wreck of the *State of California*, from the Railway and Marine News:

CONGRESS ALONE TO BLAME FOR LATEST ALASKA WRECK—INSUFFICIENT AIDS TO NAVIGATION AND LACK OF PROPER CHARTING RESPONSIBLE FOR LOSS OF 32 PEOPLE—VALUE OF TOTAL LOSSES IN ALASKA WATERS MORE THAN \$7,000,000.

The loss of the steamship *State of California* in Gambler Bay on the early morning of August 17, in which 32 lives were lost, has again called the attention of the public to the deplorable condition of Alaska as regards aids to navigation and insufficient charting. At intervals during the past 10 years agitations have been started and the attention of Congress has been called to this very important matter. Congress has been petitioned for appropriations for more and better aids in the district of Alaska, extending from Portland Canal, where the British Columbia coast line terminates, to different ports of call to the eastward as far as Nome and St. Michael. This agitation, made at different times, has borne fruit in a small way, and while Alaskan waters are much better lighted and marked than they were 10 years ago, the increase in these much-needed aids to navigation has not by any means kept pace with the growth in commerce.

A short time ago a separate lighthouse district was established in Alaska, and a lighthouse tender detailed for that duty. This was a step in the right direction, and it was hoped at the time the change was made that Congress would appropriate sufficient money for the establishment of needed lighthouses and other aids. The Lighthouse Board appreciates the needs of Alaska, and the men in charge of the work would like nothing better than to have plenty of funds with which to make needed improvements. The same is true of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Considering the stretch of coast line in Alaska and the many routes of steamship travel, the equipment for this department of the Government service is woefully inadequate. Instead of operating two or three small survey steamers, the Government should supply a sufficient number to prosecute this work as the commerce of that district demands. If the Coast and Geodetic Survey is short of available talent to carry on this work, the Government could very well afford to send north each summer cadets out of the Naval Academy, who would thus be given some real work and who would gain some very valuable experience. During the summer season many naval vessels are in reserve at Mare Island and at Bremerton, and the young officers attached to these ships could very well be spared to serve in Alaska.

Gambler Bay, the scene of the recent deplorable wreck, was first charted in 1889, and the latest charts were compiled from figures obtained at that time. In the charts a long reef is shown, but not a single buoy marks the location of this dangerous line of rocks. In the case of the *State of California*, it can be stated that the vessel was on her regular course at 8.27 in the morning, and at 8.29 she struck the uncharted rock which ripped out her bottom plates, and at 8.32 the ship disappeared from sight. The oldest Indian living on Gambler Bay never heard of the rock which caused the *State of California* to sink, and snuffing out 32 precious lives.

In Canadian waters, whenever a new cannery is located or a new village grows to the importance of demanding steamship service, that Government's survey boats immediately repair to the scene and secure data for reliable charts. After the survey work is done, the lighthouse department gets busy and places wherever necessary aids to navigation. True, the coast line of Alaska is very much more extensive than that of British Columbia, but, nevertheless, the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Lighthouse Departments should be given sufficient funds to prosecute work wherever vessels are navigated in these waters.

In an examination of the list of vessels lost in Alaskan waters during a period of years extending from 1878 to date, it is found that the stupendous total of \$7,340,000 has been paid out by underwriters for total losses, and a sum nearly as great has been paid out for vessels that have met with disaster, been salvaged, and restored to their owners.

Railway and Marine News is able to publish in this issue a practically complete list of vessels totally lost in Alaskan waters, the year, where lost, and the value of hull and cargo. This paper published the greater portion of this list in its issue of October 1, 1911, that being the first time such a list had ever been published. This list is republished in this issue and brought up to date, and a perusal of the same should satisfy Members of Congress of the urgent need of assistance and the establishment of lighthouses and other aids to navigation and in a systematic charting of the waters of Alaska.

Name of vessel.	Rig.	Year lost.	Where lost.	Value of hull and cargo.
St. George	Schooner	1878	Kodiak Island	\$25,000
Kodiak	do	1878	Geese Island	25,000
Mt. Wallaston	Bark	1879	Arctic	100,000
Vigilant	do	1879	do	100,000
Henrietta	Schooner	1881	St. Lawrence Island	25,000
Sapho	do	1882	Arctic	25,000
Amethyst	Bark	1885	do	50,000
Montana	do	1885	Bristol Bay	50,000
Gazelle	do	1885	Arctic	50,000
Raimier	do	1885	do	50,000
George and Susan	do	1885	do	50,000
Mabel	do	1885	do	50,000
Napoleon	do	1885	Bering Sea	50,000
Clara Light	Schooner	1886	Arctic	10,000
John Carver	Bark	1886	do	50,000
Western Shore	Sloop	1886	Fristol Bay	100,000
Young Phoenix	Bark	1888	Point Barrow	50,000
Julia Ford	do	1888	Karluk	100,000
Ohio	do	1888	Point Hope	25,000
Lucretia	Steamship	1889	Herold Island	50,000
Jas. A. Hamilton	Schooner	1889	Bering Sea	50,000
Amcon	Steamship	1889	Loring	100,000
Silver Wave	Schooner	1890	Point Barrow	10,000
Thomas Pope	Bark	1890	Point Hope	50,000
Korea	Barkentine	1890	Kalgin Island	75,000
Lizzie Williams	do	1890	Tugidak Island	100,000
Orizaba	Steamship	1890	St. Michael	100,000
Oneida	Barkentine	1890	Alaska Gulf	75,000
Wm. Lewis	Steamship	1891	Point Barrow	150,000
Abraham Barker	Bark	1892	Arctic	50,000
Ohio	do	1893	Nunivak Island	25,000
Jacob Howland	do	1895	Strong Island	50,000
Raphael	Sloop	1895	Karluk	40,000
Jas. A. Boreland	Bark	1896	Tugidak Island	100,000
Hidalgo	Brig	1896	Arctic	30,000
Mexico	Steamship	1897	Dixons Entrance	100,000
Jessie Freeman	Barkentine	1897	Point Barrow	50,000
Orea	Steamship	1897	do	100,000
Rosario	Schooner	1897	do	40,000
Navarch	Steamship	1897	Arctic	100,000
Sterling	Sloop	1898	Bristol Bay	100,000
Clara Nevada	Steamship	1898	Lynn Canal	50,000
Brixam	do	1898	Clarence Straits	100,000
Laurada	do	1899	Bering Sea	150,000
Wildwood	Bark	1899	Bristol Bay	100,000
Merrion	Sloop	1900	Karluk	40,000
Colorado	Brig	1900	Wrangell Narrows	50,000
Hunter	Bark	1900	Bering Sea	50,000
Catherine Sudden	Barkentine	1900	do	50,000
Alaska	Bark	1900	do	25,000
Bahama	Steamship	1902	do	100,000
Chas. D. Lane	do	1902	Nunivak Island	100,000
Discovery	do	1902	Yakutat	50,000
Islander	do	1902	Gastineaux Channel	225,000
Cleveland	do	1903	Bering Sea	75,000
Sadie	do	1903	do	500,000
Star of Russia	Sloop	1905	Chichagoff Island	150,000
Balclutha	Schooner	1904	Geese Island	45,000
Servia	Sloop	1905	Kodiak Island	100,000
Nicholas Thayer	Bark	1906	do	20,000
Oregon	Steamship	1906	Cape Hinchinbrook	200,000
Mariechen	do	1906	Chatham Straits	300,000
Themis	do	1906	Hardigan Reef	120,000
John Currier	Ship	1907	Bristol Bay	190,000
St. Paul	Schooner	1907	Sukhlisk Island	25,000
Wm. Bayliss	Bark	1907	Arctic	50,000
Lucile	Ship	1908	Ugashik	250,000
Star of Bengal	do	1908	Coronation Island	250,000
Saratoga	Steamship	1908	Bushby Island	175,000
Columbia	Ship	1909	Unimak Pass	100,000
Quatsino	Brig	1909	Heikish Narrows	300,000
Charger	do	1909	Dixons Entrance	30,000
Farallon	do	1909	Kartar Bay	25,000
Portland	Steamship	1910	Iliamna Bay	80,000
Olympia	do	1910	Katalla	55,000
Cottage City	do	1911	Bligh Island	150,000
Ramona	do	1911	Seymour Narrows	100,000
Jabez Howes	Ship	1911	Cape Decision	150,000
Hayden Brown	Bark	1912	Chienik Bay	100,000
Yukon	Bark	1912	Montague Island	10,000
State of California	Steamship	1913	Sanak Island	170,000
Curacao	do	1913	Gambier Bay	225,000
	do	1913	Warm Chuck	225,000
Total losses				7,340,000

The above list of total losses contains the names of many vessels well known on the Pacific coast. If we were to publish a list of all the vessels that have met with disaster of different kinds in Alaskan waters—vessels that have been repaired and restored to their owners—it would include nearly all the vessels engaged in the Alaskan trade.

While many of the losses in Alaskan waters can be attributed to mistakes of mariners, and from other causes, by far the greater percentage can be charged against the United States Government for failing to



provide sufficient aids to navigation. Not only is our Government responsible to a great degree for all this loss of property, and with the great losses of underwriters, but it is also responsible for the loss of many lives during the period mentioned in the above list.

Surely the people who travel to and from the great northland, which is occupying so important a place in the public prints at the present time, are entitled to the protection of their home Government. And the men who have invested their money in floating property that the great Alaskan country might be opened up and developed are surely entitled to all the assistance they can possibly get from the Government which gives them the right to engage in this coastwise traffic. Similar protection should be given the insurance people, who make it possible for the transportation men to operate their vessels. Insurance rates on Alaskan hulls would now appear to be as high as the traffic will bear, and yet, notwithstanding the insurance rates charged, it does not require very much figuring to show anyone that underwriters have lost money on Alaska business. The question is a serious one.

Mr. Chairman, the press generally of the West urges action on the Congress, and tends to place the responsibility for future safety upon Congress. I quote from the Morning Tribune, Everett, Wash.:

GOVERNMENT HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR WRECK OF STEAMER "CALIFORNIA"—UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FAILED TO CHART CORRECTLY ROCK IN GAMBIER BAY—34 LIVES LOST WHEN ILL-FATED SHIP SINKS—DISASTER DECLARED TO HAVE BEEN UNAVOIDABLE UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES.

SEATTLE, September 6.

Finding that the failure of the Government to chart correctly a portion of Gambier Bay, Alaska, was the direct and only cause of the wreck of the steamship *State of California* in those waters Sunday, August 17; completely exonerating Capt. T. H. Cann, jr., and his associates from any blame in connection with the disaster, and highly complimenting the performance of the officers and the equipment of the ill-fated vessel, the official report of the board of inquiry which, in this city, investigated the wreck, was forwarded yesterday to the Department of Commerce at Washington, D. C.

DISASTER UNAVOIDABLE.

Included in the report was a transcript of all the testimony taken, as well as the findings of the board. Capt. Bion B. Whitney and Capt. Robert A. Turner, Federal marine inspectors, with headquarters in this city, who comprised the board of investigation, united in the final decision on the disaster.

The disaster, as well as the loss of 34 lives, was declared, in their opinion, to have been unavoidable under existing circumstances. Led by the chart to believe that there were 72 feet, or 12 fathoms, of water beneath his vessel, Capt. Cann was entirely justified in assuming that the course was safe, the inspectors decreed.

NEW SEATTLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
Seattle, Wash., April 7, 1914.

Hon. J. A. FALCONER,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Appropriations have been asked in Congress by the Department of Commerce for the construction of vessels and for increase in the facilities for making a proper survey of the Alaska coast and for wire-drag operations to locate pinnacle rocks, which have in the past caused numerous accidents and the loss of many lives.

Unless the department is enabled to carry out the work proposed, the menace to life and property and to uninterrupted communication will be greater than has been the case in the past, owing to the increase in travel, in the number and size of the vessels employed, and in the quantity of freight coming with the era of railroad development and the opening up of the Territory.

This chamber respectfully appeals to you to use every available opportunity of urging the granting in full of the appropriations recommended. The attached copies of correspondence interchanged between the steamship companies operating in Alaskan waters and the Department of Commerce present details of the situation and its requirements. Such accidents as that to the *State of California* in Gambier Bay last August, causing the loss of 32 lives, would have been avoided if thorough surveys had been made to locate pinnacle rocks in the main ship channels, where the charts showed great depth of water.

While improvement in the last two years has been made in the way of safeguarding navigation in Alaskan waters, much yet remains to be done. This can only be accomplished by providing the means called for by the Department of Commerce, including, among other things, appropriation of \$525,000 for Coast and Geodetic Survey vessels, three of which are intended solely for Alaska and three for economical operation of the wire-drag expeditions in exposed regions.

As pointed out by Secretary Redfield on his recent visit, the Government is about to expend \$35,000,000 in building an Alaskan railroad, to begin at tidewater at some port from 1,000 to 1,500 miles north of here. Properly marked navigation courses really constitute the initial link in this great transportation system for the northern Territory.

Furthermore, proper provision for the Geodetic Survey will make it possible to confine crews, which work in northern waters during the summer, at work on necessary surveys, on the Sound and along the coast States during the winter, thus overcoming the present rather costly practice of disbanding them in the fall and recruiting new crews in the spring.

We realize that you recognize the vital importance of this subject, but we write this letter for the purpose of bringing it directly to your attention and of placing before you the information herewith transmitted.

Yours, very truly,

C. B. YANDELL, Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, December 20, 1913.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your favor of the 26th of November, forwarded through Capt. J. F. Pratt, inspector in Seattle of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, transmitted to me by the superintendent of that bureau of this department.

The subject of the communication, which is signed not only by you but by four other steamship companies, is one of the deepest interest to me, and one which, I think you will agree, when the facts are before you, has already had active attention at our hands.

On November 17 I wrote the President thus:

"The need of safeguarding the Alaskan coast is enforced by the loss this season of two important vessels, the *Curacao* and the *State of California*, with serious loss of life. Our estimates call for vessels to finish promptly the survey of the coast and for funds to light it better. The Northwest is greatly concerned, and properly, about it."

To this the President replied, November 18:

"I also hope sincerely that the Congress may be able to afford us the means which we lack of safeguarding the Alaskan coast."

I am sending you separately a copy of my annual report, issued on the 16th instant. Your attention is especially invited to page 11, from which you will see that the matter has been formally placed before Congress.

I quote below so much of a communication dated December 16 from the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey as refers to Alaskan matters:

"This bureau is in full accord with the letter of the steamship companies interested in the Alaska trade, dated November 26, 1913, which was forwarded to you with my note of December 13, 1913, in regard to the necessity of examining by the wire drag the lanes of travel followed by the steamships in Alaska. The letter discloses, as was to be expected from such authorities, an appreciation of the difficulties in locating submerged pinnacles.

"For some time this survey had had in mind the urgency of such examinations and the need of accelerating the work in Alaska and increasing the means of rapid chart publication.

"The form of the appropriation for the survey is such that the sum total of the appropriations is divided among separate items. Increases have therefore been approved by you in various scattered items of the appropriation bill which bear directly on increased activity of the survey in Alaska.

"It is perhaps not necessary to mention the items for additional small buildings and extensions and for new lithographic charts.

"The other items involving increases directly or indirectly for the Alaska surveys are as follows:

"Under 'Party expenses, Pacific' an increase of \$60,000 has been submitted. Of this amount the following is intended for the Alaska field work:

For one wire-drag party.....	\$18,000
Additional to increase the efficiency of the 6 Alaska vessels.....	7,000

Total.....	25,000
------------	--------

"Of the remaining \$35,000, \$32,000 is intended for surveys and re-surveys on the coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington, including wire-drag work, three vessels in full commission during the winter months, extension of the coast triangulation and chart-revision parties, all of which are matters that should receive immediate attention and are closely related to the maritime commercial necessities of Alaska.

"Under 'Continuing researches in physical hydrography,' etc., an increase of \$5,600 has been requested. This amount will be used in increasing the activities for securing better tidal and current information along the coasts. There is an urgent demand for information of this character from mariners on the Pacific coast of the United States and in Alaska.

"Under 'Offshore soundings,' etc., an increase of \$5,000 has been submitted. This is about the amount that will be required for the field revision of the Alaska Coast Pilot, including the employment of the necessary experts.

"Under 'For continuing magnetic observations,' etc., an increase of \$25,000 has been requested. This is intended to start the work of carrying the triangulation from the Bering Sea, across Alaska to the one hundred and forty-first meridian, and is work that should no longer be delayed. Its completion will be necessary before accurate maps of Alaska can be made, and it will be most valuable in the development of the resources of Alaska.

"Under 'Objects not named,' etc., an increase of \$1,000 has been estimated. This is intended to provide funds for plans and specifications for the new vessels for Alaska surveys. Some new language has been inserted in this item making it available for emergency relief in cases of distress in remote regions, such as in the case of the Katmai volcano in 1912, the smallpox epidemic near Fort Yukon, and the more recent case of the shipwrecked passengers and crew of the steamship *Curacao*, sunk off the coast of Prince of Wales Island.

"Under 'Pay of necessary employees to man and equip the vessels,' an increase of \$22,800 has been requested. This will provide the necessary additional employees for the wire-drag party on the Pacific coast and Alaska, and will enable this survey to keep three of the Alaska vessels at work during the winter on much-needed surveys and re-surveys on the Pacific coast.

"Under 'Salaries,' an increase of six additional assistants at \$2,400 has been submitted. These trained officers are urgently required, and will hardly meet the demands for the wire-drag work, the Yukon triangulation, and for the new vessels estimated for under another head.

"You have approved estimates for six new vessels for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, \$525,000, three of which are intended solely for the Alaska surveys and three smaller ones for the more efficient and economical operation of wire-drag operations in the more exposed regions."

In addition to the above the sum of \$60,000 is included in our estimates now pending before Congress for additional aids to navigation to be established by the Bureau of Lighthouses, and you will notice on page 114 of the annual report that Congress has already made an appropriation for a light and fog signal at or near Cape St. Elias, Alaska, of \$115,000. A bill is now pending in Congress authorizing a lighthouse tender for Alaska at \$325,000. This vessel is already authorized at a cost of \$250,000, but the service requires a larger ship and we are asking that this amount be increased by \$75,000 to \$325,000. No appropriation for this is yet made.

We are furthermore requesting of Congress funds sufficient to provide vessels for transporting our salmon agents along the Alaska coast, of which you will find a note at the bottom of page 17.

It is our intention also to strengthen the work of the Steamboat-Inspection Service and that of the Bureau of Navigation in Alaska.

The subject of giving assistance to Alaskan commerce, so far as it lies within the power of this department to do it, is one which we regard as of high importance, and the department will be glad to take any proper steps to push the matter to a successful conclusion.

I shall take the liberty of placing your letter within the knowledge of the proper committee of Congress, and I have no doubt they will give same thoughtful consideration.

Yours, truly,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,  
Secretary.

SEATTLE, November 26, 1913.

Hon WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,

Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

SIR: On July 14, 1909, the steamship *Ohio*, en route from Seattle to ports in Alaska, struck an uncharted rock in Tongass Narrows, just north of Ketchikan. The charts showed no soundings where she struck under 30 fathoms (180 feet).

On August 13, 1912, the steamship *Mariposa*, while en route from Alaska ports to Seattle, struck an uncharted rock off Point Baker, in Sumner Straits, just west of where the chart shows 111 fathoms (666 feet).

On August 17, 1913, the steamship *State of California*, while leaving Gambler Bay, Alaska, struck an uncharted rock where the chart showed 12½ fathoms (75 feet).

In the cases of both the *Ohio* and *Mariposa* there was no serious damage to the vessels, and they were able to proceed on their voyage, but in the case of the *State of California* the ship sank within a few moments after striking and 32 lives were lost.

These rocks are what are known as pinnacle formations, which are peculiar to the waters of southeastern Alaska, and lead where the usual method of survey is followed. Tongass Narrows and Sumner Straits are stretches of water which have been used by vessels since the inception of trade to Alaska. Gambler Bay has been used for the past two years, since a canning industry was started therein. The *State of California* had made 16 trips in and out of the harbor during that time, and there had been several other vessels employed in the trade as well.

These accidents show the prevalence of uncharted rocks in regular channels and the necessity for resurvey work in order to discover these hidden dangers and to better safeguard not only the value of property, but, what is more important, human life. Persons competent to judge, including the local officers of the Coast Survey, express the opinion that the only way in which the presence of pinnacle rocks in the main ship channels can be ascertained is to drag the channels, and this can only be done at a large expense. However, we believe that the large increase in the number of vessels employed and in the number of passengers traveling between the ports of Puget Sound, British Columbia, and southeastern Alaska justify the Government in incurring whatever expense may be necessary to locate these hidden pinnacles. It is the desire of the steamship companies operating to Alaska to urge in every way possible the granting of sufficient appropriation to give the Coast Survey sufficient equipment and funds with which to prosecute this work, and it has arranged, among other things, to send each Congressman a letter showing the larger number of vessels employed in the trade, the increase in their size, the increase in the number of passengers traveling, and setting forth the danger to which ships, their passengers and cargo are subjected, and urging the necessity of appropriations in such amounts as the department may consider necessary for the proper execution of this work.

The purpose of this letter is to explain to you what the steamship companies have in mind and to respectfully solicit from you suggestions as to what further action we can take toward bringing about the desired result.

Respectfully submitted.

ALASKA STEAMSHIP CO.,  
By R. W. BAXTER, Vice President.  
ALASKA COAST CO.,  
By H. F. ALEXANDER, President.  
HUMBOLDT STEAMSHIP CO.,  
By M. KALISH, Vice President.  
NORTHLAND STEAMSHIP CO.,  
By H. C. BRADFORD, President.  
PACIFIC COAST STEAMSHIP CO.,  
By J. C. FORD, President.

Mr. Chairman, the President urges an adequate appropriation for coast and geodetic surveys here.

The Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Redfield, has a fine appreciation of the benefits to be derived by a thorough submarine charting of Alaska waters, and he recommends the wire-drag device be used to locate the pinnacle peaks that characterize these waters.

While the point of order raised against the pending amendment may be insisted upon, it is to be hoped that this Congress may pass the bill reported out and favorably recommended by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] is chairman.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to say this much in reference to this matter: There is a boat authorized, to cost, I think, \$250,000. There is no authority for a boat to cost \$325,000. Whatever may be the merits of the controversy as to whether a larger or a smaller boat should be built, I am obliged in my capacity as chairman and representing the committee to protect the bill from such amendments.

Mr. BRYAN. Will not the gentleman, when he is aware that there is the chairman of another committee before the House who explains the situation and waives the jurisdiction of his committee, and that every reason of economy and justice and fairness requires this boat to be built—will he not yield an ordinary technical point and permit this amendment to go in?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. If I did, somebody else is ready to make the point, and I think I had better exercise it myself.

Mr. BRYAN. I think the gentleman from Illinois would waive it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman persuades the gentleman from Illinois to waive it, I would not be surprised if it had some influence on me.

Mr. BRYAN. Then it is up to the gentleman from Illinois. Surely he will not object.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation ought not to be made on its merits. A few years ago we were building lighthouse tenders for \$150,000 apiece. Then we increased the amount until we got up to \$200,000. I made some investigations myself, and concluded that it would take \$225,000; and we provided \$225,000 for a lighthouse tender. Then we afterwards authorized a lighthouse tender for the Pacific coast for \$250,000.

They can build all they need in the way of lighthouse tenders for the Pacific coast and for the Alaskan coast for \$250,000, to attend to the lighthouse work and to take care of the aids to navigation on the Alaska coast. But some brilliant gentleman, connected somewhere with the Department of Commerce, concluded that they would like to have a little better boat to sail in—one where there would be less likelihood of turbulence and seasickness from the elements—and so they conceived the idea that they ought to add \$75,000 to the \$250,000 and build what they call a lighthouse tender for \$325,000, under the excuse that they needed it to go to the Pribilof Islands to carry supplies there.

Anyone thoroughly familiar with the duties of a lighthouse tender, outside of the Department of Commerce, ought to know that the lighthouse tender attending to work regularly could not well be used for trips to the Pribilof Islands. Originally the excuse was given that they ought to have a tender to carry supplies from the western coast up to the Pribilof Islands, and also to carry coal down the Yukon River—if that is the name of the river—from the coal fields of Alaska to the Pribilof Islands. A more absurd proposition, as far as the practical use of the lighthouse tender is concerned, I never heard.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Does not the gentleman recognize that there might be a demand for a vessel to carry a certain amount of freight for the Government in Alaskan waters that would not be required of a lighthouse tender on the Atlantic coast? The Government has paid \$83,000 during the past four years for this purpose.

Mr. MANN. The Government pays out large sums to carry supplies to the Philippine Islands. Perhaps the gentleman from Colorado thinks we ought to build a lighthouse tender to carry freight to the Philippines. There is no connection between a lighthouse tender for taking care of the aids to navigation on the Alaskan coast and carrying coal and other supplies to the Pribilof Islands.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. If by the addition of \$75,000 to the cost of the vessel we could secure a vessel that would do this work, does not the gentleman think it would be advisable?

Mr. MANN. You can not secure a vessel to do that work. The result would be that you would have a vessel costing \$325,000, and instead of doing lighthouse work it would be carrying officials and supplies, mostly officials, between here and the Pribilof Islands and back again. I might get a sail in it, and it might be that my friend from Colorado would get one. But for lighthouse service the \$250,000 vessel engaged in attending to the aids of navigation would be worth two of these vessels used a part of their time in going to the Pribilof Islands.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who has looked into this matter, if his committee has not recommended the construction of this vessel?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I so stated two or three times a few moments ago on the floor. It appears to be a question of judgment entirely between the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the Secretary of Commerce. I could readily concede that up to two years ago the gentleman from Illinois knew more about it than the Secretary of Commerce, but for the past 18 months the Secretary of Commerce has been giving exclusive study to these subjects. If the gentleman from Illinois were the Secretary of Commerce, I believe I would lean to his judgment, rather than to another, if the other was a Member of Congress and the leader of the minority, charged with opposition to all measures that come before Congress, which must necessarily divide his attention.

As I understand the Secretary of Commerce, he thinks it would be economical in building a vessel to replace one that was lost a few years ago to build it a little larger, so he could dispense with the necessity for still another vessel; that it might be that one vessel for \$325,000 would serve two purposes, instead of having two vessels, to cost in the aggregate \$500,000. I have no doubt in the world of the absolute necessity—not only propriety, but necessity—for increasing this authorization to \$325,000, but I do not intend to vote for it here.

I hope that gentlemen will not make the point of order, but will let us vote it down here, so far as that is concerned, because the Committee on Appropriations is charged with the fiscal responsibility for this House. That committee gives careful and painstaking consideration to all of these questions, and I do not believe it is the fault of that committee that we have failed to secure this increase in the authorization. But there is a place where it is in order to put this item in this bill. After a bill has been passed by the other body it is in order over there to place it as an amendment on an appropriation bill, and it will come up in an orderly and proper manner, and I hope the distinguished gentlemen who will be the conferees and managers on the part of the House will permit this item to remain in the bill, if the Senate, in its wisdom, sees proper to put it in.

Mr. RAUCH. Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances I feel that we are justified in making a point of order. Therefore, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. RUBEY). The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

General expenses: For supplies, repairs, maintenance, and incidental expenses of lighthouses and other lights, beacons, buoyage, fog signals, lighting of rivers heretofore authorized to be lighted, light vessels, other aids to navigation, and lighthouse tenders, including the establishment, repair, and improvement of beacons and day marks and purchase of land for same, the establishment of post lights, buoys, submarine signals, and fog signals, the establishment of oil or carbide houses, not to exceed \$10,000: *Provided*, That no oil or carbide house erected hereunder shall exceed \$550 in cost; construction of necessary outbuildings at a cost not exceeding \$200 at any one light station in any fiscal year, the improvements of grounds and buildings connected with light stations and depots, wages of laborers attending post lights, pay of temporary employees and field force while engaged on works of general repair and maintenance, and pay of laborers and mechanics at lighthouse depots; rations and provisions or commutation thereof for keepers of lighthouses, officers and crews of light vessels and tenders, and officials and other authorized persons of the Lighthouse Service on duty on board of such tenders or vessels, and money accruing from commutation for rations and provisions for the above-named persons on board of tenders and light vessels may be paid on proper vouchers to the person having charge of the mess of such vessels, reimbursement under rules prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce of keepers of light stations and masters of light vessels and of lighthouse tenders for rations and provisions and clothing furnished shipwrecked persons who may be temporarily provided for by them, not exceeding in all \$5,000 in any fiscal year, fuel and rent of quarters where necessary for keepers of lighthouses, the purchase of land sites for fog signals, the rent of necessary ground for all such lights and beacons as are for temporary use or to mark changeable channels and which in consequence can not be made permanent, the rent of offices, depots, and wharves, traveling expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence under rules prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce not to exceed \$4 per day, and mileage, library books for light stations and vessels, and technical books and periodicals not exceeding \$1,000, and for all other contingent expenses of district offices and depots and for contingent expenses of the office of the Bureau of Lighthouses in Washington, \$2,775,000.

Mr. BROWN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, at the end of line 13, page 130, the following:

"*Provided*, That hereafter employees of the Lighthouse Service who are not now entitled to leave of absence with pay, and who have served 12 consecutive months, shall be given 15 days leave of absence with pay each year: *Provided*, That pro rata leave shall be allowed those serving fractional parts of a year: *Provided further*, That heads of divisions shall have discretion as to the time when the leave shall be granted."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. BROWN of New York. Mr. Chairman, there are only about 300 men who would be affected—more or less—by this amendment. They are the mechanics in the employ of the Bureau of Lighthouses, and they do the mechanical work that may be necessary from time to time. I think they are the only mechanics in the employ of the United States Government who do general work of this kind for whom vacation allowance is not made. I think in ordinary justice they ought to be included with all of the other mechanics in the navy yards and elsewhere, and receive their pro rata of 15 days' vacation allowance with pay. The Senate has recently passed Senate bill 1262, which so provides. The Secretary of Commerce is strongly in favor of this legislation. I would urge the crowded condition of the calendar as being the chief reason for adopting this amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois insist upon his point of order?

Mr. MANN. I insist upon the point of order. There is a legislative committee that attends to that, presided over by the able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON].

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his compliment, but the infirmity of that distinguished chairman, which I admit, is that he can not get consideration for as many good bills as he would like.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For surveys and necessary resurveys of coasts on the Pacific Ocean under the jurisdiction of the United States, \$165,000.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "\$165,000," in line 5, page 132, and insert in lieu thereof "\$225,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 132, line 5, strike out "\$165,000" and insert "\$225,000."

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, Secretary Redfield, to whom the Pacific coast owes a very great obligation for the efficient way in which he has taken up the work of the Government on the Pacific coast and has taken up the matter of the proper development of these matters under his department, has especially attempted to impress upon the Appropriation Committee the necessity of an appropriation of \$225,000 under this particular item for charting these Alaskan coasts and for wire-dragging these waters in the way suggested by my colleague [Mr. FALCONER], who preceded me a few moments ago, and affording some kind of an assurance to vessels that sail and steam along those coasts against rocks that are uncharted and are menaces to navigation that can not be seen or discovered except by such survey.

If you go on the Atlantic coast you have bells on your towers and bells on your shores and you have buoys on the top of the water and buoys underneath, aids in every direction of every conceivable kind sufficient, it would seem, to protect the ships from all the dangers that menace navigation; but over on the coast of Alaska, where the United States Government owns practically the whole domain, where we are now expending \$35,000,000 to build a railroad in order to develop our own property, we have a great deal of trouble in obtaining the right kind of allowance for these necessary purposes. It is true enough that it is necessary to economize, but I believe here is a place where every cent that is put into this development is really retained by the Government in a more emphatic way than on other coasts, and I do not think it is right for Congress to allow these ships to go down continually and repeatedly, and when the Representatives from that section of the country come and tell you about it and tell you what the conditions are, still you hold back on the appropriations that are shown to be so necessary.

The Secretary of Commerce has shown great diligence and great care, and, as I said before, the Pacific coast owes to him a great obligation. When you go to the commercial bodies, the chambers of commerce, and among the people you find that Secretary of Commerce Redfield and his work have the confidence of the people who live out there, for they know that he is trying to do the right thing by the Government's interests in that section, and we think that the Committee on Appropriations ought to have granted the request that he made for the \$225,000 allowance in this case. These vessels that make these charts or at least make these surveys are, of course, more or less expensive to keep up, and in the hearings the Secretary has shown that it is simply impossible for him to do the things that ought to be done without such an appropriation. I think that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations ought for one time to yield to the demands of the department in view of the fact that the Government is undertaking these extra lines of activity in Alaska. Under all the circumstances that section ought to have this necessary appropriation. We have already called the attention of the committee to the fact that vessels are wrecked out there simply because they do not know where it is safe to go; they do not know the rocks or the dangers or where the dangers to navigation exist, and all we want to do is to have the necessary provision and equipment to discover those points and have them charted so the mariner, as he looks at the chart, when he is going up or down that coast, can tell where it is safe to go and where it is not safe to go. Here is an excerpt from the hearings which shows how plainly and earnestly Secretary Redfield presented the matter to the committee:

Secretary REDFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a preliminary statement, and Mr. Tittmann will supplement it. The situation in which the Coast and Geodetic Survey finds itself in Alaska is a very unfortunate one. It is called upon to survey a coast which we have spoken of this morning as having 26,000 miles outlying, very dangerous, in which there have been serious disasters within the last five years, involving serious loss of life, with an equipment which is totally inadequate for the purpose and without the apparatus to do the work. I want to be very specific about that, in order that we may lay before you what we had in mind when this estimate was prepared and anticipate a number of questions which should appear here. If there had been provided for Alaska several years ago the wire-drag apparatus, which appears on page 478, and which is included in the \$225,000 there appearing—if that apparatus had been used in Gambler Bay, Alaska, we should have saved the steamship *State of California*, with her 32 people. There is no way known of detecting what are known

as pinnacle rocks except by the wire drag, and the coast of Alaska is full of them. It is a formation, I may say, which provides them particularly. The charts show, at the point where the *State of California* struck, ample depth of water. She had been in and out there many times, but this sharp pinnacle rock was entirely unknown and could not be found by any apparatus we then had or have now, and she finally hit it and went to the bottom in a few minutes with 32 people. So that we have not the physical apparatus to make useful there in the best sense the force of men we have.

Within a month I have personally been on board two of the vessels we have, and have examined them from end to end, and have seen a third vessel. Of the two vessels which we are using on that coast for this work one of them is 38 years old and the other 30 years old. Another one is 32 years old and another one is 27 years. They have earned an honorable rest.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they wooden or steel ships?

Secretary REDFIELD. Wooden ships. One of them is a composite, wood over an iron hull. They are most badly equipped; that is to say, specifically, they have no electric-light apparatus of any kind. They are without steering engines and their power is a single-cylinder condensing engine of a type which has been discarded for over a quarter of a century. I personally examined the apparatus, went into the engine room, talked to the engineers, went into the officers' accommodations, and I will say to you that they are not such accommodations as you would yourself be willing to provide if you saw them. They are what was customary 38 years ago. Now, those vessels which are small, one of them 113 feet long and another one 140 feet long, are sent into the roughest seas that we have to survey and are engaged in a service where they must be kept at sea continuously. They are, of course, without wireless apparatus, because they have no electric power. They are very slow. The *Gedney* and the *McArthur* when they are driven hard only make 9 knots an hour.

There is a great waste of time and therefore a waste of money. In the mere going back and forth upon their duty they take a lot more time than they should. In short, the whole service, with one exception or with two exceptions, is equipped in a way which can only warrant the highest praise for the officers of that service who have made it last as long as it has, and I have rather reproved my friend and associate, Mr. Tittmann, for not having been a little more aggressive in respect of pushing for this longer. I want to say that before the new vessels and the added equipment we ask for can be provided I greatly fear that there may be serious accidents and loss of life on the coast from lack of apparatus, and, secondly, that these vessels will be out of repair before their successors can be built, so that they will be unsafe. If we assume that new ships could be had in two years, at that time the *McArthur* will be 40 years old and the *Gedney* 41 and out of all fitness for the work they are charged with doing. Therefore we have put in, at my request, equipment for wire drag apparatus for the Pacific coast such as we have on the Atlantic; and which is far—I was going to say far worse needed there, although it is needed in both places—and I have put in a request for the vessels which we require to do this work which is of greater urgency than ever before.

I have received the following from the Seattle Commercial Club, which I commend to the consideration of Congress:

The English-speaking world has again been called upon to shudder at the recital of a disastrous wreck in Alaskan waters. For years petition after petition has been presented to the proper authorities requesting aids to navigation, better facilities, and more thorough survey of the inland waters of this the most valuable outside territory of the United States, but with little effect. Each passing year witnesses some disastrous wreck on this coast, which in almost every case is due to the absence of aids to navigation or the fact that the waters have been improperly charted.

Whereas on the morning of August 17 the steamship *State of California* struck a reef in Gambler Bay, southwestern Alaska, and in three minutes went to the bottom, but with the awful death toll of 32 souls as a relic of the direful event; and

Whereas this steamship was traveling over a route not usually covered by steamships, owing to the fact that it was engaged in aiding the industrial development of a frontier section of Alaska, specifically the development of fishing and other industries on Prince of Wales and other important islands of the western coast, whose waters are almost wholly uncharted and where practically no aids to navigation exist; and

Whereas for years past wrecks of all kinds, amounting to millions of dollars, have occurred in the Alaskan Archipelago, resulting in a tremendous financial loss as well as a large number of human lives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the attention of the Congress of the United States be drawn to this condition and that Senators, Members of Congress representing the State of Washington, and the Delegate in Congress from the Territory of Alaska be requested to bring this matter directly before the House of Representatives, and that they be urged to introduce a bill in those bodies calling for a full investigation; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives and Delegate mentioned above be requested to procure, or have procured, for such investigation full facts regarding the uncharted waters of Alaska from the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Hydrographic Office of the United States Navy, as well as a report covering the need of further aids to navigation from the Bureau of Navigation and the United States Lighthouse Board; and be it further

Resolved, That the Commercial Club of the city of Seattle respectfully request immediate action on the part of the Representatives of the State of Washington in the matter of the above, owing to the urgency of the case and growing importance of Alaska and the steady increase in its shipping and commerce relations.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. The request made for this money was not accompanied by information which would enable the committee to grant it. Some of the vessels that are utilized up in Alaskan waters a portion of the year must be laid up for repairs when they come back. They can not be utilized the entire year. Various estimates have been presented as to the cost of certain things, but the entire information furnished the committee was so unsatisfactory that we could not justify an increase of this

appropriation at this time, and I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. FALCONER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. FALCONER. Did not the Commerce Department present an argument showing that these boats used up in Alaskan waters in the summer months could be used on the California and Oregon coasts?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The unfortunate part of that is that two years ago the committee went into the matter very fully, and after these vessels have finished their work in Alaskan waters and returned to the Pacific coast it is necessary to overhaul them and they are laid up and can not be used on other parts of the Pacific coast during the winter months. The thought of using them on the southern coast of California was an afterthought. It is not possible to take those vessels from Alaska, overhaul them, and send them away south to work during the winter months and then bring them back and send them up to Alaska. It would be a very unprofitable undertaking, and they can not work on the north Pacific coast in the winter months any more than they can in the Alaskan waters.

Mr. FALCONER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will.

Mr. FALCONER. By what methods are you going to survey these coasts?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They are being surveyed. It has been carried on satisfactorily for some years. We appropriate \$165,000 a year for this particular work. Of course I know that all of these departments wish to enlarge their activities very much and ask for an increase of almost 50 per cent on this particular appropriation. If that rate were retained throughout all this service the result would be that the cost to the Government would be so great that it would not be justified.

Mr. FALCONER. The United States Coast and Geodetic Survey shows that in 124 fathoms (75 feet) of water the *California* struck and went down; in 111 fathoms (600 feet) of water the *Mariposa* struck, and the whole bottom of the ship was torn out. The ship *California* had been over that direct route some 16 times. Of course it was a little out of the way. There was nothing there to indicate shallow water.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no guarantee that if more extensive surveys had been made in that particular direction they would have discovered these pinnacle rocks at those points. The committee went very exhaustively into the manner in which these surveys are made, and even with the utmost care they are not always likely to discover these pinnacle rocks in the water. But this work is being carried on as expeditiously as it can be justified, in my opinion.

Mr. FALCONER. The dragnet theory suggested by the department would certainly catch these pinnacles. On a stretch of 500 feet of net they will survey something like, if I remember, 3,000 square miles a season.

Mr. FITZGERALD. By the time they cover the Alaska coast in that survey a great many years will go by. We have been working on the Atlantic coast and Gulf coast a great many years. And the result is that we have fairly good results, but no guaranty at all that there are not pinnacle rocks in places that are unknown. Of course, the formation of the coast makes it somewhat dangerous even with a sandy shore and beach, but there is a likelihood of these pinnacle rocks on the shores where there is a rock formation of volcanic origin.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no necessity for increasing the appropriation. I hope it will not be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I sometimes think that all of us ought to at least occasionally remember that no money can be paid out by the General Government until it has first been paid in, and that while we are making special pleas for the expenditures of money it is very seldom any of them make a special plea in behalf of the fellow who has to pay the bill.

Here is a proposition where we are now appropriating for the Coast and Geodetic Survey along the entire Atlantic and Gulf coasts, including the Panama Canal, \$65,000 a year, and we appropriate for the Pacific coast \$165,000 a year. And yet our enthusiastic friends from the Pacific coast are not satisfied. They want to make the world over in a minute. We now appropriate in one year more money for the Pacific coast than we had appropriated altogether for these purposes up to 100 years ago. And we had sailors on the sea and ships on the sea in much greater numbers and importance than we now have them on the Pacific coast. They were real sailors

and real ships and did a real business. If they could have heard my distinguished friend from Washington, I think if they had stopped at the gentleman's port they would have been afraid to sail out for fear of going to the bottom. We are doing pretty well for the Pacific coast now with \$165,000 for those purposes as against \$65,000 for the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. I do not think that the constant complaints that come to us about the care of Alaska are well founded. We are doing more for Alaska than any other nation of the world does for any territory which it possesses, and we are doing more for Alaska than this country has ever done at any time for any other Territory that it ever possessed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Alaska Service: Pribilof Islands—2 agents and caretakers at \$2,000 each, janitor service \$480, 2 physicians at \$1,500 each, 3 school-teachers at \$1,200 each (1 formerly paid from the appropriation "Protecting sea and salmon fisheries of Alaska"), storekeeper \$1,800; agent, \$2,500; assistant agents—1, \$2,000; 1, \$1,800; inspector, \$1,800; wardens—1, \$1,200; 6 at \$900 each; in all, \$27,580.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 138, after line 6, insert the following:

"For the purchase or construction of such vessels and boats as are necessary for use in connection with the enforcement of the laws and regulations for the protection of the fisheries and fur-bearing animals of Alaska, including 1 seagoing vessel, 1 light-draft tug, and 6 motor boats, \$100,000."

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, this item was called to my attention by the Secretary of Commerce. He regards it as a very necessary appropriation. It was estimated, as I understand, by the Treasury Department, and is included in the estimates submitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

The Secretary of Commerce is charged, under section 14 of the act of June 26, 1906, an act entitled "An act for the protection and regulation of the fisheries of Alaska," and under section 5 of the act of June 14, 1906, entitled "An act to prohibit aliens from fishing in the waters of Alaska," with the duty of enforcing the provisions of those acts. It is also the duty of the Secretary of Commerce to carry out the provisions of the act of April 21, 1910, for the protection of the fur seals and all other fur-bearing animals of Alaska.

The Secretary of Commerce states:

The salmon, halibut, cod, herring, and other fisheries of Alaska yield an annual product valued at more than \$18,000,000. The fur industry of Alaska, exclusive of the fur seal, yields more than half a million dollars annually, and is susceptible of great development. A few details of the salmon fishery of Alaska for the year 1912 illustrate the importance of the industry.

Capital invested	\$33,759,295
Persons employed	17,705
Salmon canneries operated	87
Salmon caught	60,938,945
Cases canned (48 1-pound tins to the case)	4,056,021
Initial value of pack	\$16,295,420

The tax on the output of the Alaska fisheries in 1912 under the present law yielded \$163,888.86. Under the schedule contained in a draft of a proposed law based on hearings recently held by the Senate Committee on Fisheries, these same products, together with a proposed tax on fishing apparatus, would have yielded \$218,130.87 in revenue to the Government.

The 87 salmon canneries and the hundreds of fisheries upon which they depend are distributed along several thousand miles of coast from Dixon Entrance on the south to Kotzebue Sound, in the Arctic Ocean, on the north. The fishing season covers a period of two to six months, depending on locality and species.

To enforce the laws and regulations regarding the fisheries the law provides only four fishery agents to cover over 15,000 miles of coast. There are no regular means of transportation or travel in the region where most of the canneries and fisheries are, and for that reason the salmon agents are compelled to use the cannery boats in getting from one cannery or fishery to another. That is to say, when a Government official has to visit any cannery or fishery to see that the law is being properly observed, his only means of transportation is a boat owned and run by the very company or person that may be violating the law. This is clearly wrong, for it places the department under the necessity of asking favors from those against whom it is called upon to enforce the law. I feel sure Congress will recognize that it is improper for either the department or the fishing companies to be subjected to this embarrassment or to the criticism which such a course will certainly call forth and, in fact, has already elicited.

Moreover, the department has no vessel which it can use in patrolling the coasts for the enforcement of the alien fishing law. Recently there has been much complaint of alien halibut fishermen invading the territorial waters of southeast Alaska, and the Legislature of Alaska has already memorialized Congress on this matter.

The inadequacy of the personnel provided to enable the department to comply with the laws which Congress has enacted for the protection and conservation of the fisheries and fur-bearing animals of Alaska has been long realized. In the report of the Alaska Salmon Commission

(H. Doc. No. 477, 58th Cong., 2d sess.) this matter was discussed, and a specific recommendation was made not only for a material increase in the personnel, but also for vessels to be provided for the agents so that their inspection of the fisheries, canneries, and hatcheries might be effective.

An adequate patrol, inspection, and enforcement of the law in all the vast extent of fishery waters in Alaska from a force of only four men, with no regular means of transportation, or without vessels under their control, is impossible. At best the department can now cover only a limited portion of the field; the majority of the fisheries can either not be visited at all or only for a brief period in any one season.

Without going into details, the coast line of Alaska is about 5,000 miles, and these canneries are scattered along the coast. The inspectors provided for by law are expected to inspect those canneries. There is no provision made by law by which the inspectors can go from place to place. They have no boats. They have no means of transportation. They are dependent upon the canneries for the means of transportation from one to the other, and under existing conditions the enforcement of the law is little more than a farce, because if these inspectors are intended to enforce the law they can not depend upon those who may violate the law for the facilities to go from one place to another. If it is their duty—and it is—to inspect these canneries, they should go by Government conveyance, and without notice to the canneries.

They are also required to do certain work in the Pribilof Islands in connection with our seal fisheries there.

The Secretary of Commerce wants Congress to understand that he fully appreciates his duties under the law and the necessity for efficient service, but it will be impossible for him to render this service under existing conditions unless he is provided with the facilities for getting from the mainland to the Pribilof Islands and from point to point on the coast of Alaska.

On yesterday I received a telegram from Dr. E. Lester Jones, Deputy Commissioner of Fisheries, who is now at Juneau, Alaska, on his way to the Pribilof Islands and on an inspection tour in Alaska, as follows:

JUNEAU, ALASKA, June 21, 1911.

HON. J. W. ALEXANDER,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The inadequate personnel and lack of transportation facilities for the Alaska fisheries service is forcibly brought home to me. Conditions surprise me, and there is no need more evident than for the new boats and the new men to help protect this vast industry, which to-day is being neglected almost entirely on this account.

E. LESTER JONES.

Now, I should think that this amendment is in order. The law provides that this service shall be performed, and it is necessary for the Secretary of Commerce to be provided with these facilities in order to perform the service.

This matter was called to my attention perhaps because I am chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and it was called to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations by the Secretary of Commerce and also by myself at his request. I have given it careful investigation, and I feel that this is an appropriation that ought to be made. Provision ought to be made by the Congress for the efficient discharge of the duties enjoined on the Secretary by the law. The fishery and game laws are to be enforced under his supervision. The deputy commissioner of the Bureau of Fisheries is now on his way to the Pribilof Islands, as I have stated, and to get there he must charter a boat to take him from the mainland to the Pribilof Islands. I think we will all agree that the present conditions are not such as should obtain if the Secretary of Commerce is expected to enforce the law.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, in the investigations made by the Committee on Appropriations it frequently happens that information is disclosed which furnishes reason for the belief that much legislation if enacted would be very desirable. That committee, however, has jurisdiction only to recommend appropriations in accordance with existing law. The Committee on Appropriations has no jurisdiction to authorize vessels for Government service. It can not recommend that a fleet of vessels be provided for some service in order that it may more adequately perform its duties than if it had no fleet at all. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have jurisdiction to report legislation to provide facilities for the Bureau of Fisheries. Very likely, if the Committee on Appropriations undertook to assume to recommend appropriations for vessels not authorized, the members of the committee having jurisdiction over that subject would severely criticize the Committee on Appropriations for intruding on their jurisdiction.

I believe that best results are obtained by the Committee on Appropriations not encroaching upon the jurisdiction of other committees. Frequently the committee recommends legislation designed to protect the Treasury, to prevent expenditures of money, to safeguard the public interest against loose methods of expenditure. It rarely recommends, and it should rarely

recommend, legislation designed to open up the channels through which money is more expeditiously sent from the Treasury. Very little consideration was given to this estimate, because the Secretary was informed that if these vessels were not authorized the Committee on Appropriations had no authority to recommend appropriations for them. For this reason they made no inquiry as to the various vessels desired or their cost, or the cost of their operation after they were acquired, or the necessity for the number and character of vessels contemplated in the expenditure of \$100,000.

The heads of many departments press upon this committee for appropriations for the extension of services or the enlargement of activities for which there is no authority; and if this committee were to attempt to assume jurisdiction to pass upon all of those questions it would very quickly be engaged in controlling and recommending most of the legislation that could come before Congress. I believe that it is not desirable; and so far as I am able, I do my part to prevent these appropriation bills being made the vehicles for legislation that should originate with some other committee and be enacted upon proper and mature consideration by the House. For that reason I am compelled to insist upon the point of order, on the ground that there is no authority for the acquisition of the vessels proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] anything to say on the point of order?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No more than this: The law expressly enjoins on the Secretary of Commerce the duty to make these inspections; and I assume that, this being true, the Committee on Appropriations have ample authority to make provision for that service. To say that the Department of Commerce shall inspect the fisheries in Alaska, shall protect the wild game in Alaska, shall protect the seals on the Pribilof Islands, shall provide food for them and transport supplies, and at the same time shall be denied the means by which to discharge that duty without some express authority of law, is something which I can not understand. I think the authority is ample under the existing law.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Suppose the Committee on Appropriations decided that some of these investigations could best be made by means of an aeroplane; does the committee think we could authorize the acquisition and maintenance of an aeroplane?

Mr. ALEXANDER. If the gentleman and his committee thought that was the better means, I think they would.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If that rule were to be adopted, then the Committee on Appropriations would have power that nobody ever contemplated when the rules of this House were prepared. For instance, the customs service must collect the customs revenue; yet a revenue cutter can not be built unless it is specifically authorized. The Department of Commerce has control of the Lighthouse Service, yet a lighthouse tender can not be built or acquired unless it be specifically authorized.

Mr. MANN. How about a customhouse?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Under what plea can it be said that under the rules of the House the Bureau of Fisheries could have an appropriation incorporated in this bill for a vessel to enable the functions of that bureau to be performed if it were not authorized?

The gentleman spoke about telegrams from the deputy commissioner of fisheries. I do not know just how he got up to Juneau, but within a week or two a vessel, chartered by the Department of Commerce to carry supplies to the Pribilof Islands, left Seattle. He probably went on that vessel, and if he did not he was guilty of gross extravagance in engaging passage on some more preferable vessel. If he had gone on that vessel he would have gone directly to the Pribilof Islands with the other employees of the department and have been able to make whatever inspection he believed necessary at that point, and he could return on that vessel when he came back. We are paying about \$9,000 or \$10,000—

Mr. ALEXANDER. About \$20,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; we got this particular vessel for about \$9,000 or \$10,000. We used to pay \$20,000, but we got that one for \$9,000 or \$10,000.

Mr. ALEXANDER. My information is to the effect that this vessel was chartered at an expense of \$20,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is mistaken. They used to pay \$20,000, but they made a special arrangement this year and they got it for \$9,000 or \$10,000.

There can hardly be any justification for this deputy commissioner of fisheries to go to Alaska for the purpose of going to the Pribilof Islands at this particular time, unless he went on that vessel. If he has gone on some other vessel and paid first-

class passage, the department is more careless in the expenditure of some of its appropriations than I believe it to be.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman has no authority for saying that the deputy commissioner went to Juneau in any other vessel.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I did not. I understood the gentleman to say that he found the need there now in going to the Pribilof Islands. This vessel is chartered to carry supplies to the Pribilof Islands.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not know the usual route from Seattle to the Pribilof Islands—whether they would touch at Juneau or not. The telegram was received at Juneau, Alaska, and he is on his way to the Pribilof Islands, and in this chartered vessel, as I understand. I further understand that it was chartered at an expense of \$20,000, and that only emphasizes the need of a vessel for the inspection service, without having to charter vessels at such a price.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. If this amendment which is offered by the gentleman from Missouri were held in order, it would throw the appropriation bills open to amendment that would be startling almost in their character. The Chair does not think it is in order under the rules of the House, and the Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Edenton (N. C.) Station: Superintendent, \$1,500; fish-culturist, \$900; two laborers, at \$600 each; in all, \$3,600.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 140, line 3, after the figures "\$3,600," insert "for construction and repair of buildings, to be available until expended, \$3,500."

Mr. FITZGERALD. I reserve a point of order to that. I suggest that such amendments as this properly come in on page 148. If the gentleman is going to offer it, I ask him to offer it there.

Mr. SMALL. Very well; Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Propagation of food fishes: For maintenance, equipment, and operations of the fish-cultural stations of the bureau, the general propagation of food fishes and their distribution, including the movement, maintenance, and repairs of cars, purchase of equipment and apparatus, contingent expenses, temporary labor, and for the propagation and distribution of fresh-water mussels, and the necessary expenses connected therewith, not to exceed \$10,000, \$350,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I wish to inquire whether the Government has heretofore been engaged in the propagation of mussels.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; this is authorized. It is to take care of the situation at Fairport, Iowa, where these fresh-water mussels are utilized.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman says there is present authorization for this character of work?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. There was a bill reported from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Sixtieth Congress, under which this work is being done.

Mr. STAFFORD. I recall that there was some inquiry in regard to that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is to propagate the fresh-water mussels which are used in the button industry.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

None of the foregoing amount shall be expended for hatching or planting fish or eggs in any State in which, in the judgment of the Secretary of Commerce, there are not adequate laws for the protection of the fishes, nor in any State in which the United States Commissioner of Fisheries and his duly authorized agents are not accorded full and free right to conduct fish-cultural operations, and all fishing and other operations necessary therefor, in such manner and at such times as is considered necessary and proper by the said commissioner or his agents: *And provided further*, That before any final steps shall have been taken for the construction of any fish-cultural stations that may hereafter be established by Congress, the respective States, through appropriate legislative action, shall accord the United States Commissioner of Fisheries and his duly authorized agents the right to conduct the fish-cultural operations and all operations connected therewith in any manner and at any time that may by them be considered necessary and proper, any fishery laws of the State to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to the paragraph. Is not this a new provision?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is; it is legislation.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I expect to make a point of order against this provision.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why not do it now?

Mr. HOWARD. This provision will turn over the supervision of the water, game, and fish laws, especially the fish laws,

to the Federal Government, and no matter what disposition Congress might have toward the distribution of fish throughout the country, we have to delegate the power to the Department of Commerce to say whether or not our laws are sufficient for them to go down and deposit a few fish or bullfrog eggs in a lake or stream in our States. Therefore I make a point of order against it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say this to the gentleman from Georgia: This has no reference to any existing situation. There have been times when the Department of Commerce, in attempting to carry on the fish-culture operations, was prevented from doing so by the laws of some of the States or by inspectors. This was intended to accomplish two purposes: First, to prevent interference with the Federal officers in maintaining fish-culture stations; and, secondly, to induce States to pass laws that would result in the protection of fish.

This provision reads:

None of the foregoing amounts shall be expended for hatching or planting fish or eggs in any State in which, in the judgment of the Secretary of Commerce, there are not adequate laws for the protection of the fishes.

The first condition of the provision is a clear limitation. The second part is legislation, but I do not care to offer part of it. I do not know that it is of a great deal of importance at this time.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. I would suggest, if the gentleman will concede it, that the only part of this paragraph which is objectionable is this language:

In which, in the judgment of the Secretary of Commerce, there are not adequate laws for the protection of the fishes.

It seems to me that if that were stricken out there would be no objection to it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know that it is of enough importance.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cold Spring (Ga.) Station: For purchase of land and construction of ponds, to be available until expended, \$6,000.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 147, line 17, after line 17, insert the following:

"Fish-cultural station, Clackamas, Oreg.: For construction, equipment, and repair of buildings and increasing and improving the water supply, to be available until used, \$15,000."

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

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a fish-cultural station now in operation and duly authorized. It came into the possession of the Government of the United States from two sources. A private corporation turned over some 16 acres of land on which they had a station and were hatching fish, and the State of Oregon transferred to the Government for a consideration some plant they had. The original location was not well chosen. It did not have adequate water supply or other facilities, so a new location was acquired in another place on the river, and the buildings and equipment of that station were transferred to the new location. They never have had adequate money to equip the station.

At this station they rear the royal Chinook salmon, which is the best of the food fishes, I think, on the Pacific coast; at least it is one of the very best. They raise about 60,000,000 a year to the finger-length stage, which is about 3½ inches, and then turn them loose into the river. They go down the Clackamas into the Willamette and down the Willamette to the Columbia and out into the sea.

The cost of these fishes is very small to the finger-length stage. There is no cheaper food supply than fishes. It costs the Government about 2 cents a hundred to raise these fishes, and they are worth when they return, from three to five years afterwards, on the average about \$1 apiece. They have been no charge on the land, no charge on the food supply raised on the land, like cattle or sheep or hogs would be, but are entirely fed and grown in the sea, and when they come back with this increased value, that has been added to them at no expense or burden to the Government or individual owners of land.

This fish-cultural station is not adequate in its present capacity to keep up the supply of these fish. The chinook salmon has a peculiar habit of life. It goes out to the sea when it reaches the stage I have stated, and is gone for from three to five years. It comes back usually to the river from which it went, on which it was hatched. They go up the river for spawning purposes.

The Columbia River basin is a very large basin and the river itself is over 1,000 miles long. The fish distribute themselves along that river, seeking gravel beds on which to spawn. Most fishes after they have spawned return to the sea, but this particular fish, when it spawns, if not consumed for food, does not return to the sea and is not available as a food fish for another season, but it is extremely valuable. I think it brings the highest price of all of the food fishes on the Pacific coast. The 60,000,000 fishes raised at present, after the natural casualties they suffer after leaving the hatchery and on their way to and in the ocean, do not come in sufficient numbers to keep up the supply for canning and other purposes. The canneries are extending their operations. The product is sold all over the United States at a reasonable price.

This amount of \$15,000 was in the estimate and was submitted to the Committee on Appropriations, and I presume it had their careful consideration. Secretary Redfield was in Oregon last year and visited this station, and in the hearings he speaks very strongly and earnestly in behalf of the station and for this appropriation. Commissioner Smith of the bureau at my request made a statement for me so that I might have it accurately from his own knowledge. He said:

The Clackamas station is one of the most important in point of output, and should be maintained at the highest point of efficiency. The buildings, which were originally constructed of old material used in one of the State hatchery buildings, are inadequate, inconvenient, and dilapidated, and require renewal or expensive repairs.

Now, the fish when they are growing are kept in long boxes as you probably have seen them, and are fed in them. They require a constant influx of fresh water. The present water supply from a spring is not adequate. It must be increased for the use even of the 60,000,000 fishes now raised in each season, and the commissioner says:

The present water supply should be supplemented by water taken from the Clackamas River.

The Clackamas River is a river of pure water coming down from the Cascade Mountains, whose waters are not contaminated and consequently is sufficiently clean and pure for the fish. He further says:

In order that facilities may be provided for raising a larger number of salmon fry to the fingerling stage before they are liberated in the open waters, in accordance with the policy which the department has adopted with reference to this branch of fish culture. It is also desired to construct a superintendent's residence, this being needed on account of the remote location of the station.

The station being about 12 miles from Portland.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAWLEY. The station is about 12 miles from Portland and about 7 or 8 miles from Oregon City and about 4 or 5 or 6 miles from the nearest little town—Gladstone, so that it requires the presence on the ground of a man in charge of the hatchery, and he ought to have suitable quarters. He further says:

The original station, located on the Clackamas River, came into the possession of the United States by a donation from the Oregon & Washington Fish Propagating Co., and the buildings and other improvements by purchase from the Oregon fish commission. The physical changes of the Clackamas River in the vicinity of this station have made it impossible to successfully operate in this locality. The old tract of land is now overgrown with brush and is of no present or prospective value to this bureau. It is therefore proposed to condemn and sell this property.

That is, the Government received a gift of the old hatchery from the private corporation, with some buildings that they possessed, with 16 acres of valuable land, which has possibilities of water power and for other purposes. Now they propose to sell that. How much it will bring I am not ready to state, but it will bring some considerable sum of money. If that money were available, it would aid in the improvement of this station, but when that is sold it will naturally go into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. We are asking now that this old dilapidated building, made out of old buildings, where such a very valuable product is being raised, be repaired and be put in condition, and that the facilities there be somewhat increased, so larger numbers of salmon fry may be hatched, and that part of the money, a little more than the old location would bring, a little larger sum, be appropriated for that purpose.

I think there is no doubt from the hearings had before the Committee on Appropriations and the statement of the commissioner and Mr. Secretary Redfield, and from the statements made to me by the men engaged in the salmon-fishing business out there, that it is a very valuable and important work and its extension necessary. Now, they catch salmon at the moment they enter the Columbia River with nets, seines, and gill nets

and fish traps up the Columbia River from its mouth for 1,000 miles; and a very large number of people at the mouth of the river—about 1,000 fishermen, if I remember correctly—and thousands of fishermen and their families on the river are largely dependent on this fish and make a very good living in the catching of fish in the spring and fall run; and I appeal to the committee and to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to let this matter come before the committee on its merits and that we may adopt it. I hope the committee will grant this very modest and very necessary request.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, there is at the Clackamas station, according to the Secretary of Commerce, a very fine fish-hatchery station. There is an old station on the river some distance from it, and the committee was requested to authorize the sale of the old station. It was suggested that the property might bring \$15,000. Regardless of what the property might bring, the request was made that \$15,000 be appropriated to improve the existing station. The committee was anxious to ascertain just how much there was invested now in the present station. What was said of it is this, that it is one of the most valuable stations that the Government has, and upon inquiry it was ascertained that Congress had appropriated \$5,000 for the purchase of a site.

Four thousand dollars was expended for that purpose; \$1,000 reverted to the Treasury, and some of the buildings were removed and erected there, and then that station has been developed and improved and maintained as all other fish-cultural stations are maintained. We carry in this bill for maintenance, equipment, and operation of the fish-cultural stations of the bureau the sum of \$350,000. We increase the appropriation in this bill \$10,000 over the appropriation made for the current year. And out of this \$350,000 the Bureau of Fisheries can make improvements and furnish equipments at those stations where it is deemed in the opinion of the department to be desirable to do so. Now, this year, although this appropriation is larger, the department submitted a large number of requests for special appropriations for various numbers of these stations. Now, a peculiar condition existed at one of them. At Woods Hole Station, Mass., there was a very extensive wharf, where considerable sums are expended for repairs. It was necessary to make some very extensive repairs, and so as to relieve this general appropriation of \$350,000 of the very great demand that would be made upon it if the repairs necessary at Woods Hole Station were made from it, a specific appropriation of \$40,000 was made to repair the wharf at that place. If the department is to continue to have this general appropriation, out of which, in its discretion, it can equip, maintain, and improve these stations, it should not ask for specific appropriations for each of the many stations that are maintained, and if it refers to specific appropriations for the improvement and equipment of the stations, then the proper thing to do would be to very materially reduce the lump appropriation of \$350,000. The department has ample funds to do whatever is necessary. The committee has not attempted to curtail it. It has built up the Clackamas Station out of the general appropriation. We carry in that appropriation for the next year more than has been carried at any time in its history.

The appropriation for this year is \$335,000, and the appropriation is increased \$15,000. Before that it was \$300,000, and in 1910 it was \$275,000. So the committee has liberally increased this general fund out of which the department, with the information before it, could expend the money where most desirable.

I have no sympathy with these suggestions, where some one has a piece of property and has asked to be authorized to sell it and to spend the money for something else. This was one of those instances, and the committee did not recommend it. I do not think we should make these specific appropriations in this way, while responding so liberally to the request of the department for the fund out of which these stations are maintained and equipped. And for that reason I can not favor the amendment and am compelled to press the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York make the point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oregon wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HAWLEY. I do not. I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] offers a further amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 147, after line 17, insert the following:

"Clackamas (Oreg.) Station: For equipment and repair of buildings and for increasing and improving the water supply, to be available until expended, \$10,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman—

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

Mr. HAWLEY. In reply to the gentleman's statement a moment ago, when the bill was reported I took the matter of the equipment of this station and its improvement out of the lump-fund appropriation up with the Director of the Bureau of Fisheries, supposing in that lump-fund appropriation the estimate of the Treasury Department of \$15,000 had been taken care of. He informed me over the phone that the amount appropriated in the lump fund would afford him no funds at all to make the necessary improvement and the necessary extension.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What are they going to do with all that money?

Mr. HAWLEY. That I can not answer, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Of course, the gentleman knows that all of these departments will encourage Members by such information, in trying to add to the money appropriated for the departments.

Mr. HAWLEY. I can not agree with the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, in impugning the good faith of the Commissioner of Fisheries.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not impugning him. I am stating what is a notorious and acknowledged fact.

Mr. HAWLEY. I can not agree to it. I would not impugn his good faith.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not asking the gentleman to agree to it.

Mr. HAWLEY. I have no reason to believe he would misstate it to me over the phone. He says it is a valuable fish-hatchery in the work it does and the equipment is not valuable itself.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why does not he equip it? That is what we give him this \$350,000 for. What is he doing with that money? We give it to him to provide these fisheries with equipment, and if he does not do it, we will find out what he does with it.

Mr. HAWLEY. I can not answer the question; I can only state what he said to me when he wrote me the letter at my request.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order: This is an authorized station. As the chairman has just stated, the construction has been authorized, the purchase of the site has been authorized, and there is maintenance already provided for it in one way in the lump fund and in another way in the appropriation for the statutory roll at the fish-cultural stations. And to increase the expenditure of money does not make the matter subject to a point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is clearly subject to a point of order. It repeals the covering-in act.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] says it is according to existing law.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment by eliminating those words "to be available until used."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment by eliminating the words "to be available until expended." Without objection, it will be so modified.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let us vote.

The CHAIRMAN. In that form it is not subject to a point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon demands a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 18, noes 35.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing the entire letter.

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

There was no objection.

Following is the letter referred to:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
BUREAU OF FISHERIES,  
Washington, April 22, 1914.

Hon. W. C. HAWLEY,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I beg to invite your attention to an item of \$15,000 submitted to Congress with the estimates of appropriations for the Bureau



of Fisheries for the fiscal year 1915. The item in question is in the estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1915 under the heading "Department of Commerce Bureau of Fisheries," page 612, and is entitled Fish-Cultural Station, Clackamas, Oreg.—for construction of buildings and improvements to water supply, to be available until used, \$15,000.

It is the policy of the bureau to extend the scope and magnitude of its Pacific coast salmon operations. The Clackamas station is one of the most important in point of output, and should be maintained at the highest point of efficiency. The buildings, which were originally constructed of old material used in one of the State hatchery buildings, are inadequate, inconvenient, and dilapidated, and require renewal or extensive repairs. The present spring-water supply should be supplemented by water taken from the Clackamas River. In order that facilities may be provided for rearing a larger number of salmon fry to the fingerling stage before they are liberated in the open waters, in accordance with the policy which the department has adopted with reference to this branch of fish culture. It is also desired to construct a superintendent's residence, this being needed on account of the remote location of the station.

The original station, located on the Clackamas River, came into possession of the United States by donation from the Oregon and Washington Fish Propagating Co., and the buildings and other improvements by purchase from the Oregon fish commission. The physical changes in the Clackamas River in the vicinity of this station have made it impossible to successfully operate in this locality. The old tract of land is now overgrown with brush and is of no present or prospective value to this bureau. It is therefore proposed to condemn and sell this property.

Very truly yours,

H. M. SMITH, Commissioner.

Mr. O'HAIR. Mr. Chairman, at this point the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] has an amendment which he desires to offer. He was called away and has not yet returned, and I want to ask unanimous consent that his amendment may be offered and considered when he returns.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HAIR] asks unanimous consent that the paragraph on page 147, including lines 16 and 17, may be passed over temporarily, in order that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] may offer an amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from South Carolina spoke to me about that; and if we are to have an understanding to the effect that gentlemen are to have the right to offer amendments, I want to know what they are. I do not want any such misunderstanding as we had to-day.

Mr. O'HAIR. I do not know what it is. I am doing it as a friend of his.

Mr. MANN. I understand the gentleman from South Carolina desires to offer an amendment to the item covering lines 10 and 11, on page 148, in reference to a fish hatchery in his State.

Mr. FITZGERALD. When will the gentleman from South Carolina be back?

Mr. O'HAIR. In a short time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have no objection to the gentleman from South Carolina having the right to offer an amendment at that point.

Mr. MANN. It is not an amendment to that paragraph, but an amendment which is to be offered at that point.

Mr. O'HAIR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] may have permission to offer an amendment at the end of line 17, on page 147.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HAIR] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina may have permission to offer an amendment at the end of line 17, on page 147. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the arsenal item. I spoke on that item this afternoon, and I neglected to ask permission to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER] asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in connection with the arsenal item. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYAN. I make the same request, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Alaska item.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in connection with the debate on the Alaska item. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Louisville (Ky.) fish hatchery: The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to convey to the board of park commissioners of the city of Louisville, Ky., a right of way 120 feet wide through the property of the United States in Jefferson County, Ky., used as a fish-cultural station and hatchery: *Provided*, That such conveyance of right of way shall not be construed as affecting the right or title of the United States in said property or as in violation of any stipulation or condition in the conveyance of the same to the United States, and on the

further condition that the land or right of way to be conveyed hereunder shall be constructed and maintained as a parkway free of any expense to the United States, and that all work thereon shall be such as not to interfere with the operations and efficiency of said fish-cultural station and in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of Commerce.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. BRYAN. There is nothing in this section to show that the land to be conveyed is to be used as a street, and there is no clause requiring it to revert to the Government again if it is not used as a street. There is nothing here that I have been able to find to show that it is a continuation of a street that is 125 feet wide, or whether it is desired to use 40 or 50 feet of it as a street and the rest of it for some other purpose.

I will state to the gentleman that this matter first came up, so far as I have knowledge of it, before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and the bill was referred to me by the committee to look into, and I saw the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. He had unfortunately been sick and he did not give me much information, but said that he intended to bring it in, perhaps on this bill. I think we ought to have a little information about it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The committee of which the gentleman is a member reported this identical provision in a bill. They reported it after it had been referred to the Department of Commerce and after it had been favorably reported upon by the Secretary of Commerce.

The situation is this: Three years ago Congress appropriated \$25,000 for the establishment of a fish-cultural station in the county of Jefferson, in the State of Kentucky. The State of Kentucky donated the land upon which the station is located. The city of Louisville or the State of Kentucky is building a boulevard running along the river, and it wishes to continue this boulevard through the property donated heretofore by the State to the Federal Government for a fish-cultural station. The provision on page 148 requires, if the gentleman will notice, "that the land or right of way to be conveyed hereunder shall be constructed and maintained as a parkway free of any expense to the United States." The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] unfortunately was taken ill, and was compelled to leave the city.

It is a matter in which the people of his district are very keenly interested. The State donated the land. They wish to make this parkway. The committee believe it will improve and enhance the property that has been donated by the Government. It is to be maintained in such a way as will not interfere with the operations of the hatchery and in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of Commerce; and it was because the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, upon the favorable recommendation of the department, had reported this identical language in a bill that the Committee on Appropriations, because of the absence of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], incorporated this provision.

Mr. BRYAN. Is this the identical language of that bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is my recollection.

Mr. BRYAN. Then the bill was evidently amended after I left the committee meeting. It is made better by the amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is my recollection that we compared the language with the item in the bill reported from that committee.

Mr. BRYAN. Of course, it seems to me this land ought to revert to the Government if it is not used as a street; but it is more safely protected in this language than it was in the bill before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. If no one else cares to make the point of order, I will withdraw it.

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. As a matter of fact, the provision is not mandatory, and the Secretary of Commerce can require any conditions that he believes to be desirable from the standpoint of the Government.

Mr. MANN. The language used here is—

Authorized to convey \* \* \* a right of way 120 feet wide.

What does that mean? Does it mean to convey the land?

Mr. FITZGERALD. A right of way.

Mr. MANN. To convey an easement?

Mr. FITZGERALD. To convey an easement. A right of way is an easement.

Mr. MANN. Ordinarily a right of way is a mere easement.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I believe that is the intention. The city or county is constructing a boulevard along the river. This is

be a continuation of it. Otherwise it can not go through the property, but will have to be diverted and go around it.

Mr. MANN. I understand. I have no objection to the purpose of it. Under the law of Kentucky, where the Government obtains land like this, does it not have exclusive jurisdiction over the land? Who would have the jurisdiction?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know. There is a provision in the Revised Statutes which prohibits expenditure by the Government upon any property acquired for any designated purpose unless the State has ceded jurisdiction over it. Whether that applies to fish-cultural stations I am not certain.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman know who would have jurisdiction of a criminal act or some other act committed on this right of way? Would it be the State or the Federal Government?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know.

Mr. BRYAN. Can the gentleman explain why it is that he was so particular not to invade the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, represented by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] a while ago, while he is willing to waive the question of jurisdiction on a matter of this kind? He does not mind invading the jurisdiction of this other committee.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] spent probably six months in the preparation of the bill from which this language is taken. He had a favorable recommendation on the bill affecting the hatchery referred to here. Unfortunately, he was taken very seriously ill, and has been compelled to absent himself from the House.

Mr. BRYAN. Of course, the House could go on and pass the bill reported from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, just as the House must pass the bill reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or else Alaska will not get the service recommended in that bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is a little difference. This does not take any money out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. BRYAN. It takes land.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; it does not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is a difference. This land was donated to the Federal Government by the State of Kentucky. Now they wish to put a beautiful boulevard through it, and it will really be an improvement of our own property. Instead of giving up something, we probably are getting something.

Mr. BRYAN. Then there is the matter of courtesy to the very able and distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations and one whom all of us are glad to favor. That is a very imposing feature of the matter.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman can understand the embarrassments of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent that in line 7, page 147, the word "seasons" be changed to "season." It should be in the singular instead of in the plural.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to agree to an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 147, line 7, strike out the word "seasons" and insert the word "season."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Woods Hole (Mass.) Station: For repairs to wharfs and for retaining bulkheads, \$40,000.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 148, after line 11, insert as a new paragraph the following:  
"Edenton (S. C.) Station: For construction and repair of buildings, \$3,500."

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks this small appropriation exclusively for the construction and repair of buildings at this fish station. I would not disparage other stations by saying that this is the most important station in the country, but in one respect it admittedly is. It is the most important station for the propagation of shad in the whole country. This station is located on a tributary of Albemarle Sound, which is the largest body of fresh water along the Atlantic seaboard. In fact, I think I may safely say that it is the largest body of fresh water in the United States except the Great Lakes. It has the greatest water area for the catch of shad along the Atlantic seaboard. Substantially the bulk of

the shad that comes to Washington and the large northern cities during the months of February and March come from this sound and its tributaries of fresh water, and the value of the station has been amply demonstrated within the last six years.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Do I understand the gentleman to say that this is the largest body of fresh water along the Atlantic seaboard? How large an area is it?

Mr. SMALL. I can not give the number of square miles, but it is 30 miles wide and 40 miles long.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Lake Okechobee, in Florida, is 40 miles wide and 60 miles long.

Mr. SMALL. Oh, yes; but that is full of stump and cypress. Mr. CLARK of Florida. No, it is not; it is the greatest lake in the world outside of the Great Lakes.

Mr. BRYAN. Neither of them can compare with Lake Washington.

Mr. SMALL. I am speaking of navigable waters.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. And it is 40 feet deep.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to raise any rivalry in regard to which is the largest body of fresh water, and if the gentleman can demonstrate that they have larger bodies of fresh water they are welcome to the honor. But I do stand by the proposition that no body of fresh water in the United States yields so abundantly of the luscious shad as does this. I stand by that and I stand by the value of this station.

About 10 years ago the quantity of shad appreciably diminished, as shown by the catch and shipments. By reason of some wise State legislation, which gave a freer ingress and egress for the migratory fish coming in and out of the ocean inlets giving them a better opportunity to reach these waters for spawning, but primarily on account of the excellent work done by this fish hatchery, the supply of fish in that great section and tributaries has just about reached normal. So that for two seasons millions and millions of shad have been shipped out. As the Commissioner of Fisheries stated in the hearings, it amounts annually to much more than \$1,000,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I happen to know the conditions at this hatchery. There is only one dwelling there occupied by the superintendent and his family. During the height of the season a large temporary force is employed, and that house is converted substantially into a mess house; not only to the inconvenience of the family, but to the inconvenience of the men there employed. This station is very much in need of a plain, but substantial and commodious mess house.

Then, in addition, about four or five times during recent seasons the capacity of the hatchery has been reached, so that they had to decline eggs for hatching the young shad. In other words, their work was retarded, and this hatchery ought to be enlarged. This appropriation is for two purposes—primarily to enlarge the hatchery; and, secondly, for the construction of a mess house for the men there.

As the learned gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], who is absolutely conversant on the subject, says, it is an important element in the reduction of the cost of living. So that those who love shad or who want them abundant and fresh from these waters in North Carolina, which are maintained largely by this hatchery, ought to vote for this amendment carrying this trifling appropriation. The chairman of the committee can not make the argument against it that it is covered by the much-quoted paragraph in this bill.

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

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York can not make an argument against this proposition by citing this paragraph of \$350,000, because this paragraph provides for "maintenance, equipment, and operation," and I am asking for the construction of one building and for the enlargement of the fish hatchery itself which is a work of construction, so that whatever difference of opinion may exist as to the expenditure of this \$350,000 between the chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries, about which I am not able to express an opinion, there can be no question that this appropriation of \$350,000 in another paragraph which has been referred to is not available for the construction of this building.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken. This mess hall is a part of the equipment of the hatchery. They have never found it necessary to have one as yet, but they are getting a little particular down there and want to eat under a shed.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will pardon me, and I know his knowledge of the subject, I think it is quite a stretch in the interpretation of language to say that the equipment of a building includes the construction of a new building, and having such confidence in the gentleman's knowledge I still maintain that it would be a stretch of interpretation to contend that the \$350,000 appropriation in another paragraph could be expended for new construction. We would like to penetrate the heretofore impenetrable armor of the chairman of this committee when an amendment is sought carrying such a modest appropriation as this, and while I can not hope to get his consent, I do hope that he will, as I know he will if he discusses it at all, discuss it upon its merits and not attempt to argue to the committee that it is covered by any lump-sum or existing appropriation already included in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I have demonstrated to the satisfaction of some of the members of the committee, and I hope to a majority, that this is an important fish station, that it is located in an area which furnishes the largest supply of shad along the Atlantic seaboard, that most valuable food fish, and that any appropriation within reasonable limitation which is intended to increase the efficiency of that station is worthy of the consideration of the committee and of the approval of the Committee of the Whole. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this item is in the same situation as a number of others submitted by the commissioner. Special items are requested for Beaufort, Chackamas, Louisville, Crangeburg, Duluth, Edenton, and Fairport. The committee increased by \$15,000 the general appropriation for maintenance, equipment, and operation of these stations. We left it in the discretion of the Commissioner of Fisheries as to how this money should be expended. We have between 30 and 40 fish-cultural stations in the United States. Thirty-five hundred dollars, requested specifically for this particular station, is 1 per cent of the amount placed at the disposal of the commissioner to maintain and equip and operate all of the stations. Surely much more than 1 per cent is to be expended at Edenton. It unquestionably is an important station. I have come to the conclusion that the fish-cultural stations maintained by the Government perhaps do more real valuable service for the country than anything else maintained by the Federal Government at anything like the same expense. This is merely a question as to whether we should unnecessarily increase the amount to be appropriated. We have treated the bureau very liberally in the general appropriation, and have given it all that we think is necessary. It is hardly fair to select out particular places, some half dozen of these stations, and specifically appropriate sums to be expended at them, to the discrimination of the others. I think the best administration is to treat them all alike and let the department, in the exercise of its discretion, expend the money where it is most imperatively required. For that reason I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMALL) there were—ayes 18, noes 40.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina demands tellers. Those in favor of ordering tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Eight Members, not a sufficient number, and tellers are denied.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 148, after line 11, insert a new paragraph as follows: "For the purchase or construction of a vessel for the fish-cultural station at Booth Bay Harbor, Me., to be available until expended, \$4,500."

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

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment not only because of my personal knowledge of the condition of the vessel which is now in the service of the Government, but because this vessel has been absolutely condemned by the officials of our own Government.

Not only did the Secretary of Commerce absolutely condemn this vessel before the committee, but two United States inspectors from the Inspection Service have also condemned it after a special examination as being absolutely unseaworthy and unsafe. I simply want to ask the Members of this House how they can ask Government officials and employees to board a steamboat and go out to sea in it when the heads of their own department have condemned it as unseaworthy and unsafe? It seems to me to do such a thing is to be in utter disregard, almost

reckless disregard, of the lives of our officials and the employees in this service. I will not take up the time in observations of my own, because this has been very clearly stated by persons in authority, so that there can be no doubt about it. Secretary Redfield appeared before the committee, and in answer to the chairman's question here is what he said about this vessel:

Secretary REDFIELD. Three years ago, or nearly so, I was invited by one of my colleagues to take a trip on the steamer *Gannet* from my own summer home to a point near Boothbay Harbor where this vessel is centered. I took that trip, and immediately asked the Commissioner of Fisheries to put in an estimate for the construction of a new vessel on the ground that from my knowledge of this vessel and of the waters she navigates that it was unsafe to continue her in navigation longer. I say very candidly to you that this vessel is not fit for the sea she has to navigate, and that we operate her with danger. She may be at any time caught where she ought not to be. She is an old secondhand yacht. Her former owner has now replaced her by two later vessels. She is too narrow and sharp and too small for the work and is not the type of vessel to be used for that purpose. She has to navigate waters very likely to become extremely dangerous suddenly. I know the vessel, and I can assure you that she is not safe.

Now, there were two inspectors detailed to inspect and examine this very vessel, and without reading all of their report, I will read a part of it. They say:

She has carried away her rudder frequently and on one or two occasions rudder post split down through stern timber, ripping her open, and she was forced to run through the breakers into York Harbor to escape foundering. We believe this brief account of her work may be of value to you, and when it is remembered that she is of the very lightest construction, and so sharp as to be almost wedge-shaped forward and cut away aft—having been built for a yacht to be used in summer only—the fact that she is still on top of the water, after the winters spent on this coast, running as we know she has run, is not an evidence of her seaworthiness, but is rather a compliment to the seamanship of her master.

Now, that is the kind of vessel, gentlemen, that you are asking the officials and employees of this Government to go out to sea in, and every time you do it you are unnecessarily asking men to take their lives in their hands by going out in a vessel that is condemned by the heads of your own department. Is there any regard whatever for the lives of our employees in this department?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not think the case is as bad as is made out by the gentleman from Maine. The Secretary of Commerce stated that three years ago, on the invitation of one of his colleagues, he had made a trip upon this vessel and it was that experience upon that ship that induced him to recommend the Commissioner of Fisheries at that time to immediately send in estimates for a new vessel. Well, about three years ago this vessel was completely overhauled, a new boiler was put into her, extensive repairs were made to her, and it does not appear whether the Secretary made his trip before or after this extensive overhauling of the vessel. It perhaps might be wise for me to read some more of the report of these inspectors which has been overlooked by the gentleman from Maine:

The *Gannet* was built in 1890 at Boston, Mass., to be used as a pleasure yacht on inland waters, being afterwards bought by the United States for the Bureau of Fisheries.

This vessel was bought by the bureau after an inspection and examination and determination that it was a suitable vessel for the work of the bureau.

She is 61 feet on the water line, 12 feet 4 inches beam, and draws, with her coal and water aboard, 6 feet 7 inches; gross tonnage 32, net 16.

So she is a fairly respectable sized secondhand yacht. [Reading:]

Her timbers are 2½ inches square, of white oak, spaced 18 inches centers; hull planking of hard pine 1½ inches thick, copper fastened; house is a trunk, forming cabin and engine room and including pilot house, as is usual in small yachts of this type, built of 3-inch stuff, and it was noticed in the cabin that a waterway of tin had been tacked up over one berth to carry the leakage away, as sills and deck are so light they will not hold calking.

In 1911 she had a new boiler, and extensive repairs were made to the hull, which included new stem, and for 12 feet abaft stem was retimbered and planked. There is no question as to the soundness of her hull.

But the inspector states that he does not think she is a desirable type of vessel to use in this particular kind of work. Well, at different times people are inclined to think vessels are not very seaworthy. I remember some years ago I crossed the Bay of Fundy from Bigby in Nova Scotia to St. John in New Brunswick, and after four hours I had a violent conviction that I was on an unseaworthy boat. I expected to see her founder every minute, and the first officer told me it was the worst storm they had had for 10 years. That same old, decrepit, cranky vessel I was certain would founder every minute in the four hours I was compelled to remain on it in crossing the Bay of Fundy is still making two trips daily across that bay.

This yacht, with 2-inch square white oak, copper fastened, well built, a pleasure boat, was acquired by the Bureau of

Fisheries. It can not be possible that they made an investment in a vessel that was absolutely worthless for the work of the bureau. It has been going along and doing its work. Every once in a while the prediction is made that it is very unseaworthy and likely to founder. But that is possible about any boat. And while this may not be a particularly desirable boat upon which any of you gentlemen would make a trip at the invitation of one of your colleagues, the men who navigate the New England coast for a livelihood would not go upon this vessel if "were not seaworthy."

I have never seen this vessel, and I have never been upon it, and it may be it should not be utilized for the purpose for which it is utilized. The Bureau of Fisheries selected this vessel itself. The Committee on Appropriations did not pick it out for the bureau. And only three years ago they spent a very large sum putting a new boiler in it and overhauling it, so as to continue to utilize it in the service. And while I would not urge anybody to take a trip upon it, I can not withdraw the point of order I made against this proposition to appropriate \$45,000 to purchase a tug to take its place. I regret it, Mr. Chairman, but in view of my position I must insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 11, on page 148, insert the following:

"For completion of the Orangeburg, S. C., Fisheries Station, including the construction of buildings and ponds, and for equipment, to remain until expended, \$20,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is in order at this point.

Mr. MANN. Is this amendment being offered here the same amendment that the gentleman wished to offer at another place?

The CHAIRMAN. While the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] was out for the moment unanimous consent was given that the gentleman might have opportunity to offer the amendment after line 17.

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman does not intend to return to offer the amendment at the other place?

Mr. LEVER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is offering this amendment now at this point, instead of after line 17, on page 147.

Mr. LEVER. Yes. And I would like to ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment by striking out the words "to remain until expended."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to modify the amendment by striking out the words "to remain until expended." Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I still reserve a point of order on it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, in 1911 an act of Congress was passed authorizing a fish hatchery in South Carolina. That hatchery was located in Orangeburg County, in my district. Twenty-five thousand dollars was appropriated for it. I learn from conversations with officials of the bureau that that \$25,000 has been exhausted absolutely. They have gone to the extent of laying the pipes, constructing the drainage, constructing the superintendent's house, and have excavated a great amount of dirt. The hatchery is in condition now to be completed and to be made available for use to the people of the country. It can not be completed, however, unless sufficient money is given to complete it. The Secretary of Commerce estimates that it will cost \$20,000 to complete the hatchery. The amendment that I am proposing seeks to make \$20,000 available for that purpose. I do not think that this proposition rests upon the same ground as if it were a new proposition.

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

Mr. LEVER. I yield.

Mr. MANN. Was the limit of cost in the original act \$25,000?

Mr. LEVER. I am not sure about that, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, but \$25,000 was all that was appropriated, and I do not know whether there was any limit as to the cost or not. The proposition was put on in the Senate and not in the House.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that for many years we appropriated \$25,000 for a fish hatchery. Does the gentleman know why they can not establish these fish hatcheries for that amount?

Mr. LEVER. I understand in conversations with gentlemen in the Bureau of Fisheries that while what the gentleman says is true, as a matter of fact they have always made their estimates on the basis of \$50,000 for this purpose. They tell me that they would need \$30,000 really instead of \$20,000 to complete this proposition, if it were of the ordinary kind; but conditions at Orangeburg are good, labor is relatively cheap, and they hope to be able to complete it with \$20,000, and they have estimated for that amount.

The bill under consideration carries an appropriation of \$3,600 to provide the salaries of one fish culturist, one superintendent of buildings, and two laborers at the fish hatchery at Orangeburg. Now, it seems to me, that if you are going to provide salaries for employees to be used at the fish hatchery at Orangeburg, it would be good business and a good investment if you would complete the fish hatchery and give those people something to do. If they are permitted to stay at Orangeburg, as I presume they will be under the language of this bill, we shall be placed in the ridiculous position of providing \$3,600 to pay the salaries of men to sit on the bank of a hole and watch the hole, because that is all they have there now.

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

Mr. LEVER. I do.

Mr. HOWARD. Is there any output from this hatchery at all now?

Mr. LEVER. In what respect?

Mr. HOWARD. Are they shipping any fry from this hatchery?

Mr. LEVER. None whatever. There has been nothing done whatever except to lay the foundation of this fish hatchery, to construct the superintendent's building, to prepare the trenches, and lay pipes at the bottom of this hatchery to be covered over with water when completed.

Now, gentlemen of the committee, it seems to me that this is not a proposition for an extravagant expenditure of money. If I thought so I would not be supporting the proposition. I am supporting it in earnest, because we have appropriated \$25,000. We have dug out a hole in the ground, and we shall be ready now for business if you will give us just a little bit more money to complete the work, on which we have thus far expended \$25,000.

It seems to me that it can not be charged that this is out of line with our policy of economy, because I believe I can see a difference between false economy and real economy or a genuine investment. The people of the United States must be taught to eat fish. Our streams are absolutely filled with fish, and as a people we eat as little fish as any people on the face of the earth.

Now, here is a proposition to encourage this business, and I feel that the circumstances and the facts involved in the case justify the committee in allowing this small appropriation of \$20,000.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. You have already expended \$25,000 at this place, and unless an additional sum is appropriated this \$25,000 that has been expended is absolutely useless?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. If the proposition is not completed by an appropriation now or in the future, we shall have for the \$25,000 a few pipes, a few ditches, a \$3,000 superintendent's house, and a hole in the ground; that is all.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Then you have another expense connected with it each year of \$3,600 for employees, without having anything for them to do?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; that is what I understand from the item in the bill. This is a good proposition on its merits.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, from time to time Congress authorizes the establishment of fish hatcheries and makes appropriations of \$25,000 for that purpose. This hatchery was authorized three and one-half years ago, and a fish hatchery can be established at Orangeburg or at any other place for \$25,000.

This hatchery has now reached a point where they are practically ready to commence operations. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] shakes his head. He should read what the Commissioner of Fisheries says. The residence building and the workshops have been completed, tools and appliances have been bought, drains have been laid, ponds have been partly constructed, and to some extent are ready for operation. They will be ready for operation as soon as they have expended what money they have.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. In a moment. This was to be what is known as a pond hatchery. We were to propagate and raise

fry in ponds. Now, some distance from where this hatchery was located it has occurred to the Commissioner of Fisheries to operate in connection with it this station on the Edisto River. Is that the name of it?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; Edisto River.

Mr. FITZGERALD. To operate in connection with the Orangeburg hatchery a river station, so as to have a combination station, propagating some of the fry in ponds and some of them in the river station. The Commissioner of Fisheries was somewhat embarrassed when it was suggested to him that there was no authority to start off on this new undertaking under the guise of building this station at Orangeburg, S. C., and establishing ostensibly as a part of it, but in fact independent of it, this auxiliary station on the Edisto River. That is so, whatever the name of the river is?

Mr. LEVER. It is.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Now, if they wish to have at that place a type or character of station designed as intended originally, they can do it within the \$25,000 appropriated plus such money as may be necessary to be taken from these other appropriations which are made for the benefit of the fisheries service.

Just think what happens. Congress authorizes at Orangeburg the establishment of a fish-hatchery station and appropriates \$25,000. After they have been there three years and a half they ask for \$20,000 more. Then we found that under the guise of operating under this original authorization they are going off to another place to establish an auxiliary station, under what they claim is their general authority. We have another station where the land was donated and \$25,000 appropriated, and they ask \$30,000 to complete that station. The committee treated them all alike. They were given \$25,000 apiece to build these stations. In the past they always did build them for that sum, but now they have more exaggerated notions of just what is necessary. Of course, if we place the money at their disposal, they will spend all we can give them. I believe the department should finish this station at Orangeburg and commence the work of propagating fish in these ponds, and then, if it be deemed desirable to establish an auxiliary station on the Edisto River in connection with it, they can make that request. But they ought to finish one job before they start in on another.

Mr. LEVER. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that I have seen the station, and they have three ponds connecting with each other. Now, I presume this auxiliary station to which the gentleman refers is one of these ponds.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no. It is on the river. It is to be used for the purpose of propagating fish that would not be propagated in these ponds at all. They said they were going to have a combination station. Well, a combination station is built sometimes, where the station is on a river.

Mr. LEVER. Linking the ponds together, as these ponds are linked together, because this station is right on the river.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They propagate some fish in the river and some in the ponds. But you might suggest that we establish a station in Washington, and as an auxiliary of that station somebody might go to Baltimore and want to make some expenditures over there under the guise that they were going to have a combination station, one part here and one part there. Now, is this not a little too much to ask the committee to do, until they finish the job they started to do three years ago?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me, I will say that I have seen these three ponds to which the gentleman is evidently referring.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am talking about the river.

Mr. LEVER. The pond farthest away from the river can not be over half a mile, and I think the one nearest the river is not over a few hundred yards. So that, as far as I have been able to ascertain from a personal inspection of the station, there is not intended to be any station in connection with the river, except possibly that one right on the river, connecting up the three ponds.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They ought to finish this station that has been authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York insist on his point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; I insist on it.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from South Carolina anything to say on the point of order?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I did not consider that the amendment was subject to a point of order, for the reason that it was for the completion of a work already in progress.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the original provision of the law?

Mr. LEVER. I have not got it in my hand. The gentleman from New York probably has.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It reads:

For the establishment of a fish-cultural station, including purchase of site, construction of buildings, ponds, and equipments, at a point in the State of South Carolina to be selected by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, \$25,000.

It is for the establishment, purchase of a site, equipment, and everything else.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I submit to the committee that the language read by the gentleman from New York establishes the fact that there is no limit of cost fixed; and the amendment proposed by me is for the completion of a work in progress, already under way, and therefore not subject to the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But this is for the purpose of establishing it. It included everything—the site, construction of buildings, ponds, and equipment. I do not know of anything else—

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from New York the title of that act?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is in the sundry civil act approved March 4, 1911.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a part of the sundry civil bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, yes. It was one of the amendments put on this bill by the Senate from time to time, and agreed to under pressure. That is the way they get most of these things. They ought to finish this job before they go further.

Mr. LEVER. That is what I want them to do.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; the gentleman wants them to start in on a new project.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chemical laboratory: Toward the construction of a suitable fire-proof chemical laboratory, to provide additional space, to cost not exceeding \$200,000 under a contract which is hereby authorized therefor, \$25,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if this is not an authorization to provide a new building for the Bureau of Standards?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is a building for a chemical laboratory for the Bureau of Standards, and it has been held that buildings for this institution are in order on the bill.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the gentleman that decision?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; but I can get it for the gentleman. Perhaps the gentleman from Illinois may recall the ruling holding a somewhat similar building in order for the Bureau of Standards. However, Mr. Chairman, I will ask that this item be passed over with the point of order pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the item be passed over with the point of order pending. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Philadelphia, Pa.: For completion of inspection house on pier, according to plans prepared for that purpose, \$15,000; for installation of elevator in detention building, including structural changes incident thereto, \$4,000; for construction of sea wall on river front and dirt fill behind same, \$5,500; for boring artesian well and installing necessary piping and fittings to connect with station buildings, \$3,100; for disinfecting apparatus and installation thereof, \$5,400; for installing laundry facilities and remodeling of plumbing and heating apparatus connected therewith, \$2,700; in all, \$35,700.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] if he has any particular objection to this particular appropriation going into the bill?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, replying to the inquiry of the gentleman from North Carolina, I will say that we have gone over this very carefully and find that all these items have been approved by the department, being necessary for the furtherance of the service, and that they ought to be passed. They have the indorsement of the department and have been approved by it in the regular way. Such testimony as the committee desired was heard, and I believe the committee itself found that all the items were meritorious. I should say that they have been long deferred and long hoped for, and of course those of us who are interested in this particular immigration station make our acknowledgment to the committee for its prompt and intelligent action in this matter.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I asked the question for the reason that on a previous item in the bill this afternoon the gentleman from Pennsylvania made some inquiry as to the theory that was followed by the Committee on Ap-

appropriations in allowing these buildings. He was unkind enough, in my judgment, to insinuate that there was in the committee an inclination on the part of the chairman of this committee to allow appropriations for buildings in the locality in which the gentleman from New York lives, to the exclusion of those in some other locality. I felt it my duty, Mr. Chairman, not that I think that the gentleman from New York needs anybody to come to his defense in this House, but as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I felt it was my duty to say that no man can truthfully charge the chairman of the Appropriations Committee with favoring items in the locality in which he lives to the exclusion of the district of any other gentleman in this House. [Applause.]

Further than that, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, just prior to the criticism of the gentleman from New York, and on the floor of the House insisted on placing in this bill amendments making appropriations that were not authorized or were not estimated for in the locality in which he lived. It was perfectly apparent to any man who observed the procedure at that time that there was on the floor of the House a cohesion of gentlemen for the purpose of public plunder. There was a combination that had been formed for the purpose of overriding the Committee on Appropriations and it was successful. Two gentlemen from Pennsylvania were engaged in this, and there was some rivalry, as one could see, between them as to who should occupy the most space in the Philadelphia papers to-morrow morning because of the effort to get the appropriation for the Frankford Arsenal. It was an appropriation which the committee felt was not justified.

My whole purpose, Mr. Chairman, however, was to say to this House, and to every man in it who knows the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that if other gentlemen in the House, and other gentlemen on this side of the House, had the courage to resist the effort that is brought to bear upon them when pressed for appropriations in their district, not warranted or justified, we would write appropriation bills in vastly smaller amounts than we are going to at this session of Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE]. Of course, I accept in good humor the chastisement he has just administered. I esteem him highly and know full well that his sudden coming to the rescue of his friend and colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, is born of a desire to hold together the strength of that committee and to have the House and country understand that there is no division in the ranks, and that when the committee speaks it speaks effectively, speaks as one man, and as if by the unit rule. There have been several breaks, however, in the recommendations of the committee since this bill has been under consideration, and on several occasions gentlemen from various parts of the country have undertaken to question the recommendations, and even the wisdom of the committee, and have succeeded on more than one occasion in establishing a principle that the committee itself had not indorsed.

I understand the value of being upon an important committee like that on Appropriations, but I have observed that sometimes those of us on the outside have had to knock at the door of the committee for anything we may be able to obtain; that sometimes when we have struggled for years to obtain that which our people send us here to obtain, we have had to kneel a little bit as well as to knock a little bit. We have had to appeal a little bit, and we have had to yield a little bit, in order to get from the Committee on Appropriations that which we believed we deserved. While I do not say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] takes advantage of his position as chairman of this committee to obtain for his district that which he would not obtain in the open, or that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] would be guilty of any such conduct, yet I observed a little while ago an effort to break through the lines to obtain a fish hatchery for North Carolina, and I observed that a little further back, in the consideration of this bill, when we came to the appropriations respecting the rivers and harbors, without word or comment, there went to the harbor of New York for the removal of injurious deposits within the harbors and adjacent waters of New York City \$94,000, an item which is not provided or considered for any other section of this country. I also observed with regard to this very matter of immigration, upon which the gentleman has raised this question, that whereas we have been striving for years and years to obtain a fair and just recognition for the increasing immigration business for the port of Philadelphia, the port of New York never has any trouble. It walks right in and takes away exactly what it wants.

I observe that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] was keen enough before he made his criticism of the gentleman from Philadelphia to see that the items concerning the immigration service in the city of New York were safely passed, and that no question was raised until the city of Philadelphia was reached.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Oh, the gentleman should be fair. I made no criticism of the appropriations made for Philadelphia.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from North Carolina was not altogether fair to me, because he just drew me over the coals in a nice roughshod way, and he dressed me down in the presence of even the galleries, who have come to listen to his eloquence. And I observe that after all of these years of effort, of appeal, of knocking at the door of the committee, we have finally been given \$35,000 to properly equip the immigration station at Philadelphia, but that that was done only after we had appropriated \$135,000 for the port of New York, many of the items of which would have been subject to a point of order. Nothing was said about this, but it moved along as swiftly and smoothly into this bill as if the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from North Carolina had no influence in the committee or with the membership of the House.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD rose.

Mr. MOORE. Oh, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is not a party to this controversy. The issue is between the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] and myself, and the gentleman from New York is an innocent bystander—a spectator who has nothing to do with it at all.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to intrude, but if I do, I will not be the one that is licked. But for the information of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] I will state that the items regarding Ellis Island, all of them, are within the authority of the committee on this bill. The appropriation for the immigration station at Philadelphia is subject to a point of order. It is in excess of the limit of cost specifically fixed for this station, but the committee recommended the appropriation in order to complete the station, because upon investigation it believed that this was an appropriation that should be made, and it did it, regardless of whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania would be pleased or displeased. It did not let any desire either to favor him or to antagonize him interfere with it in the discharge of its duty. There was a limit of cost fixed on the Philadelphia station. They backed it all around and finally located it in New Jersey, at Gloucester. They could not find a suitable place in the State of Pennsylvania for the immigration station authorized [applause], and if it had not been for the efforts of the gentleman from New York to help properly provide and equip an immigration station at Philadelphia, the gentleman's constituents would have been up in arms in antagonizing his failure to get the appropriations that were thought necessary.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ventured my assistance in this matter without any hope of future reward or any guaranty of indemnity from attack from the gentleman from Pennsylvania or his associates.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman, as I say, is not a party to the controversy; it was between the gentleman from North Carolina and myself.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not interfering with that controversy. I am quite satisfied that the gentleman from North Carolina will effectively and completely take care of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, let us read the last paragraph.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserved a point of order a little while ago on the paragraph on page 148, and I desire to withdraw the point of order.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserved a point of order on page 148, and I desire to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the paragraph will be returned to.

Mr. FOSTER. It has been read, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in the other paragraph that has been disposed of.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina wishes to be heard for a moment, and I yield the floor.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, I listened to my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] with much interest a moment ago, and I approve of all he said in commendation of the disinterested services of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], but he made one suggestion that was quite surprising, and that was that there had been a combination between two gentlemen from Pennsylvania, Mr. DONOHUE on this side and Mr. MOORE on the other side, for the purpose of unjustifiably extracting money out of the Treasury for Frankford Arsenal. Now, I do not disparage in the slightest the activities of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE]. He has been faithful and efficient. But I do wish to commend unreservedly the moderation and the conscientious motives which actuate the service of my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Whoever heard of his asking an appropriation in any bill or for any purpose except it was meritorious? And who has not on more than one occasion observed the scrupulous care and intelligence which he has exercised in the discussion of items for the appropriation of public money? It is because he has in such large degree earned the confidence of his colleagues that he has been so successful in securing legislation for his city and the country. I wished to give an expression of commendation for the modesty and ability with which my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] approaches any effort upon his part to extract money out of the Treasury [applause] and to absolve him at any rate from any combination for that purpose. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 17041, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. AUSTIN was granted leave of absence for two days, on account of sickness.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, to meet to-morrow, Wednesday, June 24, 1914, 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 Secretary of War, calling attention to an item in the sundry civil appropriation act of June 23, 1913, as follows: "Swamp Lands, Fort Washington, Md.: For the purchase of about 6.6 acres of swamp land adjoining the military reservation of Fort Washington, Md., \$350," and requesting that the same be included in the sundry civil appropriation bill now pending (H. Doc. No. 1075); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting for incorporation in the sundry civil appropriation bill an estimate of appropriation for the acquisition of a site for a post-office building at Andalusia, Ala. (H. Doc. No. 1076); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 5574) to amend and reenact section 113 of chapter 5 of the Judicial Code of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 891), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. PETERS of Maine, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13728) for the relief of Richard Riggles, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 877), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13591) for the relief of John P. Ehrmann, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 878), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11394) for the relief of James A. Powers, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 879), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred House bill H. R. 1049, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 551) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case for the relief of H. E. Johnson, John F. Shelley, Jane M. Johnson, and Duff Quinn, accompanied by a report (No. 880), which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. POU, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16717) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay certain moneys to the officers and crew of the steamer *Hancock* or their legal representatives, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 881), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PETERS of Maine, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13350) for the relief of the widow and heirs at law of Patrick J. Fitzgerald, deceased, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 882), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11153) for the relief of Thomas C. Hyde, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 883), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. METZ, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 305) for the relief of George T. Larkin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 884), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10025) for the relief of Wickliff Fry, for horse lost while hired by the United States Geological Survey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 885), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6530) for the relief of Michael F. O'Hare, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 886), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13483) for the relief of Louis Jones, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 887), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13482) for the relief of Fred Henderson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 888), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred House bill 1052, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 552) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Fred Larsen, accompanied by a report (No. 889), which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred House bill 1051, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 553) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Peter W. Anderson, accompanied by a report (No. 890), which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 17111) granting a pension to Lucy Ord Mason; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 17348) granting a pension to John J. Coughlan; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 16927) granting a pension to Mary A. Keller; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11722) granting a pension to Frederick P. Houston; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 14724) granting a pension to Harry D. Hogan; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 15668) granting a pension to Nathan H. Williams; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 17441) for the relief of the Iowa Indians of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 17442) to amend section 103 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, as amended by the acts of Congress approved March 3, 1913, and June 6, 1914; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 17443) to establish ports of entry at Superior, Wis., and Duluth, Minn., in the customs collection district of Duluth and Superior; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 17444) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Baldwinsville, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 17445) to amend section 5 of the act of Congress of June 25, 1910, entitled "An act to authorize advances to the reclamation fund, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 17446) amending section 2 of an act approved April 19, 1908, entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the Civil War"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 282) providing for action by Congress to determine the priority of discovery of the North Pole; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 283) for the appointment of one member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 284) giving the consent of the United States for the State of Louisiana to institute suit against the United States in the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: Resolution (H. Res. 550) authorizing the continuance of employment of 14 messengers in the House post office during the remainder of the present session; to the Committee on Accounts.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 17447) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Proctor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17448) granting an increase of pension to Doris Schroeder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of California: A bill (H. R. 17449) granting an increase of pension to Lottie Tanner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 17450) granting a pension to Alfred W. Perry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 17451) granting a pension to Tressie Bratton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 17452) for the relief of John Burrows; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 17453) granting an increase of pension to John Walsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 17454) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELDER: A bill (H. R. 17455) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 17456) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan C. Oylear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 17457) granting a pension to Catharine A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 17458) for the relief of John A. Mellon; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17459) for the relief of Richard Prendergast; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KREIDER: A bill (H. R. 17460) granting a pension to Mary E. Weller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 17461) granting a pension to Charles J. McFadden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17462) granting an increase of pension to James Van Riper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 17463) granting an increase of pension to Daniel L. Watson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: A bill (H. R. 17464) for the relief of Fred Graff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 17465) granting a pension to Anna Cross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 17466) granting a pension to Lois D. Ballentine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 17467) granting an increase of pension to Louise P. Freelon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS of Maine: Resolution (H. Res. 551) to refer H. R. 1049, a bill for the relief of H. E. Johnson, John F. Shelley, Jane M. Johnson, and Duff Quinn to the Court of Claims; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Resolution (H. Res. 552) to refer H. R. 1052, a bill for the relief of Fred Larsen, to the Court of Claims; to the Committee of the Whole House.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 553) to refer H. R. 1051, a bill for the relief of Peter W. Anderson, to the Court of Claims; to the Committee of the Whole House.

## 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): Resolutions signed by pastors of certain churches in Brownsville, Oreg., and Rochester, N. Y., protesting against the practice of polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition signed by Jos. A. Anderson, of Boxholm, Iowa, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also (by request), petition of the Omaha Christian Endeavor Union, favoring national prohibition amendment, Mondell suffrage amendment, Smith-Hughes motion-picture censorship bill, prohibition of polygamy in the United States, and bill for proper observance of Sunday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. AIKEN: Petition of the Church of the Redeemer, Newberry, S. C., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of W. W. Alspach and 22 others of Newark, Ohio, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: Petition of 607 citizens of West Virginia, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Memorial of the Minnesota District of the German Evangelical Synod of North America, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLANCY: Petition of sundry citizens of Preble, N. Y., favoring national picture commission; to the Committee on Education.



Also, petition of 155 citizens of Minoa, N. Y., and sundry citizens of Preble, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of the Loyal Workers of the Wesley Adult Bible Class of the Methodist Church of Ocala, Fla., and George Riggin and many other citizens of the State of Florida, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of the Beloit (Wis.) Business Men's Association, favoring postponement of legislation affecting business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Petition of 24 citizens of the sixth district of Missouri, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIFENDERFER: Petitions of 400 and more citizens of Lansdale, 40 citizens of Rosemont, 210 citizens of Hatboro, sundry voters of Abington Township and Pottstown, 40 citizens of Pleasant Valley, 750 citizens of Newton, 20 citizens of Yardly, 18 citizens of Dolington, 350 citizens of New Hope, 120 citizens of Richboro, 100 citizens of New Britain, sundry citizens of Bucks County, various Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches of Bristol, 400 citizens of Edgewood Park, and 52 citizens of Fallsington, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Bucks County, Pa., citizens, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also petition of sundry citizens of Montgomery County, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of the Minnesota district of the German Evangelical Synod of North America against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FALCONER: Memorial of 7,000 clubwomen of the State of Virginia relative to indorsement of President Wilson's Mobile speech relating to acquisition of land by conquest; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of 34 voters of the State of New York protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of sundry citizens of Mount Carmel, Wabash County, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of sundry citizens of Coeur d'Alene and Wallace, Idaho, against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of the secretary-treasurer of the building trades department, American Federation of Labor, favoring House bill 8593, for protection of workmen engaged in building erection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GERRY: Petitions of Sam. L. Irwin, principal East Greenwich Academy, of East Greenwich; the Roger Williams Association and 29 residents of Rockville; 22 residents of Providence; and Arthur L. Reed, of Oak Lawn, all in the State of Rhode Island, urging the passage of legislation providing for national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of the Providence (R. I.) Christian Endeavor Union, urging the passage of a bill prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors to minors and Indians; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petitions of Henry J. Eltz, Conrad Oinsel, Richard Wischnowsky, Hermann Eckert, and Joseph Fojth all of Cranston, R. I., and Michael Lukowski, Jacob Wartjes, John Grosslin, and Michael J. Kelly, all of Providence, R. I., protesting against the passage of legislation providing for national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of the Rhode Island Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, protesting against the passage of House bill 13870, making appropriation for a building for the Department of Justice; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petitions of G. Hauffman and others, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petitions of sundry citizens of Thurston and Chehalis Counties, Wash., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Aberdeen, Tacoma, and Olympia, all in the State of Washington, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Petition of Local No. 28, International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, and Local Union No. 202, Cigar Makers' Union, of Portland Oreg., against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANCHAM: Petition of the Alaska Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring House bill 15430, for prohibition in Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the First Baptist Church of Topeka, Kans., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: A petition by Mrs. Fannie D. Chase and 29 other citizens of Takoma Park, D. C., for the passage of House joint resolution 168, to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, a petition by George R. Apsley and 38 other citizens of Cumberland, Md., for the passage of House joint resolution 168, to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of 60 citizens of Milton, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: Resolution of the Christian churches of Oklahoma, representing a membership of 45,000 residents of the State in convention assembled, indorsing Congressman Hobson's amendment for national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and others of Tonkawa, Okla., indorsing the amendment for national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition for censorship of motion pictures so far as Federal jurisdiction extends, from B. Colegrove, president Gospel Team, Arapaho, Okla.; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. O'HAIR: Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Illinois, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Memorial of the Presbytery of St. Paul, Minn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: Petition of Camden (N. Y.) Grange, No. 354, favoring postal ownership of telephones and telegraphs; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the New York Psychological Society, favoring establishment of a department of mental hygiene in the United States Public Health Service (H. R. 10637); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Petition of Mr. A. W. Walty, Colchester, Ill., favoring the early adjournment of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petitions of sundry citizens of Elmira, Peruville, and Waverly, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, June 24, 1914.

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thy servants in this great Senate have been called in the order of Thy providence to help administer the affairs of a great nation, to seek out ways to bring property, to establish order, to execute justice. Paths which lead to the heights where the eternal truth abides are not easy to find amid the conflict of interests. Only by Thine own guidance shall they be enabled to attain to these heights of human justice and of universal right. Grant that this day Thy blessing may abide upon these Thy servants, that they may be in thought and conscience amenable to the Divine influence, and may be led by Thy spirit into such an appreciation of the grave responsibilities and of the high honor of their position that they may find out what is best for all and that which will glorify Thy name in us as a people. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12235) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14034) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the