

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 16745) authorizing the donation of the building at Kennebunkport, Me., known as "the old customhouse," to the town of Kennebunkport, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 16746) providing for a site and a Federal building for post office at Peabody, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 16747) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish two condemned cannon to F. L. Aiken, mayor of the city of Onalaska, La Crosse County, Wis.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 16748) to incorporate the Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 16749) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to collect and publish statistics on the production, manufacture, and marketing of crude petroleum; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 16750) providing for the payment of pensions monthly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 16751) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Winamac, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 16752) to provide for the erection of a public building at Kissimmee, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ADAMSON: Resolution (H. Res. 286) for the consideration of S. J. Res. 60; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 287) for the consideration of S. 3331; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIEGEL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 251) authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the Flags of the Maritime Nations; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 45) authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of Handbook of American Indians; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 16753) granting a pension to Mary E. Henderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 16754) granting a pension to Daniel R. Sayles; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16755) granting a pension to Edward C. Hoffman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 16756) granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. Newell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 16757) for the relief of Rittenhouse Moore; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16758) granting a pension to Irwin C. McRae; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 16759) for the relief of the King Hardware Co., Atlanta, Ga.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 16760) to authorize the appointment of Orlo Cahill Whitaker to the grade of first lieutenant in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 16761) for the reimbursement of James E. Murphy for the loss of a horse while hired by the United States Reclamation Service; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 16762) granting a pension to Guy W. Atherton; to the Committee on Pensions.

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): Memorial of men in engine and train service on Frisco Railroad, relative to eight hours a day, etc.; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of National Association of Woolen and Worsted Overseers, relative to protective tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, relative to Senate amendment No. 33 to the rivers and harbors bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MOON: Petition of citizens of Belvidere, Tenn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY: Petition of sundry citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., favoring passage of the Lobeck bill (H. R. 16060); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petitions of boards of supervisors of Alameda and Ventura Counties, Cal., against Federal inheritance tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER: Petition of sundry citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., favoring a Christian amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of 550 citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petitions of E. C. Bird and others, of Boulder, Colo., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, July 1, 1916.

(Legislative day of Friday, June 30, 1916.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12717) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there are very few Senators in the Chamber; not more than half a dozen. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator from Utah let me suggest that we need not take up the time by a call of the Senate. We are now considering unobjected amendments, and if any amendment is agreed to which is opposed it can be reconsidered on the request of any Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I think we will save time by having a quorum here to begin with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bankhead	Gallinger	Lea, Tenn.	Smoot
Beckham	Gore	McLean	Sterling
Brady	Gronna	Martin, Va.	Stone
Brandeggee	Hardwick	Norris	Sutherland
Bryan	Hitchcock	Overman	Taggart
Chamberlain	Husting	Page	Thomas
Clapp	James	Polindexter	Thompson
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Shafroth	Townsend
Cummins	Jones	Sheppard	Vardaman
Curtis	Kenyon	Sherman	Warren
Dillingham	Kern	Simmons	Weeks
du Pont	La Follette	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Fletcher	Lane	Smith, Mich.	Works

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] is detained on public business. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I have been requested to announce the absence of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. GORE rose.

Mr. CLAPP. Will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me for a moment? I wish to note a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate committee amendment, striking out the additional proviso, lines 8 to 14, inclusive, on page 23, was adopted. I simply desire to note the motion at this time.

Mr. GORE. I yielded for that purpose. The Senator has a right to enter the motion.

I will state that through an oversight a committee amendment was omitted from the print of the bill, and I now ask leave to offer the amendment in its appropriate place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 41, line 13, in the item for investigations of methods for wood distillation and for the preservative treatment of timber, for timber testing, and so forth, strike out "\$135,200" and insert the following: "and for commercial demonstrations of improved methods or processes in cooperation with individuals and companies, \$160,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. I will say that a similar oversight appears, and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] will submit the amendment agreed upon by the committee. I ask for its adoption.

Mr. BRADY. In the item for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in the dairy industry, and so forth, on

page 13, line 24, after the words "\$277,470," I move to strike out the semicolon and insert a colon, and to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That \$5,000 of this sum shall be used for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in connection with the manufacture and marketing of cheese.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was detained in the committee room all day yesterday in the consideration of an appropriation bill. I will ask the chairman of the committee if there was an understanding reached that the committee amendments should first be considered.

Mr. GORE. That is the plan we are now pursuing. We are to dispose of the committee amendments first.

The reading of the bill was resumed at page 52, line 17.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 52, line 19, after the words "Argentine ant," to strike out "\$64,400" and insert "\$74,400," so as to make the clause read:

For investigations of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, tobacco, rice, sugar cane, etc., and the cigarette beetle and Argentine ant, \$74,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, after line 16, to insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a site within or near the corporate limits of the city of Wellington, Sumner County, Kans., said site to contain a sufficient and suitable tract of ground and the location of the site to be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. When a good and sufficient title to said site is held by the Government of the United States the Secretary of the Treasury, acting in conjunction with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall cause to be erected thereon a suitable building or buildings for the use and accommodation of the entomological laboratory or field station of the Department of Agriculture of the Government at Wellington, Kans., said site and building or buildings complete to cost not to exceed the sum of \$10,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that this amendment may go over for the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will go over.

Mr. THOMPSON. When the matter is called up again I should like the Senator from Utah to call my attention to it. It is a matter of considerable importance to the wheat and corn producers in the Middle West.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Kansas that as soon as the bill is read through for action on the committee amendments and all the items objected to have been passed over we will then begin with the bill from the first and take up each of the objected items and consider them in order.

Mr. THOMPSON. I should like to be heard before the matter is passed upon.

Mr. SMOOT. I assure the Senator that if there will be a chance to get word to him, if he is not in the Chamber, I will see that it is done.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 7, after the words "general expenses," to strike out "\$464,650" and insert "\$484,650," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$484,650.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 26, after the words "Bureau of Entomology," to strike out "\$868,880" and insert "\$888,880," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Entomology, \$888,880.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Biological Survey," on page 56, line 16, after the words "United States," to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$21,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the maintenance of the Montana National Bison Range and other reservations and for the maintenance of game introduced into suitable localities on public lands, under supervision of the Biological Survey, including construction of fencing, wardens' quarters, shelters for animals, landings, roads, trails, bridges, ditches, telephone lines, rockwork, bulkheads, and other improvements necessary for the economical administration and protection of the reservations, and for the enforcement of section 84 of the act approved March 4, 1909, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," \$21,000, of which sum \$2,500 may be used for the purchase, capture, and transportation of game for national reservations.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, my attention has been called to this item, and I have been reliably informed that some of the game preserves will not be looked after in case this appropriation is reduced.

Mr. GORE. I will say to the Senator that if he desires to discuss the pending amendment I will ask to have it passed over for the present. I am anxious to consider unobjected amendments first.

Mr. GRONNA. I simply wanted to give notice that I shall move to amend the amendment, not at this time but when the unobjected Senate committee amendments have been adopted.

I wish to offer an amendment to restore the amount fixed by the House. My attention was called to the fact that there is a game preserve in Arkansas, for instance, the Big Lake game preserve, and the bureau was unable, due to a lack of funds, to look after it at all. We have some 70 game preserves, and the small amount of \$25,000 has been appropriated. In at least one-half of these game preserves they have to keep wardens; there are about 35 of them in the different sections of the United States where a warden is being employed, and the appropriation is too small. I wish that the item may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will go over.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 7, after the word "marten," to strike out "\$400,540" and insert "\$420,540," so as to read:

For investigating the food habits of North American birds and mammals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry, including experiments and demonstrations in destroying wolves, coyotes, prairie dogs, and other animals injurious to agriculture and animal husbandry, and for investigations and experiments in connection with rearing of fur-bearing animals, including mink and marten, \$420,540.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, in line 10, after the words "public lands," to strike out:

Provided further, That of this sum not more than \$5,000 may be used in investigating the disease of wild ducks in the Salt Lake Valley region of Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that amendment go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment goes over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 57, line 13, after the word "sum," to insert "not less than"; in the same line, after the word "than," to strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$125,000"; in line 14, before the words "be used," to strike out "may" and insert "shall"; and in line 16, after the words "animal husbandry," to insert:

And provided further also, That of this sum not more than \$125,000 shall be used on the public lands, national forests, and elsewhere in the Western and Northwestern States for the protection of stock and other domestic animals through the suppression of rabies by the destruction of wolves, coyotes, and other predatory wild animals.

So as to make the clause read:

For investigating the food habits of North American birds and mammals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry, including experiments and demonstrations in destroying wolves, coyotes, prairie dogs, and other animals injurious to agriculture and animal husbandry, and for investigations and experiments in connection with rearing of fur-bearing animals, including mink and marten, \$420,540: *Provided*, That of this sum \$15,000 shall be used for the destruction of ground squirrels on the national forests, and other public lands: *And provided also*, That of this sum not less than \$125,000 shall be used on the national forests and the public domain in destroying wolves, coyotes, and other animals injurious to agriculture and animal husbandry: *And provided further also*, That of this sum not more than \$125,000 shall be used on the public lands, national forests, and elsewhere in the Western and Northwestern States for the protection of stock and other domestic animals through the suppression of rabies by the destruction of wolves, coyotes, and other predatory wild animals.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 15, after the words "general expenses," to strike out "\$534,200" and insert "\$550,200," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$550,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 16, after the words "Biological Survey," to strike out "\$578,203" and insert "\$594,230," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Biological Survey, \$594,230.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Division of Publications," on page 59, line 24, before the words "skilled laborers, at \$840 each," to strike out "seven" and insert "eight"; in line 25, before the words "skilled laborers, at \$720 each," to strike out "seventeen" and insert "sixteen"; and on page 60, line 8, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$177,280" and insert "\$177,400," so as to make the clause read:

Salaries, Division of Publications: One Editor, who shall be chief of division, \$3,500; 1 editor, who shall be assistant chief of division, \$2,500; 1 chief clerk, \$2,000; 2 assistant editors, at \$2,000 each; 4 assistant editors, \$1,800, each; 1 assistant editor, \$1,600; 1 assistant editor, \$1,400; 1 assistant editor in charge of indexing, \$2,000; 1 indexer, \$1,400; 1 assistant in charge of illustrations, \$2,100; 2 draftsmen or photographers, at \$1,600 each; 2 draftsmen or photographers, at \$1,500 each; 2 draftsmen or photographers, at \$1,400 each; 1 draftsman or photographer, \$1,300; 7 draftsmen or photographers, at \$1,200 each; 1 assistant photographer, \$900; 1 assistant in charge of document section, \$2,000; 1 assistant in document section, \$1,800; 1 foreman, miscellaneous distribution, \$1,500; 1 forewoman, \$1,400; 1 clerk, class 3; 1 clerk, class 2; 9 clerks, class 1; 16 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 40 clerks, at \$900 each; 18 clerks, at \$840 each; 2 skilled laborers, at \$900 each; 8 skilled laborers, at \$840 each; 4 skilled laborers, at \$780 each; 1 chief folder, \$1,200; 16 skilled laborers, at \$720 each; 1 folder, \$1,000; 2 folders, at \$900 each; 2 skilled laborers,

at \$1,100 each; 1 skilled laborer, \$1,000; 2 messengers, at \$840 each; 2 messengers, at \$720 each; 3 messengers or messenger boys, at \$600 each; 2 messengers or messenger boys, at \$480 each; 2 messengers or messenger boys, at \$420 each; 2 messengers or messenger boys, at \$360 each; 1 laborer, \$840; 2 laborers, at \$600 each; 4 charwomen, at \$480 each; 3 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$177,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 27, after the words "Division of Publications," to strike out "\$197,530" and insert "\$197,650," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Division of Publications, \$197,650.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous expenses," on page 63, line 14, after the word "department," to strike out "\$115,000" and insert "\$130,000," so as to make the clause read:

Miscellaneous expenses, Department of Agriculture: For stationery, blank books, twine, paper, gum, dry goods, soap, brushes, brooms, mats, oils, paints, glass, lumber, hardware, ice, fuel, water and gas pipes, heating apparatus, furniture, carpets, and matting; for lights, freight, express charges, advertising, telegraphing, telephoning, postage, washing towels, and necessary repairs and improvements to buildings and heating apparatus; for the purchase, subsistence, and care of horses and the purchase and repair of harness and vehicles, for official purposes only; for the payment of duties on imported articles, and the Department of Agriculture's proportionate share of the expense of the dispatch agent in New York; for official traveling expenses; and for other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for, and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the department, \$130,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Rent in the District of Columbia," on page 63, line 19, after the words "Department of Agriculture," to strike out "\$123,689" and insert "\$138,689," so as to make the clause read:

Rent of buildings, Department of Agriculture: For rent of buildings and parts of buildings in the District of Columbia, for use of the various bureaus, divisions, and offices of the Department of Agriculture, \$138,689: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit annually to Congress in his estimates of appropriations a statement showing what proportion of this appropriation is paid for the quarters occupied by the various branches of the department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be agreed to, without objection.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "States Relations Service," on page 64, line 4, before the words "clerks," at \$1,000 each," to strike out "19" and insert "21"; in line 5, before the word "clerks," where it appears the second time, to strike out "8" and insert "5," and, in line 12, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$127,700" and insert "\$127,540"; so as to make the clause read:

Salaries, States Relations Service: One director, \$4,500; 1 chief clerk, \$2,000; 1 financial clerk, \$2,000; 1 clerk or proof reader, \$1,800; 3 clerks, class 4; 8 clerks, class 3; 1 clerk, \$1,500; 9 clerks, class 2; 22 clerks, class 1; 21 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 24 clerks, at \$900 each; 7 clerks, at \$840 each; 5 clerks, at \$720 each; 1 library cataloguer, \$900; 1 clerk or photographer, \$720; 3 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$600 each; 10 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$480 each; 1 messenger, messenger boy, or laborer, \$360; 3 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$300 each; 1 skilled laborer, \$900; 4 laborers or charwomen, at \$480 each; 9 laborers or charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$127,540.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I notice in the item for the rent of buildings for the Department of Agriculture there is an increase of \$15,000. Will the Senator having the bill in charge state why that increase is necessary?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the principal reason is because of the necessity of additional quarters for the Forestry Service. If the Senator from Utah desires, I will have a memorandum in reference to that matter read which will explain it very fully.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I would like to have the letter read. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma, however, that nearly every department has asked for increases in the appropriations for rent, and that in nearly every case, when an investigation has been made of the request, it has been found that such increases were not absolutely necessary, and in many cases where such increases were asked for in other appropriation bills they have been disagreed to. I should like now to hear just what the reasons are for this increase.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

RENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

NOTE.—The bill as passed by the House provides for a considerable expansion of the activities of the department, notably in the case of the Office of Markets and Rural Organization and the States Relations Service. This, of course, will necessitate the appointment of a large number of additional employees in the city of Washington. It is estimated that in order to provide suitable accommodations for the force necessitated by the increased appropriations for these two branches alone, at least, 14,000 square feet of additional floor space will be required. It is impossible to provide accommodations for the additional employees in the buildings now occupied by these bureaus.

Many other branches of the department are now seriously overcrowded, and, unless relief can be afforded, this condition will be aggravated during the next fiscal year. From time to time it has been necessary for the department to rent several buildings which are not suitable for office purposes and are not fireproof. If the increase recommended is allowed, and authority is given to enter into term leases as suggested in the next note, it is believed that the department will be able to secure the erection of another large modern fireproof office building in the neighborhood of the department grounds to accommodate the Forest Service, enable the abandonment of several nonfireproof structures, provide for the expansion of the offices now needing additional space, and relieve some of the congested conditions now prevailing. This will result in a greater centralization of the various branches of the department, will greatly facilitate the transaction of Government business, and will be decidedly economical and advantageous. It is urgently recommended that the increase be granted.

This item was not included in the estimates because it was impossible at that time to forecast the action of the Congress upon the department's recommendations and the need for additional space was not so apparent.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that this memorandum states that the additional space required will be 14,000 square feet. The Government now generally pays from 32 cents a square foot to 40 cents a square foot according to the location and class of building. If it be a fireproof building, the price paid is generally 40 cents per square foot. There are, however, buildings in Washington which the Government is renting for 33½ cents per square foot, which are classed as modern fireproof buildings. Granting that this should be a fireproof building, and that we paid even 40 cents a square foot for it, that would amount to \$5,600, while the increased appropriation asked for, and which has been allowed by the committee, is \$15,000. In my opinion, Mr. President, that is entirely too much, even on the showing made by the Forestry Service.

Further, I want to call attention to the fact that in the sundry civil bill there is a provision for the creation of a joint committee of the House and of the Senate for the purpose of investigating the whole question of rents paid by the Government in the District of Columbia, and also authorizing a report to Congress of their opinion as to whether the Government of the United States should not erect its own buildings; if so, at what cost, and what the interest would amount to upon the cost, as compared with the amount of money which we pay as rent in the District of Columbia to-day. In view of that, I do not believe that we ought to enter upon any plan of having buildings erected here for any of the departments or bureaus of the Government at this time, at least not until that investigation is made and a report is submitted to Congress upon it. I ask the Senator if under the conditions an increase of \$5,000 would not be ample?

I will also state to the Senator that the Department of Labor, occupying a great part of the Hay Building, across the street from the State, War, and Navy Building, secures all the space which they have there for \$20,000 a year. Now, the Forest Service is asking a \$15,000 increase to house a few men who will be provided for in this bill, and I think it is unreasonable and ought not to be allowed. Upon the basis that we are paying for the best fireproof buildings in the District, granting that the 14,000 square feet of space which they claim they want as additional space for that bureau is necessary, it could be procured for \$5,600, and I believe that the Senator himself, after this statement is made, which I assure him is absolutely correct, will agree that the \$15,000 asked for is too large.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I entirely agree with the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] in regard to the general policy which is outlined. I think that the policy of renting buildings instead of constructing buildings for the Government service is wasteful and extravagant. I think that the Government ought to abandon the policy of renting buildings. I think that it ought to construct all the buildings necessary for the accommodation of its employees and for the discharge of its functions. Acting upon that theory, the committee disallowed the proposition to lease a building for five years with the hope that a reform might be brought about in harmony with the Senator's suggestion.

The 14,000 feet of additional space required relates to the Marketing Bureau and to the Bureau of States' Relations. Fourteen thousand feet would be required for their accommodation, as I remember. In addition to that, greater space is required for the Forestry Service, and, in addition to that, the extra space required for these services, the department proposes to abandon the use of buildings which are not fireproof and substitute buildings which are fireproof for the preservation of the official records.

There is no estimate in the communication as to the amount of space that would be required for that change or as to the amount of space that would be required for the Forestry Service. I may say that I think the Marketing Division is a branch of the public service that ought to receive favorable and sympa-

thetic consideration at the hands of the Senate. The Senator from Utah knows that the farmers of the country are feeling the keenest interest in improved marketing facilities. Our marketing facilities are not up to the standards that prevail in other countries. The bill carries a considerable additional appropriation for the expansion of the Marketing Division, and I think this bureau ought to receive favorable consideration and ought not to be handicapped for want of space. I trust this amendment will be allowed to go to conference.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator understands that in my statement I agreed that the 14,000 square feet of space for the marketing division should be provided for; but I am quite sure that they can get that amount of space at a yearly rental of \$5,000; I am positive of it. I do not want to interfere with them, but I do believe that the additional \$10,000 is not necessary, and that the Forestry Service can get along, at least for another year, without it, because there is no increase in the number of forests anywhere in the country; there is no increase in the number of employees of that bureau, and there is no increase of the administrative force in any particular here in Washington.

Mr. GORE. I am happy to say that is so.

Mr. SMOOT. And therefore, Mr. President, I still believe that \$5,000 increase would be ample, instead of \$15,000.

Mr. GORE. I hope the Senator will let the item go to conference, and I will be glad to take it up with him and the department further and limit it to the actual necessities of the case.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, this matter of rent in the District of Columbia is very familiar to us all; it has been debated over and over again. I have been of the opinion that there are abuses in the matter of renting buildings in the District of Columbia. It has seemed to me that in some instances they were not required and that in other instances the rent paid was exorbitant; in fact, I know that to be the case, and I have put in print a schedule of the rentals paid here and the percentage that the owners have received, which in some instances is inordinately high.

Realizing that the controversy ought to be seriously taken up, the Senator will find in the sundry civil appropriation bill passed only a few days ago that a joint commission is provided to take up this entire matter and report to Congress at the beginning, I think, of the next session. It will be a great work, but the commission will be composed of men who are somewhat familiar with the subject and who doubtless will go into it in a very thorough manner. I hope when that commission does its work and reports to the Congress that this annual, and I might well say almost perennial, discussion of the subject will end.

Personally I have not been able to make myself believe that in many instances these rented buildings were necessary, nor have I been able to persuade myself that those who have made the arrangements and signed the contracts have been as wise as they ought to have been in the amount of rental which they have agreed to pay.

Mr. President, I know nothing about this particular item. I should, of course, follow the committee in their recommendation if they have looked into it carefully, but I wanted to put in the Record the fact that the Committee on Appropriations, recognizing the importance of this matter, have taken steps which we think will reach a solution of this very troublesome question.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I desire to say that from the language of the communication which has been read it is very evident that some real estate agent desires to put up a building and rent it to the Government. I will say to the chairman we have this same question to contend with on every appropriation bill.

Mr. GORE. I will say that we refused to insert a clause authorizing a five years' lease.

Mr. OVERMAN. Then they do not need the \$15,000, because the authorization to lease has not been granted. I ask the Senator to note this language in the communication which he has had read:

If the increase recommended is allowed, and authority is given to enter into term leases as suggested in the next note, it is believed that the department will be able to secure the erection of another large modern fireproof office building in the neighborhood of the department grounds to accommodate the Forest Service.

Mr. GORE. The committee did not allow that.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand the committee left out the authorization for a lease, and therefore the Agricultural Department does not need the \$15,000, because they will not be able to secure the new building.

According to the estimate of 14,000 feet of additional space required, they do not need to exceed \$6,000, and the provision

for the lease, as I have said, having been left out, why do they want \$15,000 when, according to their own estimate, they only need \$6,000?

Mr. GORE. The 14,000 feet referred to was expressly limited to the marketing division and to the States Relations Bureau. In addition to that they suggest the necessity for additional space in connection with the Forestry Service and for the storing of their archives in fireproof rather than in nonfireproof buildings.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is so if they can have a new building, but the committee has not allowed the provision for the new building, and therefore the department does not need any more than the space especially needed for the marketing division, and that can be secured for not to exceed \$6,000. I suggest to the Senator that he accept an amendment providing for \$6,000 additional.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am willing to accept an amendment reducing the amount to \$10,000, and then in conference I should not object to reducing it to \$6,000 if that is found advisable; but I should not like arbitrarily to reduce it without a little further investigation.

Mr. OVERMAN. We have given them more money than they need to secure the space they desire.

Mr. GORE. I will say that I would not object to an amendment providing that they should not pay more than a certain amount per square foot. I am willing to limit it in every possible way so as to guarantee economy.

Mr. OVERMAN. If it is limited to \$10,000, that will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. GORE. I have no objection to reducing it to \$10,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, several years ago, soon after I came to the Senate, I called attention, as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] perhaps will remember, to the exorbitant prices that in a number of instances we were paying for buildings. We developed the fact that men erected their buildings and financed them and paid for them on 10-year leases out of what they got from the Government. Now, I do hope that we will not submit to it longer. Three years ago we appointed a committee of the Senate to look into the matter and report to us, hoping that they would give us some definite information, and enable us to bring this leasing of buildings to a close.

One of the real troubles we have had has been the desire in every instance, whenever any kind of building was erected for the Government, to put up some wonderful piece of architectural structure. I insist that in the enlargement of buildings for a department like the Department of Agriculture we ought to adopt a plain, simple, businesslike form of construction. We have the land. We ought to put up a 400-room building, which could be done at a cost of \$600,000. We ought to adopt that policy, and adopt a policy which would look forward to a general enlargement, with a well-balanced, well-constructed series of buildings—not products of wonderful architectural beauty, but using business sense upon a plan of additions and additions and additions as we need them to meet the wants of the departments. I hope we will get something from this committee, and I am glad to see this cut to \$10,000.

The chairman of the committee and the entire committee were opposed to allowing the contract for any term of years. We rejected that. I hope that we will never make another. I am sure that we can save one-half the rent we pay and have better buildings if we will put them up for ourselves.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, in considering the appropriation bills we oftentimes glide over carelessly provisions that are incorporated in the bill and really do not carry the matter in our minds. I am going to take time to read the provision that was inserted by the Senate committee in the sundry civil bill, which has become a law, relating to this subject, thinking it may be well for Senators to know precisely what it is:

Public Buildings Commission: With a view to ultimately providing permanent quarters for all the governmental activities in the District of Columbia in buildings owned by the Government a commission is hereby created, to be composed of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and one other member of said committee, to be appointed by said chairman; the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate and one other member of said committee, to be appointed by said chairman; the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and one other member of said committee, to be appointed by said chairman; the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives and one other member of said committee, to be appointed by said chairman; the Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds, the Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds, and the Supervising Architect or the Acting Supervising Architect of the Treasury during any vacancy in said office.

The said commission shall elect one of its members as chairman of the commission, and is authorized to employ such expert clerical or other services as it may deem necessary, and shall avail itself of the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts.

The said commission shall investigate and ascertain what public buildings are needed in the District of Columbia to provide suitable and adequate accommodations, with allowances for future expansion, for all of the offices, establishments, and public services of the Government in the District of Columbia, the proper location of such buildings, the probable cost thereof, and the probable cost of such new sites as they may deem it necessary for the Government to acquire.

Any vacancies in said commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments were made.

And then a small appropriation was made.

That provision does not specifically authorize the commission to inquire into the matter of rents; but it does provide a means whereby we shall, if we are wise, in the near future get rid of paying rents at all.

I have great hopes that this commission will practically solve this question, which is so often debated in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before the Senator from Utah took the floor this amendment had already been agreed to. Shall the vote be reconsidered?

Mr. SMOOT. I did not so understand. I was on my feet before—

The VICE PRESIDENT. We are two pages beyond this.

Mr. SMOOT. If that is the case, then I ask unanimous consent for a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the vote will be reconsidered. The Chair hears no objection.

The SECRETARY. It is now proposed, in lieu of the amount proposed to be inserted, \$138,689, to insert \$133,689.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 11, after the words "necessary expenses," to strike out "\$661,300" and insert "\$651,300," so as to make the clause read:

For farmers' cooperative demonstrations and for the study and demonstration of the best methods of meeting the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, \$651,300: *Provided*, That the expense of such service shall be defrayed from this appropriation and such cooperative funds as may be voluntarily contributed by State, county, and municipal agencies, associations of farmers, and individual farmers, universities, colleges, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, other local associations of business men, business organizations, and individuals within the State.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 9, after the words "necessary expenses," to strike out "\$143,000" and insert "\$165,000"; in line 10, after the word "Alaska," to strike out "\$48,000" and insert "\$60,000"; in line 11, after the words "Porto Rico," to strike out "\$40,000," and insert "\$50,000, of which sum \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used for the maintenance of a substation for the introduction, propagation of, and experiment with tropical and other fruit trees, in the event the Porto Rican Government, either by itself or in cooperation with individuals, establishes the substation on at least 50 acres of land, with the buildings, tools, implements, live stock, etc., as may be necessary," so as to make the clause read:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the island of Guam, including the erection of buildings, the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and all other necessary expenses, \$165,000, as follows: Alaska, \$60,000; Hawaii, \$40,000; Porto Rico, \$50,000, of which sum \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used for the maintenance of a substation for the introduction, propagation of, and experiment with tropical and other fruit trees, in the event the Porto Rican government, either by itself or in cooperation with individuals, establishes the substation on at least 50 acres of land, with the buildings, tools, implements, live stock, etc., as may be necessary; and Guam, \$15,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell such products as are obtained on the land belonging to the agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the island of Guam: *Provided*, That of the sum herein appropriated for the experiment station in Hawaii \$5,000 may be used in agricultural extension work in Hawaii.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 15, after the words "general expenses," to strike out "\$2,842,140" and insert "\$2,854,140," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$2,854,140.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 16, after the words "States Relations Service," to strike out "\$2,969,840" and insert "\$2,981,680," so as to make the clause read:

Total for States Relations Service, \$2,981,680.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering," on page 70, line 13, after the words "road materials," to strike out "\$37,780" and insert "\$42,780," so as to make the clause read:

For investigations of the chemical and physical character of road materials, \$42,780.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 71, line 2, after the word "conduits," to insert: "For demonstration work in irrigation from underground supplies of water through the construction of concrete or other reservoirs and the use of windmills and other appliances;" and in line 13, after the words "necessary expenses," to strike out "\$103,400," and insert: "\$105,900: *Provided*, That \$2,500 of this sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used for the establishment of an overhead system of irrigation at or near Denver, Colo: *Provided further*, That the United States shall be at no expense for land or water in connection with such plant;" so as to make the clause read:

For investigating and reporting upon the utilization of water in farm irrigation, including the best methods to apply in practice; the different kinds of power and appliances, and the development of equipment for farm irrigation; the flow of water in ditches, pipes, and other conduits; for demonstration work in irrigation from underground supplies of water through the construction of concrete or other reservoirs and the use of windmills and other appliances; the duty, apportionment, and measurement of irrigation water; the customs, regulations, and laws affecting irrigation; for the purchase and installation of equipment for experimental purposes; for the giving of expert advice and assistance; for the preparation and illustration of reports and bulletins on irrigation; for the employment of assistants and labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere; for rent outside of the District of Columbia; and for supplies and all necessary expenses, \$105,900: *Provided*, That \$2,500 of this sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used for the establishment of an overhead system of irrigation at or near Denver, Colo: *Provided further*, That the United States shall be at no expense for land or water in connection with such plant.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I want to ask the chairman of the committee what the object of that provision is. What is the purpose of establishing this overhead irrigation system at Denver?

Mr. GORE. I will say that it relates to what is known as the Skinner system and other systems of overhead irrigation. These systems have been successfully established in New Jersey, and perhaps in other parts of the country; and I think they might revolutionize the irrigation of the country, particularly in communities accessible to large markets.

Mr. JONES. If the Skinner system is successful, why send people out to Denver to demonstrate it.

Mr. GORE. I will say that a great many provisions in this bill have that object in view—that there is more or less conservatism in people where they become accustomed to a particular system.

Mr. JONES. What is the Skinner system? What sort of a system is it?

Mr. GORE. There are, I think, two different systems. I had occasion to visit a locality in New Jersey where one of the systems was in operation. I think 10 acres had been brought under the plant. Pipes some 30 or 40 feet apart are erected some 6 or 8 feet above the surface of the ground, with little openings or orifices about 4 feet apart in these pipes, and with a small gasoline engine the water is forced through these pipes. I think it requires only 30 or 40 pounds of pressure. The water comes out of these orifices in the form of vapor, and it is estimated that you can get the equivalent of an inch of rain in about 10 hours. I will say that the increased production on this 10 acres almost surpasses the dreams of avarice. The owner gave me figures where he had realized a thousand dollars an acre from products grown in this way.

In the West I do not think this system has ever been instituted at all. I think there is more or less doubt as to the success, especially of the vast and expensive systems upon which the West has been relying. At any rate, they are very expensive, and this system costs only about \$100 or \$120 an acre to install. Of course, it would succeed only in densely populated communities, in the vicinity of large markets; but I think it would be of incalculable value to the arid and semiarid regions in the western part of our country.

Mr. JONES. Are they to take some private land out there and install this plant in it?

Mr. GORE. I suppose the city of Denver would furnish the ground and furnish the water. I do not know, of course.

Mr. JONES. It says, "at or near Denver, Colo.: *Provided further*, That the United States shall be at no expense for land or water in connection with such plant." Has any proposition been submitted to the committee through the department or otherwise?

Mr. GORE. No, sir; there has not. I will say that the system does not seem to be generally known about through the country. For my own part, I learned of it rather by accident; but I think it contains such immense possibilities that I thought it ought to

be brought to the attention of the people in the western part of this country.

Mr. JONES. I will say to the Senator that, of course, anything that will develop new and efficient methods of irrigation, better than those already in use in the irrigated sections, of course, would be of value; but it seems to me that in irrigated sections like Colorado and out in my State they are pretty well up to date. Take it in my locality: It is nothing unusual to get products of a thousand dollars and even greater value an acre off of our land under our systems of irrigation. We have different systems of irrigation that we have tried and developed and put into operation.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

Mr. GORE. I will say that I happened to visit this system in New Jersey, and happened to be in Denver the following fall, and it occurred to me that it would be of incalculable value to that region; and of course, if instituted in Denver it would be given publicity over that entire region. I shall not insist on it if the Senator objects, but I should regret to see it go out.

Mr. JONES. I am not objecting to it. I am simply asking for information, and I want to know the reason why it should go in. If the committee, from the investigations they have made, and the Senators from Colorado, think it to be a wise expenditure of money, I shall not make any objection to it.

Mr. GORE. It is a very modest appropriation, and I think it might be worth multiplied millions to that region.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, relating to this matter I will say that I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This item was not proposed by myself, but at the same time I heartily concur in it. The situation is simply this: This is a system that has been demonstrated in various parts of the United States as applicable to places where there is intensive cultivation, where the amount that can be raised on a 10-acre or 5-acre tract amounts to probably two or three thousand dollars. This is a system which can be used with a little economy on their part, and on that account it is one of the tests that is going on. These people are doing it in other parts of the country. This is a general appropriation for a large sum of money, which includes an underground supply and other sources, and it seems to me Denver affords one of the opportunities to test it in as good a place as can be found. Denver, of course, is centrally located in the arid region. I believe that for testing irrigation of this kind applicable to the arid region, perhaps the best location that could be obtained would be near a large city where persons could be taken, and it could be demonstrated to them.

The appropriation is only \$2,500, and it is out of a sum to be expended. It would not reduce the amount of the appropriation if it is stricken out. For that reason it seems to me that it ought to remain, and let us see if there will not be some good result from it. If there is not, they will abandon it.

Mr. JONES. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that it does actually increase by \$2,500 the amount carried by the bill, but I make no criticism on that account.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I see that is the fact.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, of course I can only express an opinion as to this Skinner system being of any advantage whatever to the western country. I am free to say that in my opinion it will never be used. Of course I am not going to object if they want to spend \$2,500 to establish an overhead system at Denver; but if the statement made by the chairman is correct, that it will cost \$125 an acre to establish it without the water itself, I doubt very much whether there is any land out there that is not already provided with water which could stand that wonderful expense.

But I want to call the Senator's attention to a proposition which would be of immense benefit to the semiarid and arid part of our country. I believe that before many years there will be developed all through that arid country artesian wells. The lands are of hardly any value whatever to-day. People can not live upon them, and therefore they lay there as waste land. To sink an artesian well is too expensive for a poor man hunting a home to undertake. If the Government of the United States wants to assist in irrigation and open that vast waste of land, I may call it, to the people of the United States to make homes for them, I believe there can be no better way than to appropriate money for the Government to demonstrate whether artesian wells can be found in that country or not.

I have submitted an amendment to this bill. I know it is out of order to offer it at this time, but I speak of it because I am fully convinced that there are millions of acres of lands in the intermountain country, in that arid and semiarid district of the United States, that never can be cultivated unless by the development of an underground flow of water. If the Government could go into a county and demonstrate there that

it is possible to secure an artesian well of sufficient size, furnishing a quantity of water enough to develop the lands within a reasonable distance of it, then I believe capital would take hold of the proposition, advance the money to the entrymen, and that land, which is now absolutely of no use to the State in which it is located or to the Government of the United States in any way would become fertile land with homes.

At the proper time I want to offer an amendment for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I do not think this is the proper bill to which to attach an investigation of that section with reference to wells. I think that falls under the head of the Geological Survey. The difficulty about testing for water with an artesian well is that you can not determine by sinking a well at one point ordinarily what could be accomplished 20 miles from it unless a geological study is made. We had this subject up in committee for consideration and we concluded that it would be well for the Geological Survey to map out a good deal of that territory and see if there were any number of locations of the same character occupying a position where tests in a few would give information as to all.

I think the committee were unanimously of the opinion that we would like to see something of that sort done, but they thought it was necessary to take the knowledge of the members of the Geological Survey rather than of the Agricultural Department.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator he is perfectly correct in the statement he has made, that the item rightfully should go upon the sundry civil appropriation bill. I also wish to state that in the sundry civil appropriation bill that has just passed, the conference report upon which has been agreed to, there was an item which read as follows:

Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, of which \$100,000 may be used to test the existence of artesian and other underground water supplies suitable for irrigation in arid and semiarid regions by boring wells, one-half to be immediately available.

The Senate agreed to that amendment. It went into conference, and we are all aware of the unfortunate result of our conference on the sundry civil appropriation bill.

I wish to say to the Senator having this bill in charge that I take the statement he made to me as absolutely correct, that the committee intends next year, if nothing is done under the sundry civil appropriation bill, to handle this question in some way on the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. There is a provision in the sundry civil bill about artesian wells.

Mr. SMOOT. It was stricken out in conference.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the Senator is in error about that.

Mr. SMOOT. No; here is the record.

Mr. JONES. If the Senator will permit me, there has been carried an item in the sundry civil appropriation bill for the investigation of artesian and underground water. That, I think, is in the bill now, but they have held continually that they can not use that for sinking artesian wells, for boring wells.

Mr. OVERMAN. I know there is a provision in the bill.

Mr. JONES. I never could understand the theory why they could not do it, because I do not think they could investigate the underground supply without sinking a well; but that has been their holding. They never undertake to sink wells.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, they never spend a dollar in boring for water, and it is absolutely impossible to demonstrate whether you are going to get water unless you bore a well and find out whether water will come to the surface or not.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. PITTMAN. Do I understand that the Senator from Utah intends to offer an amendment later on?

Mr. SMOOT. Of course I know a point of order would be made against it, but I was hoping the chairman would not enforce a point of order. However, I am going to offer the amendment and I am going to plead with the chairman of the committee to accept the amendment and allow it to go into conference. Of course I recognize the fact that one objection will prevent it from going upon the appropriation bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator does not ask that now?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I am not asking that now.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator expects to do it when the time comes to offer individual amendments?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, regular order.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I hope to be here when the Senator from Utah offers that amendment. I should like to urge its passage.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I am opposed to putting this work on the Agricultural Department.

Mr. PITTMAN. I think I have the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Excuse me.

Mr. OVERMAN. I call for the regular order. There is nothing before the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I thought the Senator from Nevada had concluded his remark. I beg his pardon.

Mr. PITTMAN. I simply want to add my plea to that of the Senator from Utah that the chairman of the committee will not raise a point of order against it and that no other Senator will. I think it should be agreed to after our unfortunate experience with the sundry civil appropriation bill. There is no doubt that that is the proper bill. I have no doubt there are a great many proper amendments that were put on that bill, which upon proper consideration would have passed. As I had the opportunity of stating the other day, I am very sorry that the conference report on the sundry civil bill was agreed to. But it was agreed to. The Senate seemed to think it was necessary, that an emergency had arisen, and that it should be put through. Owing to the haste we were debarred from considering amendments of the kind the Senator has referred to.

I trust a point of order will not be raised against this amendment, but that we will be allowed to consider it on its merits, and I am satisfied that then the Senate will recognize its merits.

As has been said by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], we have never had available an appropriation to seek out artesian and subsurface water in those arid States. The Government owns all that vast quantity of land. It has not been taken up under the homestead act or under the desert-land act or under any existing act, and it never will be taken up unless subsurface waters can be found, waters that are unknown to-day.

If the Government will grant that land to the States the States will develop that water. The States now have no interest in it and the Government certainly should take some steps to give some value to that land, either by developing the water or turning it over to the States to develop.

I trust when this matter comes up it will be allowed to be considered on its merits.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, there are so many absurd and useless appropriations and there is such an enormous waste of public money in the Agricultural appropriation bill that it is hardly worth while to object to a small item like this. But speaking of the whole section of which the proposed amendment is a part, the absurdity of the National Government operating from Washington, undertaking to educate the people of Colorado, for example, in the matter of irrigation, must be apparent to anybody who has any knowledge of the situation.

I suppose Colorado has been one of the most active and enterprising States in the whole Union in the matter of developing and supplying water for irrigation purposes, both surface water and underground, and people there could probably teach the Agricultural Department a good deal more than that department could teach them.

Mr. President, the National Government has no ownership in the water that is devoted to irrigation. It has no control or no right to regulate the use of the water in any way whatever. It is a jurisdiction in all its parts that belongs to the States, not to the National Government. There is no earthly reason under those circumstances why the Government should be expending its money for any such purpose as is included in this particular section of the bill. If the National Government has public land that it desires to irrigate, it is perfectly legitimate for it to put down wells for the purpose of discovering artesian water or to resort to any other means of developing and supplying water for the use of its own land.

We undertook to do that in the establishment of the Reclamation Service, which, in the beginning, was perfectly legitimate and within the power and jurisdiction of the National Government. But we have extended it far beyond that. The Reclamation Service is now devoted in large part to supplying water to private land, not land owned by the Government. Some of the reclamation projects are wholly and entirely devoted to supplying water to private lands and not to publicly owned lands.

I think it is a great question, Mr. President, whether a project of that kind if devoted wholly to the supply of water to private lands is constitutional or within the power and jurisdiction of the National Government. But here is a proposition now for the Government to go into this matter of developing water, teaching the States how to develop a supply of water from underground and from surface sources. There is not any legitimate reason why the Government should do any such thing as

that. While, of course, it is intended to be a benefit to the Western States, one of which I represent here, in part, I think it is an illegitimate use of the public funds and ought not to be done.

There are a great many other proposed appropriations here for the benefit, for example, of the South in the cultivation of their crops, and other sections of the country for various purposes. A great many of them, I think, are illegitimate. We have gone beyond all reason in appropriations made for the use of the Agricultural Department. I do not know where we are going to stop. We are broadening out the service constantly year after year. The amounts appropriated are increasing as we go along until after a while we will be in a situation where we are coming near bankruptcy on the part of the Government, taking this and other departments into account.

It is a matter that is a rather serious one to me, and I am not saying these few words about it for the purpose of making any attempt to defeat this appropriation, because I think that would be an idle effort. Every attempt almost that is made here to get money out of the Public Treasury for the benefit of States is successful. I have contended against it at various times with practically no success. I am not going to take up the time of the Senate now in making any argument against this particular appropriation, but I think it is time that the Congress of the United States should be considering how far we can legitimately go and how far we ought to go in making appropriations of this kind.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to refer to the suggested amendment of the Senator from Utah at this time, because if nobody objects to it I shall object to it. I shall object to this work being attached to the duties of the Agricultural Department.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to give my reasons for it.

Mr. GORE. Let us pass over the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. While the discussion is on I wish to state my views on this question that they may go into the Record at this point.

I am opposed to putting upon the Agricultural Department a responsibility for which I consider it utterly unfit. The question of sinking wells for artesian water is not a farming project, comprehended by men who know how to cultivate the soil; it is a great geological problem; and the Agricultural Department has not experts who are competent to handle it; the Geological Survey has experts who are or should be masters of that subject, so far as it can be determined; and to make an appropriation for the Agricultural Department to sink wells to test out the problem of obtaining artesian water would be simply a waste of money.

That is why I shall object to tying it to the Agricultural appropriation bill. I have at all times been ready and anxious to see the Geological Survey proceed with tests of that kind in connection with their studies. My objection to putting it on the Agricultural Department is that I do not think they have any organization competent to handle it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in reference to the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia and also with reference to the suggestion of the Senator from Utah that this amendment would not be in order on this bill. I think the amendment will be in order because it has been estimated by the head of the department. There is an estimate here. The mere fact that it has heretofore been carried under the Geological Survey or some other bureau does not preclude it from being in order, in my judgment, under the rule. But that question can be considered when the time comes.

I want to suggest to the Senator from Georgia that while it is true there has heretofore been carried an appropriation for the investigation of artesian water under the Geological Survey, in my judgment there is no reason why the Agricultural Department could not do this work just as well as it is done by the Geological Survey. I know that that Survey investigates the geological conditions of the earth and so on, and makes its guesses with reference to whether or not there is artesian water here, there, or yonder. That information is available for the Agricultural Department; but, furthermore, that information is not very reliable. I myself know of one place in my State where the Geological Survey made an investigation and reported that artesian water could not be gotten, yet to-day there are 25 or 30 wells, each one flowing water enough to irrigate from 80 to 160 acres. By their scientific methods they can not tell whether or not there is artesian water. The only really efficient way to do it is to sink a well and see whether or not water is there; and the Agricultural Department is just as able to sink a well at a place where there are possibilities of obtaining artesian water as is the Geological Survey.

The Geological Survey do not send out officials from Washington, but they have people go out and get a well-drilling machine and put the well down. They do it by contract under the appropriation.

So I can not see very much force in the objection to putting the provision on the Agricultural bill. If it is an important thing to be done, if it is a necessary thing to be done, there is, in my judgment, not any bill to which it is more germane than to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which has to do with the development of agriculture, and that is exactly what the matter of developing artesian wells has to do with. So I hope when the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] comes up, I shall be able to be present.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington a question. Would not that amendment more properly go on the river and harbor bill?

Mr. JONES. In some sections of the country, possibly, from what has been said here.

Mr. KENYON. Does this provision cover the sinking of artesian wells in the bottom of some of the rivers?

Mr. JONES. I have not as yet found any reference to them. I am satisfied, however, that if there had been anything of that kind here the Senator from Iowa would have gotten his eagle eye on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 72, line 14, after the words "necessary expenses," to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$27,805," so as to make the clause read:

For investigating farm domestic water supply and drainage disposal, the construction of farm buildings, and other rural engineering problems involving mechanical principles, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, \$27,805.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 19, after the words "general expenses," to strike out "\$510,820" and insert "\$526,125"; so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$526,125.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 20, after the words "Rural Engineering," to strike out "\$599,200" and insert "\$614,505," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering, \$614,505.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Markets and Rural Organization," on page 74, line 9, after the word "fruits," to strike out "and"; and in line 10, after the word "vegetables," to insert "and other products," so as to make the clause read:

For collecting and distributing, by telegraph, mail, and otherwise, timely information on the supply, commercial movement, disposition, and market prices of fruits, vegetables, and other products, \$136,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, after line 10, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to gather from stockmen, live stock associations, State live-stock and agricultural boards, common carriers, stockyards, commission firms, live-stock exchanges, slaughtering and meat packing companies, and others information relative to the number of different classes and grades of marketable live stock, especially cattle, hogs, and sheep in the principal live-stock feeding districts and growing sections; prices, receipts, and shipments of the different classes and grades of cattle, hogs, and sheep at live-stock market centers; prices of meats and meat-food products and the amounts of such products in storage; to compile and publish such information at such frequent intervals as most effectively to guide producers, consumers, and distributors in the sale and purchase of live stock, meats, and other animal products; and to gather and publish any related information pertaining to marketing and distribution of live stock, meats, and animal by-products, the sum of \$65,000: *Provided*, That \$15,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. WARREN. I move to amend the amendment of the committee by striking out the proviso on page 75, line 3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the amendment of the committee by striking out the proviso on page 75, line 3, as follows:

Provided, That \$15,000 shall be immediately available.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 75, line 4, after the word "For," to strike out "the investigation and demonstration" and insert "investigating, demonstrating, and promoting the use," so as to make the clause read:

For investigating, demonstrating, and promoting the use of standards for the different grades, qualities, and conditions of cotton, and for investigating the ginning, grading, stapling, baling, marking, compressing, and tare of cotton, \$48,000: *Provided*, That of the sum thus appropriated \$28,620 may be used for testing the waste, tensile strength, and bleaching qualities of the different grades and classes of cotton in order to determine their spinning value and for demonstrating the results of such tests.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 2, after the word "methods," to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$35,000," so as to make the clause read:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the several States in the employment of agents to acquire and diffuse useful information connected with the distribution and marketing of farm products through investigational, demonstrational, or extension methods, \$35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 7, after the words "general expenses," to strike out "\$541,960" and insert "\$621,960," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$621,960.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 10, after the words "provisions of the," to strike out "act approved August 18, 1914 (Public, No. 174, 63d Cong.), entitled 'An act to tax the privilege of dealing on exchanges, boards of trade, and similar places in contracts of sale of cotton for future delivery, and for other purposes,'" and insert "United States cotton-futures act," so as to make the clause read:

Enforcement of the United States cotton-futures act: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the United States cotton-futures act, including all expenses necessary for the purchase of equipment and supplies; for travel; for the employment of persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere; and for all other expenses, including rent outside of the District of Columbia, that may be necessary in executing the provisions of this act, \$120,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 22, after the words "Rural Organization," to strike out "\$792,590" and insert "\$872,590," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Office of Markets and Rural Organization, \$872,590.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Enforcement of the insecticide act," on page 77, line 20, after the word "purposes," to strike out "\$80,410" and insert "\$85,670," so as to make the clause read:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of April 26, 1910, entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded Paris greens, lead arsenates, and other insecticides, and also fungicides, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," \$85,670.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 21, after the words "insecticide act," to strike out "\$105,000" and insert "\$110,260," so as to make the clause read:

Total for enforcement of the insecticide act, \$110,260.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Horticultural Board," on page 79, line 4, after the words "ordinary work," to strike out "\$21,758,393" and insert "\$22,178,527," so as to make the clause read:

Total, Department of Agriculture, for routine and ordinary work, \$22,178,527.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous," on page 79, after line 12, to insert:

International Farm Congress and Soil-Products Exposition: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and make an exhibit illustrative of the investigations, products, and processes relating to farming in the subhumid, arid, and semiarid regions of the United States at the International Soil-Products Exposition, to be held at El Paso, Tex., in conjunction with the International Farm Congress, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, including labor and all expenses in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$20,000.

The President is hereby authorized to extend invitations to other nations to appoint delegates or representatives to the International Farm Congress, to be held at El Paso, Tex., in connection with said International Soil-Products Exposition: *Provided*, That no appropriation shall be granted or used for the expenses of delegates.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, after line 15, to insert:

That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to designate such areas on any lands which have been or which may hereafter be purchased by the United States under the provisions of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L., p. 961), entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable streams," and acts supplementary thereto and amendatory thereof, as should, in his opinion, be set aside for the protection of game animals, birds, or fish; and whoever shall hunt, catch, trap, willfully disturb, or kill any kind of game animal, game or nongame bird, or fish, or take the eggs of any such bird on any lands so set aside, or in or on the waters thereof, except

under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time prescribe, shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator in charge of the bill for his construction of this proposed amendment before I raise a point of order in regard to it.

Mr. GORE. I shall first have to refer to the history of the attempt to secure this legislation. I think a year ago the Senate committee recommended an amendment to enact and enforce a criminal statute in connection with certain forest reserves in the State of North Carolina. It went out, either on a point of order or otherwise. Western Senators seemed to fear the establishment of such a precedent. Now, this year the amendment has been drawn to correspond with the forest reservation acquired under what is known as the Weeks Act; it is limited to the land acquired in pursuance of that act. It is not extended by the terms of the proposed statute to all those lands, but the President, upon proclamation, can set aside reserves; and after they are so established the penal provisions authorized in this act will become applicable.

I understand that in North Carolina there is a good deal of depredation on the game in the forest reserves, and to prevent that is really the point to be accomplished by this legislation. We wished to safeguard the reserves of the West and to prevent the excitement of any apprehension on that score. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] can explain the necessity for this provision more fully and forcefully than I can.

Mr. BORAH. So far as I am individually concerned, if I can be assured that this amendment is limited to the land covered by the Appalachian Forest Reserve purchase I shall make no objection to it.

Mr. GORE. If it is not so limited, we will make it so, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. OVERMAN. It refers particularly to the Appalachian Forest Reserve act.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Let me suggest to the Senator—

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. SHAFROTH. That it be amended by inserting the words "in the State of North Carolina."

Mr. OVERMAN. It might be desirable to apply it to Virginia or Georgia.

Mr. President, I will state the purpose of the amendment if I have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. OVERMAN. I want to say that in the Appalachian Range the Government has acquired what is known as the Vanderbilt estate. Mr. Vanderbilt had established a game preserve there, and the only purpose of this amendment is to protect the game on that preserve.

Mr. SMOOT. At Biltmore?

Mr. OVERMAN. At Biltmore, N. C. That is all the amendment is designed to accomplish. The land purchased there constitutes a game preserve. The State of North Carolina has given its consent to this legislation; and it is proposed that the President may set aside that land. That is all that is intended, and it is to apply to that particular place. We have made it general, however, as to the Appalachian Range reservations under the Weeks bill, because there might be some land just across the line in Tennessee that it would be desirable to cover. The Senator will see that the provision is so limited, because reference is made particularly to the Weeks Act.

Mr. BORAH. When I first had my attention drawn to this amendment, I did not observe that it was limited to the lands covered by Thirty-sixth Statutes at Large, page 961.

Mr. OVERMAN. I tried to limit it to the particular land referred to in the Weeks act. It only applies to land acquired under that act.

Mr. BORAH. There is no doubt, then, as I understand, but that it was the purpose and intent of the committee to limit it to that.

Mr. OVERMAN. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. BORAH. So far as I am concerned, I shall make no further objection to it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Will the Senator permit a suggestion? In order to make it perfectly clear, why could we not put, at the end of the section, language similar to this:

That this game preserve shall apply only to lands purchased by the Government under the act named herein?

Mr. OVERMAN. You would have to read the act and see what it means. It says here that the land to be designated is the land purchased under the act of March 1, 1911.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is the same act I am referring to.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is the act.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I say, why not provide that this game preserve shall be limited to the lands purchased under the act of March 1, 1911?

Mr. OVERMAN. I have no objection to that amendment. It is limited.

Mr. BORAH. I see no particular objection to the amendment. I think, if the Senator from Arizona will observe, that upon reading the first few lines of the amendment he will find that that limit is already there.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes.

Mr. BORAH (reading)—

That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to designate such areas on any lands which have been, or which may hereafter be, purchased by the United States under the provisions of the act of March 1, 1911.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I think it is clear enough myself.

Mr. BORAH. I think so.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. But in order to eliminate any possible objection I made that suggestion.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it is specifically stated in the amendment that it applies only to the so-called Weeks Act, and it can not be made applicable to any other part of the country.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. JONES. As I understand from the Senator from North Carolina, the real purpose of this provision is to cover a particular situation in his State. If that is true, I think it ought to be limited to that, and we ought to put in the words.

Mr. OVERMAN. New Hampshire has some land—

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, it applies also to the White Mountain region in New Hampshire, where the National Forest Reservation Commission, under the so-called Weeks Act, has purchased quite a tract of land.

Mr. JONES. I know, Mr. President, that it applies to all this land, but the Senator from North Carolina said that before these lands were purchased there was a game preserve there in North Carolina, and the purpose of this is to protect that particular game preserve.

Mr. OVERMAN. In addition to that, I said that other States in this range ought to have the same protection.

Mr. JONES. I understand; but there is the situation that already exists in North Carolina. Now, there is no suggestion that there is any special need of a game preserve in any of these other places.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator from New Hampshire wants it to apply to his State.

Mr. JONES. He simply suggested that the Weeks law does apply to it. Now, I do not know whether there is any particular need for a game preserve up there or not.

Mr. OVERMAN. There may be. I do not know.

Mr. JONES. If there should be, of course I would not object to it if the Senator from New Hampshire says there is need of it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Our people are very much interested in the protection of game, and we have in New Hampshire pretty nearly all kinds of game that you will find in any part of the country. I feel very sure that they would be delighted to have a game preserve on that Government reservation.

Mr. BORAH. I shall make no objection if it is just confined to the area east of the Allegheny Mountains. I am not sufficiently informed as to the needs or conditions of that country to pass intelligently upon its needs.

Mr. OVERMAN. I want to say that my amendment that was submitted to the committee said "purchased by the United States in the western part of North Carolina." The Agricultural committee itself struck that out, so that it might apply to Virginia, Georgia, Tennessee, and New Hampshire and the White Mountains.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I shall not make the point of order against this proposition; but it does seem to me that we are placing a tremendous authority in the Secretary of Agriculture when we make a violation of his rules and regulations a misdemeanor punishable by fine or imprisonment. These rules and regulations are recommended by bureau officers, and they are changed from time to time. All sorts of rules are made, and everybody is supposed to know what those rules and regulations are, and yet they are in no statute anywhere. They are not found in any law. It does seem to me that we ought to be careful about that; but I want to suggest an amendment to this language. In line 7, page 81, after the word "such," I want to insert the word "general," so that it will read "except

under such general rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time prescribe."

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Washington that I think it is a very great outrage to put general legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. JONES. Oh, yes. Well, we have done it many times since the Senate voted against it.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. We have failed to do it several times, too.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I have this amendment which I will offer, if there is any objection, to cover that point of order:

Provided, That this provision shall be effective only—

Mr. JONES. I am not going to make any point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 81, line 7, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert, before the word "rules," the word "general."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have no objection to that; but I do not believe this amendment is subject to the criticism which is made by the Senator from Washington. If I thought so, I would not vote for it. I would have made a point of order. It is not the violation of the rules and regulations which is a crime. The statute makes it a crime to kill this game. The exceptions are established by the rules and regulations, but the violation is the violation of the statute. That is the way I construe the amendment from a hasty reading.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is all.

Mr. JONES. Oh, I see.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator from Washington does not insist on his amendment?

Mr. JONES. Yes; I think my amendment should go in. I think these exceptions should be made by general rule, and not by special rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in.

Mr. OVERMAN. All right; I have no objection.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill, beginning on page 81, line 11, with the subhead "Part A."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will ask that we pass to page 123, omitting the present consideration of the items which immediately follow where we are now.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator want to return to some amendments?

Mr. GORE. No. The Senator realizes that there are several riders contained in this bill. We have reached them now. I think we had better pass to page 123, where there are some items more directly connected with the bill as an appropriation bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before that is done I want to call the attention of Senators who are more disturbed about general legislation on an appropriation bill than I am or have been to the fact that another body has placed on this bill two statutes—possibly three statutes—which we are asked to consider and approve. I think very likely they will be approved by the Senate; but in all the period that my service covers I have never known such a mass of general legislation to be put on an appropriation bill as we have now before us. It may be possibly for the public good and desirable that it should be done.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, we have this consolation in regard to it, that we still have the rules of the Senate, if it is not proper to do so.

Mr. GALLINGER. The rules of the Senate, however, would not apply to provisions incorporated in the bill by another body. We could not strike them out by making a point of order if we tried.

I thought it was well, in a few words, to call attention to this extraordinary method of legislation, because we are oftentimes met by the very body that placed this mass of general legislation in this bill with the suggestion that the Senate places general legislation on appropriation bills; and while we have sometimes put one statute on an appropriation bill, I have never known an instance where we put a code of laws on an appropriation bill, which we come pretty near doing in this bill.

Of course the legislation will remain on the bill, and will remain on the bill to be used as a precedent in the future that our custom here in both Houses to some extent in the case of contested legislation—legislation that can not get through the two bodies under debate, under discussion, and by vote—is to find an easy way, the line of least resistance, by carefully smuggling it into an appropriation bill or openly putting it

there; and, in violation of the rules of both Houses, we legislate in this way.

As I have said, I have not been disturbed to the extent that some other Senators have in reference to this custom, which is contrary to our rules, and I only call attention to the fact to show that the Senate is a small offender compared to what has been done in this bill by another body.

The reading of the bill was resumed, beginning with line 25, page 123.

The next amendment was, on page 124, line 20, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$70,000" and insert "\$55,000," so as to make the clause read:

That not to exceed \$55,000 of the lump-sum appropriations herein made for the Department of Agriculture shall be available for the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles and motor boats necessary in the conduct of the field work of the Department of Agriculture outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$10,000 of this amount shall be expended for the purchase of such vehicles and boats, and that such vehicles and boats shall be used only for official service outside the District of Columbia, but this shall not prevent the continued use for official service of motor trucks in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall, on the first day of each regular session of Congress, make a report to Congress showing the amount expended under the provisions of this paragraph during the preceding fiscal year.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I would like to say a word about this appropriation of \$70,000 in the House bill, reduced—happily reduced—by the Senate committee to \$55,000. This appropriation is made as a lump sum, to be expended by the Department of Agriculture "for the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles and motor boats necessary in the conduct of the field work of the Department of Agriculture outside the District of Columbia." How are these automobiles and these carriages, to be drawn—I presume, by dapple-gray horses—and these motor boats to be used?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the principal use of these means of conveyance is in connection with the Forestry Service. They are necessary in the suppression of fires and patrolling the forest reserves, and the motor boats are used on the lakes of the forest reserves. The Senate committee reduced the House appropriation for this purpose from \$70,000 to \$55,000.

Mr. STONE. I see that and approve it.

Mr. GORE. I think the principal use is in connection with the Forestry Service. For a time they used, in connection with the hog-cholera service, the motor cycles. I am not sure whether that practice is continued or not.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee says, as I understand him, that these motor machines—automobiles, and so forth—are to be used in connection with the Forestry Service. That means they are to be used for riding around over the forest reserves and in going when it is necessary to points where there is danger of forest fires, and so on. Machines of this kind cost considerable money.

Mr. GORE. I will say they do not really use automobiles, as I understand. They use Fords, as a rule, in connection with this service.

Mr. STONE. Well, the Ford is a good machine. I can certify to that from some experience with it. The Ford machine can go into places where few other automobiles are capable of going.

Mr. GORE. I think that is the reason why they are used—because they are most serviceable in connection with this work.

Mr. STONE. I do not believe that even a Ford machine could follow a deer or a rabbit through a forest jungle. I have heard it said here in debate, off and on, that these forest reserves interfere with the development of the States where they are located, partly because the local authorities can not make roads through them so as to connect one place with another place across these large areas. So it must be that the question of roads is an important consideration. Even a Ford machine must have a road of some kind, and even a Ford machine costs from \$450 to \$500. Now, you can buy a mighty good horse for about \$150, and I think a good horse would be more serviceable in finding one's way through a forest to a given point than an automobile.

Mr. President, we are getting very aristocratic in these days. We have now reached the point when even a forester looking after forest reserves, and whose duty it is to run here and there on his reserve to look after some little business connected with his official duty—going out from the home the Government provides for him—a Senator by my side remarks, sotto voce, "and also provides him with a uniform"

Mr. OVERMAN. Also with a green feather in his hat.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from North Carolina says, "with a green feather in his hat." I do not know as to the exact accuracy of that, but I do know that we supply all his needs, including a decent salary. Now, when he wants to go across the

hills or through the tangled forest to look after and defend his reserve against depredations or against forest fires, I would like to know if he could not use a \$150 horse to better advantage than a \$500 automobile?

We are getting to be too aristocratic. I think appropriations like this ought to go out of the bill.

Mr. President, I do not follow appropriation bills very closely; my time is occupied with other things; but now and then when I do look at them I find items of this kind that astound me. That great committees of the Senate and the House should put such things in appropriation bills is amazing; and yet it has been done year after year ever since I have been here. Instead of appropriating \$70,000, as the House did, or \$55,000, as our Senate committee recommends, I think if we would put in, say, about fifteen or twenty thousand dollars to buy horses and mules for this service we would save a lot of money to the Treasury and the people, and at the same time furnish a better means for performing a better service.

I know my friend from Oklahoma, the distinguished chairman of this committee, does not wish to throw the money of the people away idly or extravagantly, merely to comply with the whims and caprices of people who happen to be in the public service here and there. He must be opposed to that sort of policy.

Mr. President, speaking of automobiles, and of carriages drawn by pretty horses, with liveried drivers wearing plug hats, cockades pinned on them, yellow boots with breeches stuck in the tops of the boots, and all that, it is a common sight in Washington. I have nothing to remark about it when vain men and vainer women do it at their own expense; but it is a disagreeable sight to the eyes of many old-fashioned and really refined people when we see this snobbery exploited at the public expense. I have a machine; but I bought and paid for it out of my own pocket, as have other Senators who have ventured upon this extravagance. I think the business of Senators and Members of the House is just as important as the business of Secretaries or Assistant Secretaries of executive departments, and certainly as important as that of the clerks in these departments. But we Senators pay for our own transportation.

I know that I have to go almost every day from one department to another on official business, and I have been doing it for many years, and when I did not own a machine—and I did not own one until very recently—I borrowed one, if I could, or I went on the street cars or walked. I think the business I am sent here to perform—whether I perform it acceptably and well or not may be a question—but the business, in itself as a business, is as important, and indeed far more important, than that imposed upon the officials, generally speaking, who throng the executive departments in Washington.

Mr. President, for years we have been making headway in this direction. We are still progressing. Now we are proposing to go out into the forest reserves and into services of that kind to provide such officials with automobiles and motor boats to float up and down the streams that cross their reservations and to furnish them with such means of recreation and diversion. We have been doing this sort of thing from year to year for a long time, and it is getting worse and worse from year to year. If I could have my way, I would cast all such things out of these bills; but I know I can not have my way. I have seen this question tested often enough to know I can not have my way. All I can do is to express my opinion now, as I have heretofore, and leave it at that. All I can do is to protest.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator really think it is growing worse and worse?

Mr. STONE. I am quite sure it is not growing any better.

Mr. WARREN. Sometimes an open confession is good for the soul.

Mr. GORE. I entirely sympathize with the horny-handed and practical observations of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. Not very horny-handed.

Mr. GORE. Yes; they are.

Mr. STONE. I have a pretty soft hand.

Mr. GORE. The observations are horny-handed, and the Senator deserves credit for them. I am willing to join with him in curtailing extravagance, beginning with battleships and going all the way up or down to Ford machines.

The Senator is under an erroneous impression at least as to a portion of this appropriation. Not a dollar of this entire amount can be used in the District of Columbia in connection with high official personages or liveried servants. By express terms the money is to be used outside of the District of Columbia.

The Senator from Missouri is of course familiar with the history of this struggle in the Senate. Some two or three years ago the sundry civil bill contained a provision undertaking to prohibit the purchase and use of automobiles for officials within the District of Columbia. The Committee on Agriculture fol-

lowed that precedent. It happened that the succeeding year there was one machine used between the District of Columbia and some farm over in Virginia, which seemed to us to violate the terms of the preceding act, and we adopted language that would even exclude the use of that machine for that purpose. The Agricultural Committee has prevented the use and abuse as far as legislation can do it of machines by officials in the District of Columbia. This appropriation relates to the field service.

I shall not discuss the relative merits of the automobile and horse-drawn vehicles, or horses and mules, in connection with this particular service. I may say that a great many business men, that a great many department stores, that a great many grocery stores are substituting the machine for delivery purposes as against the horse and the mule, I assume on the ground of economy. I know not what other motive might inspire such a change.

Mr. President, we have had forest fires in this country which entailed losses of millions and millions of dollars. We have expended more than a half a million dollars in a single year for the prevention of forest fires. This appropriation is in the nature of an insurance. It is a species of preparedness, preparation to anticipate the ravages of forest fires, preparation to minimize their enormous losses on Government property. While the horse and the mule might serve on certain trails threading the forest, we have spent much money upon the construction of roads to aid in the prevention and suppression of forest fires. Upon these highways there can be no question as between the relative merit of the automobile and the Missouri mule, although I would not detract either from the character or the reputation of the Missouri mule. The committee reduced the appropriation from \$70,000 to \$55,000, the amount carried last year, and if the Senate, upon consideration of this measure shall decide to eliminate it I shall have no further protest to make.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the fact that prior to the passage of the act which was approved on the 16th day of July, 1914, appropriations had been in lump sums without any specification as to whether automobiles should be purchased or not. There was considerable discussion of the question, and this is the provision that was put in the legislative, executive, and judicial act approved July 16, 1914:

SEC. 5. No appropriation made in this or any other act shall be available for the purchase of any motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicle for the service of any of the executive departments or other Government establishments, or any branch of the Government service, unless specific authority is given therefor, and after the close of the fiscal year 1915 there shall not be expended out of any appropriation made by Congress any sum for purchase, maintenance, repair, or operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for any branch of the public service of the United States unless the same is specifically authorized by law, and in the estimates for the fiscal year 1916 and subsequent fiscal years there shall be submitted in detail estimates for such necessary appropriations as are intended to be used for purchase, maintenance, repair, or operation of all motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, specifying the sums required, the public purposes for which said vehicles are intended, and the officials or employees by whom the same are to be used.

This statement is made in the House report:

In compliance with the provisions of section 5 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act of July 16, 1914 (38 Stat., 454), a paragraph is included authorizing the expenditure of not exceeding \$70,000 from the lump-sum appropriations of the various bureaus for the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles and motor boats for the conduct of the field work of the Department of Agriculture. This paragraph does not carry any appropriation. It simply grants the specific authority required by the act of July 16, 1914.

Mr. President, there is no question but that these vehicles are a source of economy. There is not any question but what they are needed, and needed not only in that branch of the Government but also by the field agents that are sent out by the Government.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not at all familiar with the conditions in the Forest Service, particularly in the forest reserves. I will ask the Senator if any considerable part of the forest reserves can be traversed by automobiles.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Quite a little. Those roads are built by the State, however, and many of them were built before any forest reserves were established. There are a number of roads there but not nearly as many as there ought to be.

Mr. GALLINGER. As a rule, they are trails, are they not?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No. There are parts of them that are trails. For instance, take the town of Aspen in the State of Colorado and the town of Leadville, Colo., there are roads there and good automobile roads, put there before there was any forest reserve, and they can use those in going long distances. It is almost imperative that there should be some kind of vehicle of this nature employed. It seems to me the fact that the com-

mittee reduced the amount from \$70,000 to \$55,000, and I doubt the wisdom of it, shows that the committee were careful in making this appropriation.

Mr. GALLINGER. Simply for information, what method do the agents employ for travel where there is merely a trail?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Horses.

Mr. GALLINGER. Horseback?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; horseback. But you can not take an apparatus of sufficient quantity to do any good for the purpose of extinguishing fire on horseback, and there are a good many of these men who are employed as supervisors and agents of the Government in the forest reserve. There are over a thousand of them and there is a limited number of automobiles that could be employed. It is not every one who has an automobile. That would be out of the question. Of course they are very limited, but there are certain places that they regard as being more important than others. Perhaps there are places where more than one agent stays, and on that account an automobile can be used to advantage in going from one part of the reservation to the other.

Mr. GALLINGER. I did not mean to express any hostility to the provision, but I wanted a little information. That is all.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It seems to me this is a wise provision if we are going to administer the affairs of the forest reserves in a proper manner.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the amendment will go through all right. I shall not make any motion; everyone here knows it ought not to be in the bill.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I think the only question involved in this controversy would be the extent to which we furnish automobiles rather than the fact that we do furnish some automobiles. I do not know whether we are furnishing too many or not. The question which was asked by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] is based upon a supposition which very generally prevails throughout the East, and that is that these forest reserves are reserves which are covered by forests, which is a very great misapprehension. The fact is that there are thousands of acres in and hundreds of miles to be traveled through these forest reserves where the roads are practically as good for automobiles as they are here in Washington. These reserves are not all that mountainous, forest-covered region which naturally presents itself to the mind when you think of a forest reserve.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, if it is simply territory denuded of trees, what particular need is there of its being traveled for the purpose of protecting it?

Mr. BORAH. That raises a different question, a question which I have often presented here, but nevertheless they are traversed by these people who are there for the purpose of traveling over them, and they can travel much more expeditiously and cheaply in automobiles ordinarily than they can otherwise.

But I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will not be misled by the supposition that these forest reserves are of that kind which one would naturally suppose them to be by the name which they bear.

I was traveling across one of our forest reserves some three years ago in company with a gentleman from the East. After we had driven in an automobile for hours I said to him, "Now, you have been traveling across a certain named forest reserve." He said, "These jokes are all right, but this is a little exaggerated, it seems to me." I said, "This is, in fact, a forest reserve." There was not a tree in sight, unless it was some willow or some small shrubbery or something of that kind along practically a dry stream; neither had there ever been a tree upon that land. The Lord had never been able to make a tree grow on it, but it was within a very large forest reserve. That is the condition we have to deal with in regard to this matter. Of course, not all lands in the reserve are such, but vast areas are, and therein lies the "winter of our discontent."

Mr. SHAFROTH. Let me suggest to the Senator from Idaho also the fact that nearly one-third of the total area that is included in the forest reserves has been located on that line which we call above the timber line, where nature has decreed that no tree can ever grow. Yet millions and millions of acres are included in that area.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Colorado a question. He read the statute which provides under certain limitations for the purchase and use of automobiles, motor-drawn or horse-drawn vehicles. That statute also provides that there shall be an itemized estimate of each of these and showing by what officer it is to be used. I assume that itemized and particular estimate has been furnished for this year's appropriation.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think so. I have not the Book of Estimates here.

Mr. GORE. I have a letter here from the Secretary of Agriculture, which I will ask to have printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. But that would hardly form an estimate in the intention of the law. It is the intention of the law evidently that among the regular estimates to be furnished shall be an estimate in particular of these vehicles and the persons who are to use them.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state to the Senator that I do not know whether it is in the Book of Estimates, but I will examine and let him know.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Can the chairman of the committee tell me?

Mr. GORE. I intend to ask to have a letter from the department printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The letter of the department is not an estimate.

Mr. GORE. I understood the Senator desired to know what information there was in the Book of Estimates on the subject.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Yes. The chairman was unable to state it at that time?

Mr. GORE. I can not do it without consulting the Book of Estimates.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state to the Senator I will examine it and let him know.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word at this time.

Mr. GORE. I understand that the entire subject is set out in detail in the Book of Estimates.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I am not going to delay the consideration of this matter very long, but I can not refrain from expressing my delight that the senatorial conscience has been somewhat aroused on the question of squandering public funds to provide luxurious means of transportation for the well-paid officeholders in Washington. I think if we are going to start to cut down expenses in furnishing luxuries to the officers of the Government we ought to commence in the District of Columbia.

The vehicles provided for in this paragraph are to be used, I understand, for the protection of public property. They are not luxuries, such as are enjoyed by some of our distinguished well-paid officeholders. If we are going to begin to economize in the matter of buying automobiles and carriages, I insist that we begin where it is doing some harm or costing something to the American people. If Government property needs protection, it is the duty of Congress to provide the means of protecting it regardless of the cost. This is not the place for economy. I for one believe that we can save a good many thousand dollars a year by stopping the furnishing of automobiles to officials of this Government in Washington whose salaries are sufficient to justify them in paying for their own automobiles or horse-drawn carriages, if they desire them. It is in my opinion an unwarranted prodigality of public funds to provide these luxuries for the private use of the public officers.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I wish to say that it seems to me, as we go along, we might begin now as well as later to establish a progressive policy with respect to this governmental habit to which we are committing ourselves. In Berlin, years ago, I noticed that when the Kaiser rode in his automobile along the public streets and across the parks, he had seated in front of him a herald who blew the royal trumpet, the royal signal, and everybody else was legally obliged to get out of the way or be lawfully run over. Berlin was not the only capital where this rule prevailed. Following these examples of those who rule by divine right, I submit that in this bill or in the next we should insert a provision legally establishing the official toot for these automobiles. We should decide by law just how and in what way to sound the official signals; and, when sounded, just what private citizens must do. It should be settled whether the ordinary citizen, including Members of Congress, shall run into fence corners, if any there be, or slide off onto the farthest side of the road to give a clear way to the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, the chief clerk, the Forester, or whatever it may be. It would seem to be important as we go along this path that there should be some statutory rule established to distinguish the ordinary citizen from the department clerk and the Forester.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I merely desire to observe that if our Government resolves to commit itself to militarism, to Caesarism, to Kaiserism, we must be prepared to accept the inevitable accompaniments.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the automobile has been the subject of a great deal of fun, as well as a great deal of contention, on former occasions here. I recall a long debate not many years ago when one of the prominent Members of this body objected to the word automobile being contained in any

of the appropriation bills, or the Government owning one. He said that he had never ridden in one and never expected to do so, and his State had none in its borders as far as he knew, and he hoped there would not be one there. The second day after I noticed in the newspapers where his son had bought one and had a slight collision on the streets with somebody. A week later one live-stock association in his State had bought a number of automobiles to round up the cattle on the ranges.

It is undoubtedly true there have been abuses in the use of automobiles the same as in horses and carriages, but in this particular matter under debate I have no interest if it is sought to cut it out, except to say that it is not intended to apply in the city of Washington. That is prohibited by the language of the section itself.

It is true, as stated, that forest reserves have great open stretches upon which there is no timber. It is also true, however, that there are forested patches here and there, and the distances across open spaces, in case of fire, if one summons help from the other, must be made as rapidly as possible. Horses are very generally used; they are used in all the mountain trails, but in places where the forests are separated by these areas or where different forest reserves join each other it is much cheaper than having horses to have automobiles.

Furthermore, in the case of fire it is very much quicker to reach the scene of action. When there is a fire that is liable to get beyond the reach of the regular men employed, aid is always sought at the nearest village, the nearest town, or the nearest ranch. The automobile that goes there and brings the men back gets them there much more quickly and the amount and value of timber saved in that way is a great many times what this proposition of \$55,000 amounts to to furnish automobiles for rapid transportation.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I would like at this moment to call my colleague's attention to the fact that less

than 10 per cent of the expenditure in the Book of Estimates is for service in forests.

Mr. WARREN. It is not only the forest reserve but it is matters of hog cholera, and so forth, where there must be quick action; it is a matter of the quick prevention of the spread of diseases from one point to another. As a matter of fact agricultural pursuits are usually conducted off of railroads where there must be some mode of transportation. So they are used in all these different ways.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. My suggestion was not pointed at that position. I was only suggesting that as a matter of fact nearly all the argument that has been used in favor of this appropriation was the tremendous saving it would make by preventing destruction from forest fires, and I am also pointing out the fact that the estimates show that less than 10 per cent is used in that way.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator from Wyoming asked me a short time ago whether the Book of Estimates contained a detailed statement concerning the needs of the department. I will state that in the Book of Estimates of appropriations for 1917, at pages 288, 289, 290, 291, and 292 will be found a detailed statement as to exactly what these automobiles were used for.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I will say to the Senator, I have the estimate in the book furnished me by the clerk of the committee since I made the request.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I had better make a short explanation concerning this matter. I have here the Book of Estimates, in which I find a "Statement of proposed expenditures for the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles and motor boats for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, as required by section 5 of the act of July 16, 1914 (38 Stat., p. 508)."

Then there follows this detailed statement:

Bureau, division, or office.	Horse-drawn or motor-propelled.	Appropriation.	Number.	Description.	Amount.
Office of Farm Management.....	Motor-propelled...	Farm management.....	1	Motorcycle.....	\$150
Weather Bureau.....	do.....	General expenses, Weather Bureau.....	1	Launch.....	70
Do.....	do.....	do.....	1	Motorcycle.....	30
Bureau of Animal Industry.....	do.....	Inspection and quarantine.....	1	Automobile.....	625
Do.....	do.....	Eradicating cattle ticks.....	1	do.....	600
Do.....	do.....	do.....	1	do.....	600
Do.....	do.....	Military horse breeding.....	1	do.....	600

This statement goes on as to the various departments and extends to everything that is under the jurisdiction of the Agricultural Department—the Bureau of Entomology, the Bureau of Chemistry, the Forestry Service, and so forth.

Mr. OVERMAN. Had not the Senator better put the whole table in the RECORD? I think it ought to be there.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not think it is desirable to insert this whole table in the RECORD.

There is also a detailed statement in reference to the Forestry Service on page 290; there is a similar statement on page 292, showing, for instance:

General expenses, Forest Service—

This is the expense item for a motorcycle, which was \$335. There were three of those, each of which cost \$335, and there was an expenditure for maintenance of \$85, \$65, and \$60, respectively.

Then there are launches which are used. Many of these items are for motorcycles and launches, and they, of course, are necessarily used in—

Mr. OVERMAN. Where are the launches used?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The launches are used in Alaska.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state that here is one referred to "for use in boarding ships and as a lifeboat in emergencies." That is employed at Sand Key, Fla.

The next motorcycle which appears in this table to the amount of \$100 was:

For use of animal husbandmen in visiting ostrich farms in Arizona. Travel can not be advantageously performed by any other means except by automobile, and that is more expensive.

Here is another motorcycle—

used in making trips to the Egyptian cotton experiment station in the Salt River Valley, Ariz.

There was also a motorcycle—

used in visiting various parts of the projects and in making trips between the station and town for the purchase of supplies.

Mr. OVERMAN. I did not ask for information relative to motorcycles. I inquired as to launches. I do not know why the Agricultural Department needs launches.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I read from the Book of Estimates as follows:

Motor boats..	1,540	Forest-fire protection on Kaniksu, Pend Oreille, Coeur d'Alene, Missoula, Bridger, Superior, Minnesota, Tonto, Tahoe, Wenatchee, Siuslaw, Olympic, Crater, Chelan, Madison, and Columbia National Forests.	Forest ranges and patrolmen.
Motor boat...	375	General administration on Florida National Forest.	Forest supervisor and forest rangers.
Do.....	100	* * * * * Forest-fire protection on Chugach National Forest, Alaska.	
Do.....	250	* * * * * Patrolling Klamath Lake Bird Reservation, Oreg.	Warden in charge of Klamath Lake Bird Reservation, Oreg.

I presume these are used wherever there is a large body of water which it is necessary for the employees to go over or to traverse the length of.

Mr. President, the provision is in accordance with the estimates; it is made in perfect detail and conforms exactly with the law. I doubt very much the expediency of reducing the appropriation to \$55,000, in view of the necessity which is shown in these estimates.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is agreed to, without objection.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, has the committee concluded the consideration of committee amendments?

Mr. GORE. No, sir. There are several other amendments which have been passed over, and one or two yet to be considered.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I want to say a few words, not for the purpose of raising any question in regard to it but in order that the RECORD may contain in brief my views in reference to this amendment, on pages 80 and 81.

In so far as the amendment on pages 80 and 81, with reference to game preserves undertakes to give the National Government jurisdiction over the game preserves for the purpose of enforcing criminal laws, I do not mean by refusing to raise an objection to the amendment that I concede the proposition that the National Government can exercise that power. I think that matter belongs to the States. If those who are advocating this amendment believe that the National Government can enforce that kind of a law, and are content with it, all right; but as a legal proposition I do not believe that it is sound doctrine.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, if it is in order, I wish to ask permission to reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 4 of the bill striking out the provision regarding the study of methods of clearing off "logged-off" lands was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. I wish to ask if the Senator from Washington merely wishes to now lodge the motion or wishes the amendment now reconsidered? I shall interpose no objection to notice being entered.

Mr. JONES. I think it will take only a moment.

Mr. GORE. I would not want to reopen the matter now. I had rather finish the committee amendments; but there will be no difficulty about opening the matter at the Senator's convenience.

Mr. JONES. It is in reference to a committee amendment, and I thought the Senator might be willing to have the matter reopened now.

Mr. PITTMAN. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he would prefer at this time to recur to the amendment on page 14, which was passed over?

Mr. GORE. I will say that we are only lacking one or two amendments, I think, of finishing the consideration of the committee amendments. Then we shall revert, in their order, to all of the amendments which have been passed over.

Mr. PITTMAN. Very well.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 125, line 14, before the words "The Secretary of Agriculture," to insert the following side head: "Detailed estimates for executive officers, clerks, and employees below the grade of clerk."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 126, line 3, after the words "arising out of," to strike out "an outbreak" and insert "the existence"; and in line 9, after the words "the sum of," to strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$1,250,000," so as to read:

Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals: In case of an emergency arising out of the existence of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious disease of animals which, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, threatens the live-stock industry of the country, he may expend in the city of Washington or elsewhere, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,250,000, which sum is hereby appropriated, or so much thereof as he determines to be necessary, in the arrest and eradication of any such disease.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 126, after the words "such disease," at the end of line 11, to insert:

Including the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction, in cooperation with the States of animals affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied with all quarantine regulations, and said sum shall be immediately available for the purposes specified: *Provided*, That the payment for animals hereafter purchased may be made on appraisal based on the meat, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of appraisal based on breeding value no appraisal of any animal shall exceed three times its meat or dairy value, and except in case of an extraordinary emergency, to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, the payment by the United States Government for any animal shall not exceed one-half of any of such appraisements.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I am not sure that it is now in order, but at this point I desire to move to amend the committee amendment after the word "specified," in line 19, on page 126, which I hope will be accepted by the Senator in charge of the bill.

In explanation of the amendment I will say that this provision relates only to the existence or outbreak of the foot-and-mouth disease which may hereafter occur, and makes provision for the payment of certain damages in that event. I have had some correspondence with the Department of Agriculture regarding a case which might possibly be attended to under a claims bill, but it seems that as provision is being made for this, and as the department have stated that they are not in funds to make a sufficient recompense for the losses incurred by the person to whom I refer, it might be well to provide that this particular case might be provided for out of this appropriation.

I have here from the governor of my State, who knows all the circumstances, and was very useful and instrumental in eradicating the foot-and-mouth disease, two letters regarding this amendment, which I ask that the Secretary may read, showing the very great desirability of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, before that is done—I have no opposition to this amendment—I merely want to ask if individual amendments have been reached or whether the committee amendments have all been disposed of?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are still committee amendments undisposed of.

Mr. GORE. I will say that we are now considering only committee amendments.

Mr. LODGE. That is what I understood.

Mr. GORE. But the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] being desirous of leaving the city this evening for that reason I have made an exception in his favor in the consideration of amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware has offered an amendment to a committee amendment, which is in order.

Mr. GORE. But I have pursued the rule of passing over committee amendments where Senators desire to either amend or discuss them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 126, line 19, in the committee amendment, after the word "specified," it is proposed to insert the following:

And of the above sum \$2,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be immediately available to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to ascertain and pay the loss caused George P. Frederick, of Newport, Del., resulting from disinfecting his premises by Government inspectors during the outbreak of the foot-and-mouth disease in the fall of 1914.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, before that amendment is acted on, I want to suggest that in lines 18 and 19 the words "and said sum shall be immediately available for the purposes specified," be stricken from the Senate committee amendment.

Mr. GORE. Yes; I desire to have that done.

Mr. SMOOT. Then the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware would follow the word "regulations" instead of the word "specified."

Mr. GORE. I ask to have that proviso stricken from the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be modified to that extent.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, in explaining this amendment, I desire to have two letters from the governor of my State read, so that the committee of conference appointed on the bill may be in possession of the facts regarding the proposed amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Do I understand the chairman of the committee has accepted the amendment?

Mr. SAULSBURY. No; I do not so understand.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is it proposed in this way on the floor of the Senate to suggest the amount to be paid for a loss and pass upon it? If so, I am obliged to object to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment does not specify the amount.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I may say that the amendment limits the amount and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to ascertain the loss.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment does not provide the amount to be paid, but limits the amount the Secretary of Agriculture may pay.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I think it ought to take its course with all other claims of this character. It is very dangerous for us to select out one claim and legislate concerning it. I do not see why the general appropriation carried in the bill would not leave this claim subject to be considered just like any other claim.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that he is mistaken about that, because while the provision in the bill relates to the very class of injuries to which this special one belongs, it is for future recompense, and applies only in case such injuries occur in the future. It seems to me that it would be certainly a very good thing to provide that in a case of this kind this individual should not be put to the difficulty of having a special claims bill introduced and referred to the Court of Claims, with all the resulting expense—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. SAULSBURY. If the Senator will pardon me—when there is a million and a quarter dollars appropriated for this

very purpose. It seems to me there is no reason why we should legislate in favor of unknown claims which may arise in the future and refuse to act upon one that is known, is certified to by the governor of the State, and can be treated under the general provisions of this act.

Mr. SMOOT. The provision in the bill relates to claims which have been or may be filed with the Government.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, there is a fund still undisposed of in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture for handling generally the foot-and-mouth disease, and no deficiency has been reported to us. I think putting this claim from the floor in an appropriation bill unwise, and it would be a very dangerous precedent.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, the Senator is under a misapprehension regarding that; and I can read to him from letters I have in my hand from the Secretary of Agriculture showing that he has no funds in hand from which he can pay these damages. I read from a letter of the Secretary of Agriculture addressed to me on the 11th day of November, 1915.

Mr. SMOOT. Will not the Senator have both letters read to which he has referred?

Mr. SAULSBURY. I will have those letters read; but, as preliminary to answering the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia, I desire to read from the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture says:

The solicitor of the department concurs in this view and is of the opinion that in the absence of an appropriation for paying such claims as that advanced by Mr. Frederick the department is without authority to reimburse him. It is believed that if his injury merits redress by the Government his remedy is with Congress.

That is also concurred in by the Acting Secretary in a letter to me under date of October 23, 1915, in which he says:

The department is of the opinion, however, as stated in the Secretary's letter of March 18, that even though Mr. Frederick's claim were equitable, it would have no authority to pay it from any appropriation available to the department.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then, it does not fall under the general class of such claims under the procedure which we have been following.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I ask, in order to inform the Senator in regard to this claim and how it arose, that the letters which I have sent to the Secretary's desk from the governor of my State be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

STATE OF DELAWARE,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, DOVER, DEL.,
Wilmington, Del., October 25, 1915.

Hon. WILLARD SAULSBURY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your favor of the 19th instant and am very glad that you have taken up the George Frederick matter with the department. I was in personal charge of every detail of the case of enforcing the quarantine against the hoof-and-mouth disease in 1914, and familiarized myself with the Frederick case, and I can say to you without any hesitations that Mr. Frederick's grounds for the claim of reimbursement are absolutely substantial. He was unable to conduct his business after his place was disinfected. Dr. Schaeffer advised him to correct this effect by washing, but it did not in any way correct the trouble. After some months he obtained the services of a chemist, who finally was successful in reducing the odors arising from disinfection. In the meantime his business was practically destroyed. Although Mr. Frederick's plant was in bad condition at the time it was disinfected, I consider that the manner in which disinfection was applied and the personal manner in which he was treated by the department agents was outrageous and unwarranted. In conclusion, I will say that if this trouble had arisen through the fault of any official of the State of Delaware I would have seen to it that the legislature reimbursed Mr. Frederick. As it was, the matter of disinfection was entirely in the hands of the Government officials, and I could not make a just claim upon the State of Delaware.

I thank you for your cooperation in this matter, and trust that you will call upon me if I can be of any assistance.

Very respectfully, yours,

CHARLES R. MILLER, Governor.

STATE OF DELAWARE,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, DOVER, DEL.,
Wilmington, Del., March 9, 1916.

Hon. WILLARD SAULSBURY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Permit me to call your attention to my letter of October 25, 1915, relative to the damage incurred by George P. Frederick, of Newport, Del., by reason of the manner in which the Government agents fumigated his plant. I sincerely trust that Mr. Frederick can be reimbursed an amount commensurate with the loss which he has sustained. My letter of the 25th of October accurately and clearly states the facts. The delay in having Mr. Frederick's case settled has created such a feeling in our State that it would seriously interfere with any future action which might be necessary for the Federal authorities to take in case another epidemic would occur requiring Federal intervention in Delaware.

In Mr. Frederick's case the militant attitude of the chief Federal officer was such as to create a deep-seated and resentful prejudice against the Federal officials; and I can personally indorse this attitude, as I was cognizant with all the facts at the time the incident occurred.

I am pressing this matter for two reasons: First, I think Mr. Frederick's claim is a just one, and, second, I wish to establish a feeling of cordiality on the part of our citizens toward the national authorities, who, I know, are conscientiously and earnestly endeavoring to assist State officials and citizens in eradicating infectious diseases.

Thanking you in advance for your assistance, I shall be glad to hear from you in regard to this matter.

Very truly, yours,

CHARLES R. MILLER, Governor.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator if this item—and it is a personal claim—has ever been presented to the Senate or the House of Representatives in the form of a bill for the relief of the claimant?

Mr. SAULSBURY. No, I may say.

Mr. SMOOT. Does not the Senator believe that that is the proper course to be pursued?

Mr. SAULSBURY. I think, Mr. President, that might be the usual course; but no one knows better than does the Senator how difficult it is to get a bill of that character through the Claims Committee on account of the enormous number of claims before it; and it seemed to me, when there was an item in this bill to pay damages caused in the same way that the damage has been caused this man, and when the department has suggested that it needed additional legislation, and the whole matter was before the Senate for consideration, that this was a very proper way to close up such an account as this.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, it is obnoxious to the rule to put any private claim upon an appropriation bill; but I understand that there has been no real investigation made as to the actual amount that is due Mr. Frederick.

Mr. SAULSBURY. No; not by any department; and the amendment simply empowers the Secretary to ascertain the damage and pay not exceeding \$2,500—of course, leaving everything in the hands of the Department of Agriculture, just as everything is left in the hands of the Department of Agriculture under the provisions of this special appropriation.

The Senator is doubtless very familiar with the method of settling claims of this character. I presume that in the settlement of various claims as between private individuals probably not one in a thousand comes to litigation, and they should not lead to litigation as against the Government if that can be avoided by negotiation and by proper settlement. Of course the danger would be in trusting an ordinary agent to settle Government claims; I can understand that; but there is nothing compulsory in this amendment; it simply makes an appropriation to the extent of \$2,500, out of which the Secretary may make an equitable adjustment of this man's actual losses, which, according to the letters of the governor of Delaware, are shown to be substantial, and which should be settled.

I only desire to say a word more. The governor of the State was very active and very energetic, and during practically the whole time the foot-and-mouth disease was being stamped out in my State gave his personal services to the Government officials in helping them and assisting them throughout the State in their work. Senators will see from his letter that he feels that for the general good, to produce a better feeling toward the Government officials, and to insure that they shall not be arbitrary in their actions as affecting the people, this particular case should be settled. I say it would be a very good thing to let it be done, and I hope no Senator will object to it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator what steps have been taken by the department to find out just what damage was done to Mr. Frederick?

Mr. SAULSBURY. This matter has been in correspondence between the Department of Agriculture and me for a good many months, possibly running up to a year. They first sent there to make an inspection the same man who had fumigated Mr. Frederick's place, and I think, from the tone of that official's report on the situation, that it was about what usually comes from a department inspector who is sent to overlook his own work. He did not think that anything should be paid. On my request, another man was sent there, and his report led to the conclusion reached by the department that however just the claim of Mr. Frederick might be they had no funds available from which to pay it, and, therefore, it made no special difference as to whether the claim was a valid one or not.

Mr. SMOOT. Is this claim any different from other claims against the Government for the loss of cattle?

Mr. SAULSBURY. I fancy not.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that there has been an appropriation made for the purpose of paying such claims. Whether that appropriation has been entirely exhausted I can not say, but in the appropriation bill of a year ago and in a special bill which was passed by Congress appropriating an additional million dollars over and above that which was appropriated in the Agricultural bill, provision was made for the payment for cattle which were killed because of

the order of the Department of Agriculture on account of the foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. SAULSBURY. The point made by the department may be that this is not a claim for recompense for cattle killed. This man had a butcher shop in which was meat which, I fancy, came from infected cattle. The chief injury, as I understand, to this man came not from condemning and taking his meat but from leaving his place in such a condition that other meat which he brought in to sell became so affected by the odor of the fumigating material which had been used, that it was rendered absolutely worthless, and he could not sell it. It may be that the department can not recompense such injuries as that from the old appropriation. I confess that I do not know about that.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator ought to introduce a bill for Mr. Frederick, and I think the claim ought to be examined into by the appropriate committees of the House and the Senate. If Mr. Frederick was damaged—and I have no doubt that he was—and if the damage was occasioned unlawfully, I do not think there will be any trouble at all in getting a bill for his relief through Congress. We have passed more claims bills at this session, I presume, than we have passed during the four or five sessions; but it is a dangerous proposition to undertake to put a claim upon an appropriation bill when there never has been even a bill introduced in Congress to provide for its payment.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Of course, the Senator appreciates that the amendment appropriates no money to Mr. Frederick; it appropriates money from which his claim, when ascertained by the department, may be paid, just as this general provision will operate as affecting claims which may arise in the future.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if this appropriation in the bill applies to the future, it applies equally to the past.

Mr. SAULSBURY. If the Senator will read the provisions of the paragraph, I think he will find that he is mistaken.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the claim in which the Senator from Delaware is interested is one which this bill would provide for in the future, it is provided for if it happened in the past.

Mr. SAULSBURY. But if the Senator will read the terms of the provision of the bill he will see that he is mistaken.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; I am not mistaken. What I mean is that if there has been no provision in the past to meet any such claim as that presented by the Senator, then there is no provision in the future to meet any such claim. It is a different character of claim from the claims provided for in this appropriation and stands upon a different footing. I do not think it ought to be added to this appropriation bill without consideration by the committee. I think it would be a mistake to set the precedent of adopting an amendment incorporating a claim of this kind in an appropriation bill when the principle involved and the question of liability, even, have not been considered by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is not the same phraseology used in this bill as is used in the former bill? For instance, on line 14 it reads:

Of animals affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease.

Is not that the same as the language of the existing law?

Mr. SAULSBURY. That would cover undoubtedly the meat of this man which had been infected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Well, is not that the same phraseology which was in the original appropriation regarding the foot-and-mouth disease?

Mr. SMOOT. I could not say as to that without referring to the law.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I am not familiar with the phraseology of that act, but I hope that no Senator will see fit to make a technical objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is making the inquiry because the Chair sees a point of order coming and wants to find out what the original act was.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I am not able to give the Senator at the moment the wording of that act. Possibly I can find it.

Mr. SMOOT. This is the provision as to the \$2,500,000 in the act a year ago under the headline of "Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals":

In case of an emergency arising out of the existence of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals which, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, threatens the live-stock industry of the country, he may expend, in the city of Washington or elsewhere, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,500,000, which sum is hereby appropriated, or so much thereof as he determines to be necessary, in the arrest and eradication of any such disease.

That is the appropriation that was made a year ago. Then in the conference, I suppose, there was added the following:

Including the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction, in cooperation with the States, of animals affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease wherever found, and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied with all quarantine regulations, and said sum shall be immediately available for the purposes specified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is exactly the language used here; and the ruling of the department must have been made upon the theory that the fumigation of a butcher shop was not "material contaminated by or exposed to" the disease, under those constructions that you get once in a while. The Chair does not believe it is the law. A man is certainly just as much entitled to pay, if he is entitled to anything—the Chair does not say he is entitled to anything—but if he is entitled to anything he is just as much entitled to pay for the destruction by fumigation of his butcher shop as he would be for the destruction of his cleaver or any other of the appliances or material that he might have around the shop. It seems to the Chair that the Secretary of Agriculture now has ample authority and money to adjust this claim.

Mr. SMOOT. It looks that way to me, Mr. President, and I can not see why the amendment should be put in this bill. There would be some justification for putting in an amendment directing the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate all the claims made against the Government for the purposes named in the amendment of the Senator, but I do believe we ought to go to work and pick out one claim and tell the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate that and pay it if he finds that the amount is due the man for damages. I think, as the Vice President says, that under the wording of the bill itself, with the Senate amendment, the Secretary is already authorized to pay any claim against the Government for materials destroyed by fumigation on the part of the Government.

Mr. SAULSBURY. That may be very true, Mr. President, but I once heard of a man who was in jail, and he was told by his lawyer that they could not put him in jail. "But," he said, "I am here."

Now, the department rule that they have no money available to pay this claim. The only effect of adopting this amendment would be to authorize the department to investigate this claim. I do not think there was any Senator within the hearing of the Secretary's voice when he read these two letters from the governor of my State saying that he has personal knowledge of this particular matter who does not think that a technicality here is really to cause very unnecessary trouble to this man, who has been injured by the inspectors of this Government. It seems to me that in such a case as this it is hardly necessary to interpose a technical objection to an investigation by the department which is charged with such investigations, and is able to pay out millions of dollars on those investigations, for the purpose of preventing justice being done to this man, who is supported by the governor of the State, who says he desires this claim particularly to have attention by the Government for the purpose of assisting the officers of the Government in case any outbreak should occur in the future.

Mr. KENYON and Mr. GALLINGER addressed the Chair.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I will yield to the Senator from Iowa, who first rose.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I merely want to say to the Senator from Delaware that if claims of this character are to be paid by the Government, I know that in my State the claims would amount to enormous sums. I have not understood that the Secretary was recognizing this class of claims. I am not quite clear yet, because we could not hear all of the discussion, as to whether the Secretary has given any intimation that claims of this class are to be paid, as he understands it, under the law. I think there would be \$5,000,000 of this class of claims from my State, and certainly the claims from the State of Illinois would even exceed that, because that is where the foot-and-mouth disease was perhaps at its worst.

I can not understand why one special class of damages should be attached to a bill of this kind, when all of these other cases have been ignored and of course will be ignored. It seems to me it is clearly a claim.

Mr. GALLINGER. I rose to ask substantially the same question as that which has been propounded by the Senator from Iowa. I was about to inquire as to whether or not the department had acknowledged the validity of the claim, but did not pay it for the reason that there were no funds available for that purpose? Am I correct in assuming that that is the case?

Mr. SAULSBURY. The ground of the department's opinion is not clear in the correspondence which I have. Therefore I can not answer the Senator's question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I can state to the Senator that the department has ample funds to meet all liabilities under the act of Congress which was similar to the one

now before us, and there could not have been a refusal to pay for lack of funds. The refusal to pay was for lack of funds to meet this kind of claim upon the ground that Congress had not provided for the payment of any claims of this character.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have had some knowledge of the procedure in these cases. It seems to me that the claim in which a constituent of the Senator is interested has substantial grounds; that the payment ought to cover a case of that kind and all cases of that kind; but I, of course, do not know what attitude the department takes, and for that reason I propounded the question.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I could not satisfy the Senator about that. I think possibly this proposed amendment might be very much improved—and I think, undoubtedly, it should cover cases of this character—by adding certain words in the amendment after the word "materials," on line 14. I do not know what the Senate will do with a claim of this kind. I think, in the form in which I have introduced it, the justice of it is absolutely manifest and there is very good reason for its adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not know whether there is a point of order made here or not.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I will make the point of order, if it has not been made—I understood the Senator from Georgia made the point of order—that it is in effect a claim.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair expressed an opinion just now that perhaps the Chair had no right to express, something which the present occupant of the chair is frequently likely to do.

The Chair has no means of knowing whether the rejection of this claim comes from the construction of the statute or because the Secretary of Agriculture did not deem it a proper claim to allow. Beyond any question of doubt, as it stands now, it is a private claim on an appropriation bill, and the Chair will be compelled to sustain the point of order, if that is the point.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment. I move to insert, immediately before the word "quarantine," in line 18, page 126, the word "lawful."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the insertion of the word proposed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, may I, then, offer an amendment on such lines as to cover in a general way what has been objected to, the objection being sustained on the point of order? After the word "materials," in line 14, I move to insert the words "buildings, shops, or other property," so that it may cover such conditions as that which I have described, and so that this claim may be presented to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Let us get at just what that would be. On what line would it come in, and where?

Mr. SAULSBURY. After the word "materials," on line 14.

Mr. SHAFROTH. What page?

Mr. SAULSBURY. Page 126. I move to insert at that point the words "buildings, shops, or other property."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, this amendment is not changing existing law. This amendment, inserted by the committee, is a mere repetition of existing law. The proposed amendment is a change of existing law and extends the liability of the Government. I make the point that it is objectionable to the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will be compelled to overrule that point of order. This is an appropriation to apply to certain purposes, and the Senate can make the appropriation for any purpose it pleases. This is not a general law heretofore made, but simply an appropriation for a certain purpose. The Senate can make the appropriation for this purpose if it chooses.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to suggest to the Senator from Delaware that in my opinion he will not accomplish the purpose he has in view by the amendment he has offered. I am interested in the matter because, as my colleague has just said, there are claims in my State, of the general character of the one now presented from Delaware, amounting to millions of dollars. The reason those claims could not be paid or even considered under the law as it is proposed to be is that the law is limited to compensation for things that are purchased or destroyed by the Government. The claim made by the Senator from Delaware, as I understand it, is for damage to things that have not been purchased or destroyed by the Government. Therefore, simply to add "buildings or any other structure" would not reach the case, unless the former words are enlarged or modified to permit damages to be paid for

things that have not been purchased or destroyed in order to meet the ravages of the disease.

If the Senator from Delaware and the Senate desire to enlarge the liability of the Government so that compensation will be made for all damages that have been brought about by quarantine regulations to farmers and butchers and all others who have been affected, I do not know that I will oppose that sort of legislation, because my State would be very deeply interested in it; but candor requires me to say that it will immensely increase the amount of the appropriation necessary to pay these claims. The \$1,250,000 here provided for would hardly begin the work of compensation. I think the Senate ought to understand very clearly just what it is doing before the change in the law is made.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will say that I have not made a point of order on the other claim. It seems to have been done by others. It seems to be a specific claim, and somewhat of the character of other claims that have been paid, although I had not given them thorough consideration. But the amendment which has just been offered seems to open the gateway for millions of claims. I may say that the Government of the United States has expended \$4,500,000 in its efforts to extirpate the foot-and-mouth disease, and has paid half of the losses entailed upon the owners of cattle and other property destroyed in this crusade, when it might have destroyed them without compensation at all. I fear to insert this provision, because no man can tell the number of claims that might follow in its train.

I therefore move to lay the amendment on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, there is an amendment which has been suggested by the department in connection with this provision, and I will offer the amendment at this time. It is merely a proviso. The fund of \$600,000 remaining over from the appropriation last year lapsed on yesterday. The provision contained in the bill relates to anticipated exigencies. The department suggests that the amount of the unexpended balance be reappropriated and made available for the payment of claims already accrued if there be such.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, did the Senate committee have that in view when they reduced the amount of \$2,500,000 appropriated by the House to \$1,250,000?

Mr. GORE. No, sir; I will say to the Senator that they did not. In the examination of this question it was stated that they had ample funds on hand to pay all the accrued claims and all anticipated claims during the remainder of the fiscal year. I was a little surprised at this request coming in, but it is simply in pursuance of the policy which has been deliberately adopted.

Mr. SMOOT. The amount we provide for the ensuing year would be \$1,850,000, then, instead of \$1,250,000.

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir; but it is of an entirely different character. The \$1,250,000 relates to future exigencies, and the damages that may occur in the future.

Mr. SMOOT. No; to past and future ones.

Mr. GORE. It is not at all retroactive. There may be some claims and losses which have occurred in the past which could not be compensated for without this provision which I offer. It is to meet that situation that this amendment is presented.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not understand the situation in that way. This appropriation of a million and a quarter dollars is to arrest and eradicate "any such disease"—that is, the foot-and-mouth disease—"including the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction." So, if we now make the \$600,000 unexpended balance available for the coming year, the appropriation for this purpose will be \$1,850,000 instead of \$1,250,000.

Mr. GORE. Under that construction I should not have presented this amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think there is the least question but that that will be the result. I will ask the Secretary to state the amendment, and then we will see.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENYON in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 127, line 2, after the word "appropriations" and before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided further, That so much of the appropriation of \$2,500,000 made by the Agricultural appropriation act of March 4, 1915, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, for the arrest and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals as remains unexpended at the close of said fiscal year is hereby reappropriated and made available for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, for the objects mentioned in said appropriation act, includ-

ing necessary investigations to determine whether said diseases have been completely eradicated in districts where they previously existed.

Mr. SMOOT. There is not any question that if we adopt that amendment the appropriation for the coming year will be \$1,850,000.

Mr. GORE. I will withhold the amendment for the present, then, because I questioned the head of the Animal Bureau very particularly upon this point, and he answered that they had funds available for the payment of all accrued claims and for all anticipated claims during the remainder of the fiscal year.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the last fiscal year, and that ceased on yesterday.

Mr. GORE. That ceased on yesterday. I had overlooked the clause to which the Senator called my attention in the committee amendment. I withhold that amendment for the present, and will look into it further.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling 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. 14303) 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.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. BRYAN. I desire to present the conference report on the fortifications appropriation bill.

Mr. GORE. I will ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for that purpose, if the Senator will assure me that the consideration of the report will not lead to several hours' debate.

Mr. BRYAN. I think I can assure the Senator of that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENYON in the chair). The conference report will be read.

The Secretary read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14303) 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, 2, 5, 6, and 10.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 14, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. That except as expressly otherwise authorized herein no part of the sums appropriated by this act shall be expended in the purchase from private manufacturers of any material at a price in excess of 25 per cent more than the cost of manufacturing such material by the Government, or, where such material is not or has not been manufactured by the Government, at a price in excess of 25 per cent more than the estimated cost of manufacture by the Government: *Provided, however,* That whenever in the opinion of the President an emergency exists affecting the general welfare of the United States, he may waive the limitations contained in this section."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Renumber the section to read "7"; and the Senate agree to the same.

N. P. BRYAN,
LUKE LEA,
WESLEY L. JONES,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

SWAGAR SHERLEY,
G. W. RAUCH,
F. H. GILLET,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida to explain briefly what amendments the Senate

has receded from, and also what amendments the House has receded from.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, the Senate receded from the first amendment in disagreement, which was an appropriation by the House of \$250,000, the Senate amendment being for \$225,000, for the protection, preservation, and repair of fortifications.

The Senate also receded from the increase of \$54,000 for the construction of mining casemates, cable galleries, and so forth.

The Senate also receded from the amendment for the purchase, manufacture, and test of sea-coast cannon, in which the amendment of the Senate increased the amount to the estimate of the department.

Mr. SMOOT. That is, from \$2,700,000 to \$6,000,000?

Mr. BRYAN. No; it is on page 4, the last paragraph. The House provided for \$1,284,500. The Senate raised that to \$1,764,500. The Senate receded on that and on the item at the bottom of page 4, increasing the House appropriation by half a million dollars.

Mr. SMOOT. Did the House recede from that amendment?

Mr. BRYAN. No; the Senate receded.

Mr. SMOOT. What did the Senate do in relation to the—

Mr. BRYAN. I am going through first with what the Senate did. I will explain to the Senate the action of the House when I have done that.

Then the Senate receded from amendment numbered 10, with reference to the Clark invention.

The House receded from the increase by the Senate in disagreement on page 4. The Senate increased the House item from \$2,700,000 to \$6,000,000, and the House receded.

For contract authorizations, the Senate increased the House authorizations by a million and a half dollars, or to \$3,000,000, and the House receded.

The House receded from the Senate amendment on page 5, by which the Senate increased the appropriation for the purchase, manufacture, and test of ammunition from \$400,000 to \$480,000.

The House receded from the amendments with reference to the Hammond invention, found on page 7.

Mr. SMOOT. The House receded?

Mr. BRYAN. The House receded.

The House receded from section 3, on page 15.

Mr. SMOOT. That is in relation to the services of skilled draftsmen?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

The House receded from the disagreement on section 4, with an amendment to increase the amount to \$10,000. Then section 4, as it appears here of the House language, which was stricken out, was restored, with the proviso that the limitation could be waived whenever, in the opinion of the President, it was necessary for the public welfare.

The total amount of reduction in the appropriations put on by the Senate is half a million dollars. The Senate had put on some additional amounts of over \$3,000,000—nearly \$4,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12717) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended on pages 126 and 127.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 127, after line 2, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to ascertain and pay the damages due William Blair, of Hominy, Okla., resulting from the dipping of his cattle by the Bureau of Animal Industry in August, 1915, \$18,293, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this is a private claim on an appropriation bill, and similar to the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY]. Does not the Senator having the bill in charge believe that that ought to go through Congress the same as other claims?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement in connection with this provision. I may say that my colleague [Mr. OWEN] introduced a bill covering this claim, which for some reason was sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry rather than to the Committee on Claims.

The proposal was discussed in the committee. I stated to the committee that I would not move to attach this amendment to the bill. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], who is a member of the committee, was so much impressed with its

justice that he made the motion and the motion was agreed to by the committee.

Now, I should like to state briefly the character of this claim which I think places it really upon exceptional ground. This man Blair owns some 900 head of cattle. We passed a law which requires the dipping of cattle under certain circumstances. The Department of Agriculture sent down an inspector to superintend the dipping of this herd of cattle. In mixing the chemicals too much of some element was retained or contained and the result was that a number of the cattle were burned to death. Some 50 or 60 of them died outright and all the others were seriously damaged; the owner was obliged to carry them over for the period of a year.

When they were being dipped the owner of the cattle, Blair, protested to the inspector that he was killing his stock, and made an effort to have him change his methods; but in despite of that the inspector persisted with the dipping, and this damage resulted. The inspector I do not think was under bond, but at any rate, he has left the United States.

The department has made an investigation of this occurrence and has recommended that Blair ought to be paid the sum of \$18,000. Of course he insisted that he was entitled to some \$30,000, but there were elements of loss which the department did not take into account. But the department admits that it was done through its agent in compelling a citizen to submit to the laws of the land, and by the administration of the law by the department this citizen has sustained a loss of some \$18,000. I may say that it has resulted, I understand, in the bankruptcy of Blair.

As the Government has done this itself, through its own representative, compelling its citizens to submit to the dipping of the cattle under the law, and the dipping was carried on over his protest at the time the stock was burned to death, and serious damage was entailed, damages admitted by the department, which I have no doubt resulted in the bankruptcy of this man, it seems to me that it really places it upon exceptional ground and that as the department confessed its own error, confessed the loss, he ought not to be obliged to be subjected to the additional cost, time, and delay of pursuing the ordinary route of obtaining redress against the Government of the United States.

There is no doubt but that the amendment is liable to a point of order. It is merely a question as to whether or not the circumstances rescue it from that necessity.

Mr. SMOOT. I really believe, Mr. President, on a claim of this kind, after just a few moments' consideration by any committee it would be reported favorably. There is not any doubt but that the money is due Mr. Blair on the statement made by the Senator from Oklahoma, and I am not going to interpose a point of order against the amendment, because it seems to me that not only has the man been damaged to the amount of \$18,000 but a great deal more than that.

Mr. GORE. I think more.

Mr. SMOOT. From the statement of the Senator I feel justified in withholding any point of order. I am perfectly willing that the claim shall be placed in this bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I trust no Senator will interpose an objection to this item. It was very carefully considered by the committee. As the chairman of the committee has stated, this man has sustained an enormous loss through no fault of his own, but through the fault of the Department of Agriculture or through that of the department's inspector. The claim is a small one in comparison with the tremendous loss which the man has sustained, and we ought to allow the amount which was placed in the bill by the committee.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I know of no reason why this individual claim should be singled out and paid in this extraordinary manner. There may be a hardship imposed upon the stock owner. Undoubtedly there are numerous cases where all the Government may be able to do and all the several States may do will not compensate the owner of the live stock for the loss. That is one of the things beyond remedy. The Government can not at its own expense undertake to even up all those processes.

In my own State I am quite sure more than \$8,000,000 would be required if property owners were compensated for the stock destroyed by either State or Federal authority, or both. About a million and a half dollars has been paid out in that State by the Government, either for the value of the stock itself, the expenses incurred, or the destruction of property that was unavoidably connected with the infected stock and required to be destroyed.

These matters, though, Mr. President, would not justify making out separate bills for each of the property owners to be compensated here in the manner of this particular item on page

137. If this process were followed in the one case it ought to be followed in others. I know of a single case, that of one of my constituents, living in Lake County, Ill., not far from Waukegan, where a herd was destroyed by 27 Federal inspectors, who went in with guns and by intimidation destroyed a herd that had been bred for many years. The stock was slaughtered and left lying on the premises for 48 hours after destruction to spread the infection. A reasonable valuation put on the single herd is more than \$300,000. The uniform sale made for many years past out of the herd for breeding purposes would indicate the value of the property destroyed to be \$300,000. The herd is all gone. It is an absolute destruction.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. GRONNA. In the case to which the Senator from Illinois refers, did not the department offer to pay a certain amount? I ask the Senator if the Agricultural Department did not in that case offer to pay a certain amount?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; they offered to pay the beef value on the market.

Mr. GRONNA. Which was rejected by the owner of the stock. This is a different case, I will say to the Senator. The cattle were killed, and they were killed by an officer of the Government, but no pay has been offered to the farmer who lost the stock, and the amount appropriated in the bill is not one-fourth of the value of the stock.

Mr. BRADY. And they were killed by an officer of the Government.

Mr. GRONNA. Against the protest of the owner of the cattle.

Mr. BRADY. Against the protest of the owner.

Mr. SHERMAN. That does not add any virtue to it whatever. There is not a stock owner in the country who did not protest. If the mere idle form of a protest shall attach some right or impose upon the Government the duty of appropriating without going through the ordinary course of a claim in the department, then the Senate will be swamped with claims of a like kind. The fact that a protest was made would not stop the Government operation. The protest was made in every instance in my own country. Mrs. Durand, in the particular instance to which I called attention, went to the circuit court, a court of general jurisdiction, and obtained an injunction against the destruction of the property on the ground that it was an irreparable injury, because neither the Government nor the State ever proposed to pay more than the beef value. The injunction was disregarded by the officers of the department or their representatives who went upon the premises and destroyed the property, as I have already stated. So that was an aggravated case. Still, I apprehend that even the beef value of the herd, if put in here on page 127 as a particular provision, specifying Mrs. Durand by name and providing ten, fifteen, or twenty thousand dollars for her payment, would be subject to a point of order. If not subject to a point of order, it would be subject at least to the argument that it had no place in that form in this bill. Let whatever in the discretion of Congress is a proper sum be fixed, and then let the claim be filed in the department like all the other claims and be paid.

These cattle were dipped, I understand, and some of them died as a result. They were dipped by the Government. Why?

Mr. NELSON. Is the Senator familiar with what occurred in Chicago at the time they had what they called a fat-cattle show, where they gathered in blooded cattle from all over the country and then quarantined them and killed some of them? Is the Senator familiar with that occurrence?

Mr. SHERMAN. Somewhat, but not in great detail. I know that during a part of the time some of my friends were there.

Mr. NELSON. Some of the people of Minnesota were caught in that, and lost their blooded cattle, fine short-horn cattle, and they only proposed to pay the same as for ordinary steers for beef purposes.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is correct. There were some male cattle at that point whose value, of course, will be said to be speculative—that would be regarded as a fancy price. For people who are familiar with this grade of cattle, those that are registered, it is not a fancy price, as any stock raiser knows. The bulls that sell at \$5,000 are not disposed of at an exaggerated value at all. Many of those animals were destroyed. Many others were kept in quarantine. Many others were so handled or exposed to suspicion because of the quarantine or misfortune that the sales that would have resulted were entirely destroyed and the business of that herd was broken up at least since that time, and probably it will interfere somewhat for several years to come. Of course, these prospective

sales are purely a speculative value. They are not an element of damages in any claim that is to be made; to say the least of it it is the direct damage to the property owner.

I know of no reason why this particular claim should be put in this form. The mere fact that the property owner lost something does not justify, to my mind, its being embodied in this bill. Why should he not take his chances with the rest of the live-stock owners? I do not know the fact that he lives in Oklahoma attaches any particular virtue to the cattle or the owner thereof.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. GRONNA. I do not wish to be understood in any manner to say that the department were justified in doing what they did in the case the Senator has referred to in his own State. But this is a different case. The department did not enter upon the premises of this man and offer to buy his cattle for the purpose of slaughtering them. They entered upon the farm and against the protest of this farmer proceeded to dip them.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then what is the difference?

Mr. GRONNA. And the cattle died. This man has not been remunerated in any way, because, as the Senator knows, under the law the department could not reimburse him for the loss or pay him for the damages he sustained.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let it be added under an appropriate wording that if the cattle were not killed directly by slaughter in order to eradicate disease, if they were treated in a manner which resulted in their damage or death, it would be included. Put it on the same basis that other property owners are paid who lose live stock.

I assume that when the cattle were dipped it was for some specific purpose; that they had some disease—probably the foot-and-mouth disease. I make the inquiry. It may be that they had cattle tick or some contagious disease which the department did not want to spread to neighboring herds.

Mr. GORE. I will say that the owner was prepared to ship them to market, I understand, and the cattle were not diseased; they were dipped for the purpose of disinfecting them, through fear of fever.

Mr. SHERMAN. What was the nature of the disease?

Mr. GORE. They had no disease, I will say to the Senator. My understanding is that the cattle were prepared for market and the owner was arranging to ship them to market at that time, and the dipping was required because they were going, I suppose, from an infected territory to an uninfected territory.

Mr. SHERMAN. Might I inquire what kind of disease was apprehended.

Mr. GORE. Fever tick.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is a contagious complaint, or, rather, the tick is contagious like the ordinary parasite that belongs to other animals or the human body. Whenever you are around in the neighborhood where it can reach you it does so. It has predatory instincts like these evil trusts which are continually going about in order to obtain sustenance.

I understand the southern cattle fever is the result of being bitten by the tick, and it communicates the disease to the animal so bitten. So if the animal would desire to scratch itself on some adjacent fence stake or building, if it was successful in its operation it would leave the tick and keep the fever; and when another animal came along the tick would immediately take up its headquarters on this other animal not so infected, and so the disease spreads. It is a question of the activity of the tick.

I do not know any difference between dipping an animal in the particular part of the United States subject to the Texas fever, as we call it, when it comes into the stockyards, and killing it as the result of dipping and shooting it outright in order to prevent it from infecting by the foot-and-mouth disease and transmitting it to other yards in the neighborhood. I fail to see any difference. It does not make any difference whether I lose my stock by being shot by the Government inspector because it has foot-and-mouth disease or dipping my cattle just before I ship them in order to disinfect them from Texas fever before they are received in interstate trade for packing houses in Chicago. What is the difference? It is a distinction without a difference, and it is a distinction that applies peculiarly to Oklahoma. It does not apply any place else.

I do not know how many high-toned bulls were killed in my State—not the bulls on the Chicago market, but genuine ones. They were slaughtered at the hands of Government agents ruthlessly. It did not make any difference how distinguished their pedigree or how desirable they were, they all went the same way.

Mr. GRONNA. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. SHERMAN. All right.

Mr. GRONNA. I suggest to the Senator from Illinois that there is a difference. If this herd had had the foot-and-mouth disease, the Department of Agriculture would have been authorized under the law to pay certain damages. There is no law that I know of permitting the Department of Agriculture or anyone else to pay anything for animals virtually killed by the department.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have already suggested, Mr. President, that a few apt words be added here by which in such cases the damage may be paid. Whatever the object of the dipping, it was to enable the live-stock owner to make his shipment. Otherwise the cattle that were ready to go into the market could not have been put into interstate trade. Undoubtedly the dipping could have been prevented by the property owner if he had refrained from shipping his cattle.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have looked into the matter further, and I find that, instead of being prepared for shipment in Oklahoma to some market, they had been brought from a Texas point below the quarantine line, I understand, into a portion of Oklahoma north of the quarantine line, and for that reason they were being dipped, but it was insisted by the owner that they were not infested with ticks.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let me inquire: The dipping was supposed to be for the purpose of enabling the live-stock owner to ship the cattle?

Mr. GORE. No; that was my impression; but I find, on looking at the record, that they had been shipped from a point in Texas below the quarantine line to a point in Oklahoma north of the quarantine line, and for that reason they were being dipped in order to render them immune in that section.

Mr. SHERMAN. But the dipping in any case was necessary if they continued in interstate trade. They could have been returned to the shipper.

Mr. GORE. They could, of course, have been returned to Texas. The owner insisted that they were not infested with ticks.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then there would not have been so much loss as to have them die as the result of the treatment.

Mr. GORE. I say the owner insisted that they were not infested with ticks. He had veterinarians examine them who said they were not infested with ticks. Notwithstanding that, they were still dipped.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not see the justice of adding a claim of this sort to this bill. I shall vote to sustain the point of order when made.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, before the Senator does that, permit me to say a few words. Of course, I realize the fact that this man lives in Oklahoma, and that the cattle were killed in Oklahoma constitutes no special exception in favor of the claim. The Senator is undoubtedly correct in that contention; but I wish to bring this matter to his attention:

Under the quarantine laws of the United States the Government can destroy diseased cattle in certain cases without any compensation to the owner. It does that constantly now; it destroys a great deal of live stock without any compensation whatever to the owner. When the foot-and-mouth disease broke out it raged with its peculiar virulence in the Senator's State and adjacent States, and the department felt called upon to slaughter those cattle for the protection of the live-stock industry of the United States. The losses were so extensive and so serious that the Government departed from its general practice and made an exception in favor of this outbreak and compensated the owners of those cattle, at least in part, and, in conjunction with the States, supposedly in full. It could have slaughtered many of those cattle without any compensation to the owners; no owner would have had even the color of a case for damages against the Government; but the Congress of the United States departed from the established custom and voluntarily compensated those owners. It did not remit them to the ordinary course of obtaining reparation through a private claim.

Now, this is an exceptional case, of course not so extensive, but it seems to me that the equities back of the payment to the owner of the cattle infected with the foot-and-mouth disease in the Senator's State obtain in favor of this man who, without any fault of his own, was subjected to serious losses. His situation would have been much better if these cattle had been infected with the foot-and-mouth disease. In that case he would have been compensated, he would not have been compelled to go to the Court of Claims, he would not have been compelled to come to Congress and go through the tedious process of securing the passage of a private-claims bill. That is the only reason.

The Senator is entirely correct in his insistence that this is obnoxious to the point of order. It seems to me that there is a species of equity which has been extended by the Government to citizens of his own State in cases less entitled in some respects to consideration, an equity which might at least be justified in the adoption of this amendment. I hope the Senator will be able to see it in that light.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I shall make a point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator make a point of order?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; I will when I conclude my remarks. I wish to say a little something before I take my seat on the general merits. This may be a hardship, but it is one of a very great number of hardships growing out of the diseased condition of cattle. There is even less equity in this application than in the case where, contrary to the wishes of the owners, the animals were slaughtered. There it was known that there was to be a destruction. Here there was an effort to cure a diseased condition of cattle or at least to disinfect them and make them proper for further shipment. The difficulty is, it seems to me, like making this an exception to the general rule. It could be obviated by some proper amendment to this section or to the committee amendment which is proposed to the section that would avoid the precedent here for making particular claims in this form in an appropriation bill. It seems to me that we can avoid that precedent by doing so.

On the question of hardship I do not care to take very much time. I can only say that a great many stock raisers in the West and in the northwestern part of the country are out a great many hundreds of thousands of dollars, some of them having been brought almost to a point of bankruptcy by their misfortunes. Some of them still have notes at the bank representing the purchases of stock killed by Government inspectors. They have received the appraised value, some part of it from the State, 50 per cent of it from the total amount allowed, and the remaining part from the Government. Altogether about \$1,450,000 has been paid out in my own State, the total losses in property in that State would aggregate more than \$8,000,000. A great many of these herds were owned by tenant farmers whose ability to continue successfully their business was tied up in their stock. So when this misfortune came it was a most serious matter for them. They have lost and will not recover for some years to come. Those are more equitable claims than anything that this property owner presents, who would undertake to ship cattle through and over a given State line and then they were taken by the Federal inspector and dipped, and in the process some of the cattle died. I know in this difficulty of last year, at the live-stock show in Chicago, values aggregating many millions of dollars passed from a quick asset either into a slow asset or totally disappeared.

There is a good deal of prejudice—I find it in some of the hearings before the committee—that a blooded animal ought not to be paid for at any more than its beef value. If that could be announced as a general rule, then there is an end of all live-stock improvement in the live-stock industry; you put an end to all incentive to breed the better class of cattle in the United States.

Mr. GORE. I should like to say to the Senator that the pending bill contains the provision that breeding cattle can be paid for at the rate of three times their beef value.

Mr. SHERMAN. I understand. That is supposed to be a sort of just compromise between the actual value sold in the ordinary course of trade of blooded animals and the mere beef value or the scrap stock value put upon the animal. I do not know whether three times the value will prove at all adequate. It may be that that is the only practical basis on which an agreement can be reached; but I know that the Herefords, the Guernseys, the cattle that are distinctly bred and their pedigrees followed year after year, with a view of developing the largest amount of carcass in the slaughterhouse, that animals of that description, both male and female, sell for prices that are out of all proportion, apparently, to their value. Still the beef raisers in the corn and clover country inevitably tend to get the blooded cattle as beef producers. They find that it is money in their pockets to do so.

I know there is some feeling against a blooded bull. I remember some years ago there was great prejudice in my part of the country against the animals that were pedigreed. It was said that a crabapple bull was just as good as any other, and it was a discrimination against the right of the common people to interfere with the scrub bull. They have gotten over that notion in every part of the country where they breed either for beef or milk.

I only refer to this to show the manifold hazards the stock raisers not only in my State but in the adjoining States of Iowa

and of Missouri and generally in the live-stock producing States have incurred.

I want to have printed in the Record at length, without reading, Mr. President—for I do not want to take much time—the history of the origin and development of the foot-and-mouth disease, discovered about August 18 to August 23, 1914, at Niles, Mich., and running on through to the present time, including the difficulty at the Live Stock Show at Chicago last fall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

HISTORY.

1. Suspicious cases discovered about August 18 to 23, Niles, Mich. Dr. Clemo, local veterinarian, called to David Muruk's farm. Dr. W. T. Graham, local veterinarian, called to William Hoadley's farm.

2. Dr. Graham sent special-delivery letter to State Veterinarian Dumphy.

3. Dr. Dumphy notified Federal Inspector E. P. Shaffter at Detroit.

4. Dr. Fess, assistant inspector, was sent to Niles September 1. He and Dumphy took samples of diseased tissue and contents of vesicles and sent them to the Bureau of Animal Industry at Washington. Eight days later experts reported to the Detroit inspector that it was a non-contagious disease—mycotic stomatitis. (Read bulletin by Dr. J. A. Moore, director New York State College of Veterinary Science.) The cases at Niles ran through the entire herd. Also read pamphlet issued by Bureau of Animal Industry, November 28, 1908, "Differential diagnosis," and still Dr. Ward, of the Pathology Division, said cases at Niles, Mich., were mycotic stomatitis.

5. September 19, with disease increasing and no action or quarantine or interest displayed by the Bureau of Animal Industry, after one month, Dr. Hallman, Michigan College of Agriculture, went to Niles, obtained specimens, and he and State Veterinarian Dumphy inoculated a calf at East Lansing. They had results in four days and concluded the disease was infectious, which mycotic stomatitis is not.

6. Again Federal inspectors were notified at Detroit, but not until October 5 did Federal Inspector E. P. Shaffter go to Niles, Mich. When he arrived there, six weeks later than he should, he became convinced it was foot-and-mouth disease. He got samples, sent them to Washington, and asked for experts to come on from Washington, but put on no quarantine. Cattle were shipped to Chicago Stock Yards, farmers were coming and going on infected farms. Dr. Adolph Eichorn, who had had considerable experience in Europe, was sent to Michigan, almost two months after cases were first reported to the Bureau of Animal Industry. Why was not Eichorn sent there August 26? Dr. Adolph Eichorn was sent to Niles, Mich., October 6, but although he reported by wire at once that the disease was probably foot-and-mouth disease, not until October 13, a week later, did Dr. A. D. Melvin, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, call Dr. U. G. Houch and tell him to go to Niles, Mich., as they likely had foot-and-mouth disease there. He, with J. R. Mohler, H. E. Smith, and B. A. Gallagher, went to infected section and pronounced the disease, after two months' delay, foot-and-mouth disease.

In the meantime shipment of hogs from the Michigan district had infected the Union Stock Yards at Chicago. That square mile of pens became rotten with the disease. The disease has since been proven to have been in the stockyards prior to October 15.

Serum was made from infected hogs for weeks. Several hundred of the most valuable dairy animals in the world were permitted to be shipped into the annual dairy show October 20, and yet it was known to exist among serum hogs of the Chicago Serum Co., at Union Stock Yards, November 20, when about 120 of these hogs were destroyed on account of this disease, Veterinary Inspector Bennett permitting cattle to come and go and dairy-show cattle arriving. October 27 Federal Inspector Bennett absolutely denied there was a single case of foot-and-mouth disease at the stockyards to the dairy-show officials, but the following day advised the manager of the dairy show to spread in aisles and approaches saturated shavings with disinfectants.

October 30 dairy-show cattle put in quarantine.

October 31 disease found in dairy-show herd. Shipments of feeders continued for four days after from the stockyards to various counties in Illinois and adjoining States, so that by November 6 reports poured in showing 19 counties in Illinois infected.

November 1, although disease was known to be in the cattle of Darlington & Co. and Ronan & Kelly, the yards were still open to visitors who visited pens and tramped about without restriction over all the premises. It was doubtless due to visitors the week previous that brought the disease from the yards to the dairy-show cattle at the Coliseum.

By December 10 Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Iowa, Illinois with 46 per cent, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Virginia, Wisconsin, Kentucky, and Kansas had the disease.

January 27, 1915, three loads of infected hogs reached Philadelphia from the Chicago stockyards, showing disease still at yards with shipments made.

June 26, 1915, entire State of Illinois lifted from quarantine, except Union Stock Yards.

August 7, 1915, fresh outbreak of disease from hog cholera serum started on the farm of Henry Pearson, near Wheeling, Ill. Thirty hogs in herd of 124, 2 cattle in herd of 4 being found infected.

August 10, 1915, outbreak in hogs near Wyanet, in Bureau County.

August 16, 1915, but for outbreak, it was the intention to open the Union Stock Yards to free movement of feeders on this date; something significant in this, a new epidemic.

August 19, 1915, nine herds in Cook County, Ill., one in Bureau, one in Warren, two in McDonough Counties infected on this date, as well as one herd in Dodge County, Minn., in Posey County, Ind., and one in Saginaw County, Mich.

From this date, August 19, 1915, to present date, March 23, 1916, with the disease still in evidence in Christian County, Ill., hundreds of herds have been slaughtered, bringing anxiety and distress upon the owners.

The serum which caused this latter outbreak, which has cost the lives of thousands of head of live stock and hundreds of thousands of dollars, besides bringing upon the owners of the cattle untold suffering and deprivation was due to eleven hundred dollars' worth of hog serum produced by the Chicago Serum Co. at the stockyards some time prior to October 20, 1914, and through Department of Agriculture was permitted to be kept and after a questionable test in July, 1915, was sent on sale.

The first animal of the Crab Tree herd was taken August 16, 1915, at once isolated, and State veterinarian sent for. State veterinarian was at Half Day, Ill., 15 miles away, combating a fierce raging of the disease from the first case on August 7 at Wheeling, a few miles distant. He did not know what disease the animal had, he said, although for 10 days working in infected herds. The following day brought Federal Inspector Lavery, and although the animal was by himself, one man to attend him, the cattle barns thoroughly disinfected, the Federal inspector pronounced this case (the worst case in the Crab Tree herd) "weed poisoning," and said no precaution from infecting the herd need be taken. In 10 days animal was as well as ever and pegged in alfalfa field.

September 7, Federal Inspector L. E. Eppla in making the rounds found the young stock barn with aged bulls completely recovered from the foot-and-mouth disease; all lesions healed; so light was the attack that not one animal showed any sign of disease or sickness, some young calves not even having it.

The milking herd of 36 head had one-third recovered, one-third just starting. By September 19 not one trace of foot-and-mouth disease could be found in herd. September 17 a thorough examination by State and Federal inspectors found but one lesion and by September 19 that had healed.

September 24, Dr. Joseph Hughes was permitted to inspect herd, and Dr. Hughes, who had so successfully carried the dairy show cattle through the disease, could not tell that there had ever been any foot-and-mouth disease, as no evidence showed.

October 1, the family started to use the milk and make butter out of the cream. Calves were born healthy, vigorous, wonderfully fine; milking herd coming back to full milk; not one case of abortion; butter fat higher than before disease, even with fresh cows.

November 8, milk records and cream tests show herd in normal condition, and had been for three weeks.

November 9, herd never as fine; 7 cows ready to drop their calves; young stock slick and beautiful; 15 splendid young bulls, vigorous and strong; dams in advance registry; as fine imported Guernsey blood as ever brought to America.

Twenty-six armed men came upon the premises, although enjoined by circuit court injunction, imprisoned the men and Mrs. Durand, shot the animals in the stanchions, 140 years of pure-bred breeding of the finest dairy strains the country ever possessed.

Twenty-seven hours before the Federal men took last animal from stable.

Forty-eight hours a single animal was buried.

Dragged across the paddock, through the pasture one-third of a mile and left in a heap, a trail of blood to mark the way. But well animals taken from clean, sanitary, disinfected stables—the birds, squirrels, rabbits, and dogs carried no infection away, for there was none; and not one animal contracted the disease from the Crab Tree herd, notwithstanding the outrageous handling of the operation.

With an expenditure of over \$300,000, and building up of one of the highest milk, cream, and ice-cream businesses in the country, the breeding and selling of pure-bred cattle, through the carelessness, ignorance, and, one might add, criminal intent of the Bureau of Animal Industry the entire enterprise has been completely eliminated and one of the finest dairy farms in America, an example to dairy farmers, has laid idle for six months.

Is the Department of Agriculture created to destroy rather than to encourage the American farmer, breeder, producer? Is the Bureau of Animal Industry operated for the benefit of the packer exclusively? Wholly inefficient, that branch of the Department of Agriculture has lost the respect and confidence of the entire farming element of America. For the first time in the history of the United States, American breeders and farmers are organizing in various States for protection and recognition.

In cases of an epidemic such as the recent outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, caused absolutely through the incompetence of the Bureau of Animal Industry, the breeder asks not only adequate compensation for cattle killed but also for all losses and expenses relative to and incurred through the malady. The patience and good humor of the breeder have been exhausted and a radical reformation in the operation of the Bureau of Animal Industry is now asked for.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I should like to make the point of order that this appropriation for an individual claim is not properly incorporated in the bill, but is contrary to the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order that this is a private claim on an appropriation bill will be sustained.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if he thinks that the Senate conferees ought to recede on this proposition to pay this value on the 3 to 1 basis for cattle slaughtered under the foot-and-mouth extermination policy and to remit such owners to their remedy through private claims bills?

Mr. SHERMAN. No; I am making no point of order against that amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, notwithstanding it is a committee amendment, I will make that point of order. I will say that that proposition went out in the other House on a point of order, and I make the point of order against it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Oklahoma specifically state his point of order?

Mr. GORE. I refer to the amendment authorizing the payment for animals slaughtered in such cases on a basis of 3 to 1.

Mr. SHERMAN. The claim of Mr. Blair for \$18,293?

Mr. GORE. That has already been acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Oklahoma make his point of order more specific, pointing out the exact language to which he refers?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the provision might go out in the other House on a point of order and yet not be subject to a point of order in the Senate. Our rules here are very different with reference to points of order from those in the other House.

Mr. GORE. I think the amendment would be subject to the point of order here. It is legislation proposing to fix the basis for the liquidation of private claims, and it is undoubtedly subject to the point of order.

Mr. SMOOT. Has the amendment been agreed to, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It went out on a point of order. Mr. SMOOT. Was the point of order made against the whole amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order was made against the amendment commencing on line 3, on page 127.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the amendment referred to by the chairman of the committee has already been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; that amendment has been adopted; but the amendment to which the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] refers, the Chair presumes, was the one which went out on the point of order.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask, Is it the last amendment against which the point of order has been made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order just sustained was made against the amendment, on page 127, beginning with line 3. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] now makes the point of order against the amendment on page 126.

Mr. GORE. I merely ask to have the amendment stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been adopted.

Mr. GORE. Then I move to reconsider the vote by which it was adopted; or I will bring the matter up in the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. The ruling of the Chair was undoubtedly correct as to the amendment on page 127. It is evidently subject to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 126 was agreed to.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will renew my motion in the Senate.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 127, line 8, after the words "Department of Agriculture," to strike out "\$24,673,393" and insert "\$23,929,320," so as to make the clause read:

Total carried by this bill for the Department of Agriculture, \$23,929,320.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I understand that that is the last of the amendments reported by the committee, and I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he will not consent to adjourn at this time? It is Saturday afternoon, and everybody is tired out.

Mr. GORE. There are a few amendments of not very considerable importance which I think may be disposed of in a few minutes. It is not my purpose to hold the Senate very late.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like, if the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Utah will consent, to return to an amendment on page 53. I do not expect to be present on Monday, as I shall be obliged to be absent on some business of the Senate in connection with one of the Senate committees, with my colleague [Mr. THOMPSON], and should therefore like to have the amendment to which I refer now disposed of.

Mr. GORE. In view of the statement on the part of the Senator from Kansas, I ask that the amendment to which he refers be now stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment referred to by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The amendment referred to, which was passed over, was, on page 53, after line 16, to insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a site within or near the corporate limits of the city of Wellington, Sumner County, Kans., said site to contain a sufficient and suitable tract of ground and the location of the site to be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. When a good and sufficient title to said site is held by the Government of the United States the Secretary of the Treasury, acting in conjunction with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall cause to be erected thereon a suitable building or buildings for the use and accommodation of the entomological laboratory or field station of the Department of Agriculture of the Government at Wellington, Kans., said site and building or buildings complete to cost not to exceed the sum of \$10,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I now find that the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has not had time to examine the statement which I gave him in reference to the amendment, and he says he would rather have the amendment go over. If the chairman has no objection, I will ask that the amendment may go over and that we may dispose of it later.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the chairman of the committee that it will not take any length of time to discuss the amendment. I simply desire to ask the Senator from Kansas a few questions in relation to the necessity for it.

Mr. GORE. I have no objection whatever to the amendment going over. I consented to its immediate consideration for the convenience of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SMOOT. I recognize that.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, in connection with this amendment, I desire to say that I have here a letter from the Chief of the Bureau of Entomology, which I should like to have inserted in the Record, without reading, showing the purposes of the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. It would be very helpful to have the letter in the RECORD, and then I can read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be inserted in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY,
Washington, D. C., November 30, 1915.

Hon. WM. H. THOMPSON,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 26th instant is received, and in reply I am glad to furnish you with the following information:

This bureau has an entomological laboratory and field station located at Wellington, Sumner County, Kans. The territory covered by the entomologists connected with the field station comprises Kansas, southern Nebraska, southwestern Iowa, western Missouri, western Arkansas, Oklahoma, and northern Texas. This is one of the two strongest field stations of the section of cereal and forage insect investigation. There are employed at this station five permanent assistants, a stenographer, and janitor, and in summer the force is increased by the addition of two or three temporary assistants.

The beginning of field work in the vicinity of Wellington was in the spring of 1907, in connection with the green bug outbreak of that year. A permanent station was established there in August, 1908, since which time it has been necessary to move the laboratory three times.

At this point the most important insects under investigation, with relation to their control by the farmers are the Hessian fly, the chinch bug, the fall army worm, the false wireworm, the white grub, the true wireworm, the green bug or spring grain aphid, and the alfalfa webworm. In addition to these major projects, and simultaneous with them, a large number of minor investigations are being carried on. These minor investigations dovetail, so to speak, with the more important ones, and are therefore conducted at practically no expense.

In reply to your inquiry as to whether or not the work at the Wellington station has been, or is likely to be, of sufficient value to justify the establishment of a permanent station at that point, one or two specific instances may be mentioned which bear on the work already done there.

In 1908 there occurred in Kansas a disastrous outbreak of Hessian fly. The matter was at once taken up by our assistants in cooperation with prominent millers, grain men, farmers, and others, and a campaign was inaugurated which resulted in the prevention of a fall attack of the pest, in its consequent elimination from the grain fields that section of more than a half million dollars, this figure being given as a conservative estimate by Mr. George H. Hunter, a very well-known miller and grain dealer of southern Kansas. With reference to more recent work with the Hessian fly, Mr. W. L. English, supervisor of agriculture for the St. Louis & San Francisco Railway, under date of August 27, 1915, writes as follows:

"I wish to say that your field assistants at Wellington, Kans., have done some exceptionally good work in our territory, and we appreciate the efforts being put forth to arouse farmers to a realization of the situation that confronts them with reference to the Hessian fly. We appreciate very much the cooperation we have received from your office relative to this work."

There have always been carried on at this point extensive and important investigations with the chinch bug which have enabled the farmers of this section to reduce greatly, and in many cases to prevent entirely the losses previously caused by this well-known pest.

The work of this station will, it is expected, be continued along similar lines to those followed in the past. Some of the investigations under way, such as those dealing with false wire worms and white grubs, will eventually result in enabling the farmers to control the ravages of these very destructive pests by thoroughly practical measures.

But while, as may be seen from the foregoing, much work of great value to the farmer and to the State has been done at the Wellington station, and while much more is under way which must result in equal profits to all concerned, it is but fair to say that many investigations which should have been taken up long ago remain still untouched because of the lack of facilities for conducting them. For instance, the three-repeated necessity of changing the laboratory location has effectually prevented the investigation of subterranean insects—that is, such insects that pass the larval stage below ground—because in many cases this period covers a series of years. For the same reason we have been unable to secure, for permanent use, grounds upon which to carry on experimental plat tests. You will understand that such tests are inaugurated for the purpose of testing thoroughly certain proposed measures for the elimination or control of insects, that the real, practical value of such measures may be demonstrated before they are advocated for public use. Such tests are without value, and indeed impossible of accomplishment, unless they can be continued in the same field for a reasonable period of years. I have cited these instances to indicate the difficulties under which the work at Wellington has been conducted, and to indicate also, in some measure, the need for a permanent establishment at that point.

I trust that this, in a general way at least, embodies the information you desire.

Very respectfully, yours,

L. O. HOWARD,
Chief of Bureau.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, I will renew my request to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE]. It being Saturday afternoon and it being impossible to secure the presence of a quorum, I suggest to the Senator that he now move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. GORE. I had rather return to the passed-over amendments. Let us make what progress we can for a little while. It is still early. Any seriously contested amendment, of course, I shall not make an effort to have considered, for we should probably lose a quorum; but at this early hour I should not like to consent to delay the consideration of amendments which might not consume much time, for when we next meet, fresh and invigorated after adjourning over Sunday, everybody will be full of oratory.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Oklahoma ought to say that, because I do not remember an Agricultural appropriation bill which has gone along so smoothly as has this one. There has been no oratory indulged in at all, and I do not think there is any disposition to debate the bill at length.

Mr. GORE. I was making no reflection on the Senator from Utah, but I simply had in my memory incidents that occurred here yesterday.

Mr. SMOOT. Those were in connection with an entirely different bill.

Mr. GORE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment passed over will be stated.

The first amendment passed over was, on page 13, line 24, after the word "markets," to strike out the figures "\$272,470" and to insert "\$277,470," so as to make the clause read:

For all necessary expenses for investigations and experiments in dairy industry, cooperative investigations of the dairy industry in the various States, inspection of renovated-butter factories and markets, \$277,470.

Mr. WARREN. Has the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] been heard from in reference to that amendment? The amendment was passed over because the Senator from Idaho, who is now in a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs, asked that it might go over.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Idaho offered his amendment to the provision, and it was agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. Has he done so since then?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; he did so to-day; and I do not think there is now any dispute about the matter.

Mr. WARREN. If the amendment of the Senator from Idaho has been offered and agreed to, I know of no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment has not yet been agreed to. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is, on page 14, line 9, to strike out—

Mr. SMOOT. Is not the first amendment passed over at the bottom of page 4? I think that amendment was passed over at the request of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. I will say to the Senator that that amendment was adopted while I was engaged on another matter, and there will have to be a motion made to reconsider it before it can be taken up.

Mr. SMOOT. Why would not this be a good time to take it up?

Mr. JONES. I will be glad to have that done if the chairman of the committee is willing.

Mr. GORE. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. JONES. I shall be glad to make a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment at the bottom of page 4, striking out the item for studying the methods of clearing off "logged-off" land was agreed to, and will do so whenever the chairman of the committee is willing.

Mr. GORE. I think it would be perfectly proper at this time.

Mr. JONES. Very well.

Mr. GORE. I hope the motion to reconsider will be agreed to.

Mr. JONES. I make the motion to reconsider the vote whereby that amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Washington to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment at the bottom of page 4 and top of page 5 was agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I hope that that amendment will not be agreed to. It was stated yesterday that it was stricken out on a report from the department. The clerk of the com-

mittee has kindly procured for me a copy of the House hearings with relation to this item, and I find, on page 45, that, while Mr. Spillman, of the Agricultural Department, came before the committee and stated substantially what the chairman of the committee said yesterday, he also said something further with reference to this matter. Without reading all that he said, I will read a portion of his testimony near its conclusion:

The CHAIRMAN. Is it your expectation to have this item an indefinite item or do you expect to reach final conclusions in the near future?

Mr. SPILLMAN. On certain phases of the problem I think we have reached final conclusions, or approximately final. They probably will never be absolutely final—that is, as to methods and as to cost of using these different methods we have reached approximately final conclusions. As to the conditions under which any given method is justifiable we have not reached final conclusions yet; but we have made, I think, important progress in that direction this past year, and we can use that fund to very great advantage at least for a year or two more. I can not say now just how much longer, but we certainly can use it this next year to advantage.

Mr. President, it seems to me that that warrants a continuance of this appropriation for a year or so. I know that in my section of the country, where there are thousands of acres of land on which timber has been cut, the question of getting the stumps out is of very great importance. In some cases it costs, under the methods now employed, \$125 or \$150 an acre; but after it is cleared the land is very productive; and any method or any system by which the clearing of these lands can be facilitated and cheapened is one of very great importance to our people. I hope that the Senate will continue this appropriation for the coming year, at any rate, and let the department see if they can not further assist us in the matter, especially along the lines Mr. Spillman indicates in his statement.

I do not want to take the time of the Senate further. I know the Senator from Oregon is very much interested in this matter. He is not here, and I hope the chairman of the committee will not be disposed to insist upon the committee amendment at this time.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the language which has been stricken out, it appears to me, is of rather an extraordinary nature, and I feel that it ought to be stricken out. We are going to appropriate money for what?

For studying methods of clearing off "logged-off" lands with a view to their utilization for agricultural and dairying purposes; for their irrigation; for testing powders in clearing them; and for the utilization of by-products arising in the process of clearing.

Why, Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington, instead of living in the Northwest lived in New Hampshire, he would know that we think we have solved the problem of getting rid of rocks of various sizes, some of them weighing tons, which we are obliged to clear off if our lands are to be worth anything for agriculture. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] suggests, so that the sheep can get their noses in the grass. Why it should be necessary in this age of the world to test powders to find out what kind should be used to blow rocks and stumps out of the ground surpasses my comprehension. We use dynamite.

Mr. JONES. Yes; but we use a different kind of powder in getting stumps out than is used in getting rocks out.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, dynamite will blow stumps out. I have seen it done over and over again, and we have stumps, as well as rocks, in the section of the country from which I come.

Mr. JONES. It is a question of economy—of ascertaining the cheapest method.

Mr. GALLINGER. In other words, it is another one of the propositions to spend money to investigate what has been demonstrated by the good old farmers for the last 50 years.

Our land has all had to be cleared. The people who came into New Hampshire came on horseback from Essex County, Mass., and they settled in a wilderness. Their first duty was to clear off trees enough to build cabins, and, of course, they had to fight Indians while they were doing that.

The next duty they had to perform was to get the rocks off the land so that they could raise something to support their families. We have built stone walls enough in New Hampshire to almost encircle the United States, and we learned how to get rid of the rocks and how to get rid even of the stumps in the early days when the settlers did not have high-power powders and did not have dynamite; but in this enlightened age they understand what powder will do, they know what dynamite will do, and they know what log pullers will do, and they clear their lands. Now, why we should put into the hands of a theorist an appropriation to tell the farmers how to get rid of stumps I can not for the life of me understand. I think it is a waste of money to undertake anything of this kind.

But, Mr. President, I want to address myself—and I prefer to do that on Monday rather than to-day—to this entire para-

graph concerning farm management. I believe it is the greatest humbug that ever was thought of in connection with agriculture, and that we are wasting not only the sum of \$5,000 proposed to be appropriated for this item, but the much greater sum which, I believe, is proposed to be appropriated elsewhere in this paragraph. I desire at least to satisfy myself by a little discussion of that paragraph, because I shall feel that I have neglected a duty if I do not call attention to what I think to be an inexcusable waste of public money in appropriating to enable a man who knows little about agriculture, and who has 40 clerks in his office, and 3 photographers—and nobody knows whether they photograph fields before they are planted or after the crops are up—to go around the country with 3 photographers and some slides, I believe, and tell the farmers how they can best farm their little parcels of land.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GALLINGER. With pleasure.

Mr. NELSON. I want to call the attention of the Senator to an appropriation that immediately precedes this, and which, to my mind, is even—

Mr. GALLINGER. Even worse?

Mr. NELSON. Yes; which is even worse.

Mr. GALLINGER. I did not suppose that was possible.

Mr. NELSON. I refer to the paragraph which reads:

To investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice, \$230,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; that is another illustration of the fact that we are putting in the hands of men, who perhaps never did a day's work on a farm in their lives, large sums of money to enable them to tell farmers how to farm.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. GALLINGER. With pleasure.

Mr. WORKS. Does the Senator think that that is any worse than the attempt to teach the people of the Western States how to irrigate their land?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think not. I think it is along the same line. These things remind me of what John B. Gough said. Some of you perhaps have heard John B. Gough, the temperance orator, a man who understood the art of gesture as no other man has in my time. A theological student came to him one day and said, "Mr. Gough, I should like to have you teach me gestures." "Teach you gestures," Mr. Gough replied, "I would just as soon teach a dog how to wag his tail." It is just so with these things. We are enabling theorists, men who have comfortable quarters in Washington, making it necessary for us to rent great buildings, men surrounded with 40 clerks and 3 or 4 messengers and 3 photographers, to go around the country teaching the farmers how to farm! But I wish to discuss that more at length when I have time, and I hope I will have an opportunity to do so on Monday.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] that this bill carries an appropriation for investigating diseases of citrus fruits and for the extermination of the Mediterranean fly and other pests which infest and infect citrus trees. That is done on the supposition that the General Government ought to assume that expense and lend that assistance and service to the citrus-fruit growers in his State and in Louisiana and in Florida. Now, if the Senator will say that that is an idle appropriation for my part I shall be glad to accept an amendment that none of it shall be wasted in his State.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma will not be able to intimidate me in any such way as that. Of course if these diseases are such as to give the National Government jurisdiction because of their interstate character and because of their transmission from one State to another, such expenditures can be justified, but they can not be justified on any other ground.

Mr. GORE. I think that is true.

Mr. WORKS. You may apply it to my own State if you will. If it were simply a question of taking care of and protecting the trees of California, and the other question did not enter into it, I should say it was a wrongful appropriation of money. The people of California should pay for those things and not the National Government; but the Federal activity has always been attempted to be justified on the ground that it is an interstate question, and sometimes it is. That is the only justification for it. I am not asking anything for the State of California that I would not be willing to grant to any other State.

Mr. GORE. I entirely agree with the Senator as to the principle he lays down. I think it applies to the irrigation plant at Denver. The method of irrigation to be employed there has not been elsewhere introduced in the West, as I understand. If

its success is demonstrated there, it can be applied generally throughout that section with incalculable advantage.

The department introduced drought-resisting wheat, and it has been a great success throughout the arid region. Senators may say that it ought to have been left to the States, to the localities, and to the farmers themselves; but the Government and the farmers have thought otherwise; and experience has abundantly justified the wisdom of Congress and the expenditure of that slight amount of money.

Now, it is easy for Senators to criticize particular items in this bill, and I own to having done so myself. The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] criticized in a moderate way the proposed irrigation plant at Denver, notwithstanding its success, if demonstrated, would be of incalculable service to a number of States; yet he insists upon retaining a provision to demonstrate the processes of clearing "logged-off" land when the department officials say they have pretty well exhausted the known means and appliances, although their statement, of course, would not foreclose the possibility of new inventions in the future. They have explained before the committee the different processes of clearing logged-off land. Those who were supposed to know, said it was a matter of common knowledge, and did not require expert skill or experience.

I mention this now because Senators manifest a tendency—and I suppose it is justifiable, in the main—to criticize particular items, when there are other items of the same character which they would undoubtedly justify. I remember that on yesterday the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] resisted the insertion in this bill of the provision in regard to investigations affecting the Hessian fly, and he may have been right in that; but it was followed the next moment by a motion on the part of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], who I think volunteered a suggestion a moment ago, that a provision for investigating the chinch bug be put in this bill. I say that, to illustrate that, Senators who criticize, sometimes with full knowledge and sometimes perhaps with insufficient knowledge, are not themselves quite in a situation always to cast stones.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. GORE. I do.

Mr. WORKS. I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will take notice of the fact that the only item in the bill which I have criticized is one that is supposed to be of benefit to my own State.

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir; I understand that; and I am sure the Senator will rejoice one of these days that the Senate voted it in.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to say, with regard to the Senator's suggestion about my opposing the item for irrigation at Denver, that I did not oppose that item. I simply made some inquiries to get information with reference to it, and when I got the information I made no opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GORE. I may have done the Senator an injustice; and if so, I beg to apologize for it.

Mr. JONES. I know the Senator did not intend to do so, of course. I assume that there are probably a great many items in this bill that, strictly speaking, may not be justifiable, and I know several members of the committee hold that view; but the item for studying methods of clearing "logged-off" land, while not a matter of national importance, in the sense that it affects the whole country, has been carried in the bill for two years; the department have done a good deal of work; and Mr. Spillman, while he thinks they have finished the investigation of certain phases of the work as nearly as they can, says there are some other questions in the study of which they can use this money very advantageously during the next year or two.

I am not, of course, an old pioneer like the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], but I do remember the time, when I was a boy, when I helped to clear some land in the State of Illinois of timber and helped plow the land after it was cleared, and I know that the problem of clearing in that State—and I think probably it would be true in New Hampshire—is entirely different from the problem in the Northwest.

I know that in Illinois when the trees were cut down and the land was plowed in two or three years the stumps were all gone. In our country that is not the case. The stumps do not rot, and after the trees have been cut down for 10, 12, 15, or 20 years there will be stumps 8, 10, and 15 feet in diameter, just as solid as they were when the trees were cut. So that the problem of clearing our land after the timber has been cut is entirely different from the problem in the East and in the Middle States. It is not a poor man's proposition; it is not a

cheap proposition; and the question of getting the kind of powder that can be used efficiently and economically in the clearing of that land is a very important question. Possibly they might blow the stumps out with dynamite, but I do not think so. The stumps will split, and they are pretty nearly as hard to get out after they are split as when they are solid. So that the question of getting the stumps out is a very important one.

I think this item is quite as justifiable as many of the other items in the bill. I recognize the force of the criticism of the Senator from New Hampshire with reference to many of these items; but I think, from my knowledge of the situation out in the West and of what the people there have to do, that this item is justifiable; and in view of the work which has already been done and of the hope expressed by Mr. Spillman that in the next year or two some other important developments may be brought about I do hope that the Senate will continue this item.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the stumps in his country can be gotten rid of more readily than they can in the Eastern States?

Mr. JONES. Not in any of the Eastern States that I have been in or had any experience in.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have traveled through the Senator's State and through Oregon, where the inhabitants are said to be web-footed, and I have found that the character of taproots that we have in the East are not found, as a rule, in the trees of the West, especially in the States where they have very heavy rainfall. Am I correct about that?

Mr. JONES. There are not so many taproots, but there are many other kinds of roots that go all over the country. Take the cedar trees. There they have, you might say, a great many taproots going away down into the ground.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I want to say to the Senator that when they logged their lands out there, their cedar trees and so forth, they cut the stumps very high; they cut the tree and left a long stump. In recent years they have been cutting off those stumps and making shingles out of them, and a good many of the cedar shingles and cypress shingles that we get in our country are made from those dead stumps.

Mr. JONES. They make just as good shingles as the tree.

Mr. GALLINGER. I observed, in a little trip I made from Seattle to the Canadian city on the seacoast, that there was the most reckless kind of cutting that I supposed intelligent human beings ever practiced, and I did not know why it was. I was told by some one that it was because the high winds shivered the tree near the base. I do not know whether there is anything in that or not.

Mr. JONES. I never heard of anything of that kind in my State.

Mr. GALLINGER. But the trees were cut several feet from the ground. I do not wonder that they are making shingles out of them, because I thought then that if we in the Eastern States could only have what is wasted in those parts through which I traveled, we would be a very happy people.

Mr. JONES. In reference to that, I just want to say that it is true that they used to cut the cedar trees, especially quite high up, and now, as the Senator from Minnesota says, they are using the cedar stumps. The cedar is just as solid and makes just as good shingles now as in the days when they thought, I suppose, that there was an unlimited supply of cedar, and they cut it as they did because it was more easy to cut it in that way, I suppose.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, sometimes I wonder—and I think I have expressed it once or twice before in the Senate—whether I am not neglecting the interests of the people whom I try to represent. We have rivers in New England that if they were in the South would demand very large appropriations. In fact, we have creeks in New England that would call for appropriations if they were in another section of the country, but we do not ask for appropriations for them. We have rocks where the Senator's constituents have stumps, and I want to give a little personal experience. I am not much of a farmer, but I have a little rocky farm on which I amuse myself. I do my farming chiefly in a hammock when I am there in the summer time. I thought I would break up 1 acre of land that I imagined probably never had been plowed—if it had been, it had not been to my knowledge in 60 years—on a corner of a field where I found my hay crop was not doing very well. The breaking up of that 1 acre of land and the removal of the rocks cost me \$225, and I do not believe I could sell the acre of land for \$10.

Now, I did not think of coming here and asking to have an item put in this appropriation for farm management to the effect that this distinguished Prof. Stillman or Spillman, or whatever his name is, should come to New Hampshire at the expense of the Government and tell us how to get rid of those rocks.

In other words, my impression is—and I do not want to be too positive about it—that we are appropriating money for things that have been demonstrated over and over and over again. It seems inconceivable to me that the great country represented by the Senator who has just spoken and by other Senators on this floor, having been inhabited as long as it has by intelligent men, by men who have worked out a living on the land, should not to-day know how to get rid of stumps.

It is inconceivable to me; and I do not believe any man in an office here in the city of Washington, surrounded by 40 clerks and 3 photographers and 4 messengers, carrying an appropriation of \$230,000 for that one little establishment, can go to the State of Washington and tell the Senator's constituents how to get rid of stumps to any better advantage than they can get rid of them themselves. I can not bring my mind to feel that it is a possible thing.

But, Mr. President, as I said before, I want to spend a few minutes—not very long, because I have gotten over making long speeches in the Senate—in the discussion of this entire item, and I should like to do so on Monday. I hope that the question now under consideration will pass over for the present.

Mr. RANSDALL. There is no objection to that, Mr. President.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, may I ask if the next amendment passed over is not on page 14?

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is on page 14.

Mr. RANSDALL. I understand that is the next one that was passed over.

The SECRETARY. From line 1 to the proviso in line 11.

Mr. PITTMAN. I offer an amendment which I should like to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 14, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "\$214,320" and insert "\$189,320;" also to strike out the proviso beginning with the word "Provided," in line 9, down to and including the word "purposes," in line 11, and to insert, at the end of line 16, the following:

The sum of \$200,000 is hereby appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, out of any money in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purchase and maintenance of stallions for the production of horses for agricultural and military purposes: *Provided*, That all expenditures authorized under this act shall be made by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture.

Mr. PITTMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. RANSDALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I am requested by the chairman of the committee, in charge of the bill, to ask that this matter be passed over until Monday. Will the Senator consent to that?

Mr. PITTMAN. Very gladly.

Mr. JONES. As I understand, the amendment on page 4 has gone over at the request of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. RANSDALL. That is correct.

Mr. JONES. That is entirely satisfactory to me.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is on page 21, relative to investigating the handling, grading, and transportation of grain, and so forth.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask that the amendment go over. I have an amendment to offer to the appropriation which I want to consider in connection with this amendment.

Mr. RANSDALL. I have no objection at all, Mr. President, to the amendment going over until Monday.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is on page 25.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the seed provision. I ask that it go over. We can not dispose of that question to-day.

Mr. RANSDALL. I have no objection at all.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is on page 53, line 17.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. It was agreed that that amendment should go over until Monday.

Mr. RANSDALL. Does the Senator allude to the amendment on page 53?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. RANSDALL. The Senator asks that that go over?

Mr. SMOOT. That goes over until Monday.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is on page 56, for the maintenance of the Montana national bison range.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I do not see the chairman of the committee in the Chamber. I do not feel like taking up this matter while he is absent.

Mr. WARREN. Let it go over.

Mr. GRONNA. I want the amount appropriated by the House restored; but I ask that it go over until the Senator returns to the Chamber.

Mr. RANSDALL. I have no objection.

Mr. SMOOT. The amendment on page 57, which went over at my request, I should like to have go over until Monday, too.

Mr. RANSDALL. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Those are all the amendments passed over.

Mr. THOMPSON. I desire to offer an amendment and have it lie on the table, relative to the development of the sugar-beet seed industry in this country.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will say that in the case of the so-called grain-grades rider there have been several amendments suggested by the department, and I wish to present them now and have them adopted, so that this particular portion of the bill can be reprinted, and we will have it on the desks of Senators who are interested in it on Monday.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator mean that he offers certain amendments?

Mr. GORE. I am going to offer them and have them adopted now if I can.

Mr. SMOOT. That will lead to the discussion of the whole subject.

Mr. GORE. I do not think so. It will take only a few minutes, after which we propose to adjourn.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the amendments be stated.

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir. I have them arranged here.

The SECRETARY. On page 101, line 14, it is proposed to strike out "grades" and insert "standards"; on the same page, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "grades" and insert "standards"; after the word "act" and before the period, it is proposed to insert:

The word "person," wherever used in this act, shall be construed to import the plural or singular, as the case demands, and shall include individuals, associations, partnerships, and corporations; the words "in interstate or foreign commerce," wherever used in this act, mean "from any State, Territory, or District to or through any other State, Territory, or District, or to or through any foreign country, or within any Territory or District." When construing and enforcing the provisions of this act, the act, omission, or failure of any official, agent, or other person acting for or employed by any association, partnership, or corporation within the scope of his employment or office shall in every case also be deemed the act, omission, or failure of such association, partnership, or corporation as well as that of the person.

Mr. SMOOT. That seems to be a far-reaching amendment, and I will ask the Senator to allow it to go over and be pending and take it up on Monday.

Mr. GORE. I will say that if it suits the Senator I would rather it would be adopted and printed in the body of the bill, which will make it somewhat more intelligible. Of course I would consent to a reconsideration if the Senator desired it.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will consent to a reconsideration, I shall have no objection at all.

Mr. GORE. There will be no trouble about this or any other amendment that I am now offering. I think Senators have a right to a reconsideration.

Mr. SMOOT. That is all right, then.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator to have these amendments printed in italics, so that we can find them more easily in the bill?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMOOT. They will be printed in italics.

Mr. GORE. My understanding is that they will be so printed, because they are not committee amendments; but if I am in error about it I will ask to have that done.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, under the ordinary method of printing a bill they will not be printed in italics. They will be a part of the bill.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma permit me to suggest that he simply offer the amendments and then ask to have them printed?

Mr. GALLINGER. As pending.

Mr. NORRIS. They are offered as pending amendments, and can be printed in that way. If they are adopted, they will become a part of the bill.

Mr. GORE. I will say to the Senator that the only objection I could urge to that is that it is so much more difficult to consider them and to appreciate their real significance. I have just stated to the Senator from Utah that any amendment that is adopted under this request will, of course, be subject to reconsideration at the instance of any Senator. I desire to have them offered now and adopted, so that they can be printed in

the body of the bill. The bill can be then much more intelligently considered.

Mr. NORRIS. The suggestion that I made was to print them in the body of the bill, if the Senator is going to have a reprint of the bill, as I understand it, and let them be printed as amendments in italics. Then we can take them up and they will show on their face just what they are.

Mr. GORE. I will say that the most of them are verbal and inconsequential changes. If there is any amendment in regard to which the Senator particularly desires to have that course pursued I will consent that it be done.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know what the amendments are going to be.

Mr. GORE. I assure the Senator that there will be no difficulty whatever in securing a reconsideration.

Mr. NORRIS. But there will be nothing on the face of the bill to show that they are amendments.

Mr. GORE. I have requested that they be printed in italics.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course I doubt whether the Senator can accomplish that in the way he desires, because if he should have them adopted as a part of the bill, and if they were printed as amendments, then the other amendments to the bill that are printed in italics would mean one thing and the italics in another part of the bill would be part of the bill. It seems to me it would lead to some difficulty.

Mr. GORE. Very well.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator will not lose anything by having them printed in italics as amendments.

Mr. GORE. I should like to suggest, then, that we pursue the reading of the amendments; and that in the case of any amendment where any Senator desires that course taken, we, of course, will do it. There are some that are purely verbal in character, and we might as well get them behind us now. I want to speed the consideration of the bill as much as I can without inconvenience or without assuming too much risk in the haste.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will request that the last amendment read, which seems to be a pretty important one, be simply printed in italics as an amendment pending.

Mr. GORE. I ask that that be done, Mr. President. That may also be done with any other amendment that any Senator desires.

The SECRETARY. On page 102, lines 12, 13, and 14, it is proposed to strike out "from any State, Territory, or District to or through any other State, Territory, or District, or to any foreign country," and to substitute therefor "in interstate or foreign commerce."

On page 103, line 4, after the word "shipped," it is proposed to insert the words "in interstate or foreign commerce."

On page 104, line 24, it is proposed to strike out "which has been" and to substitute therefor a comma.

On page 104, line 25, at the beginning of the line, before the word "shipped," it is proposed to insert "which has been."

On page 106, line 4, after the word "for," it is proposed to insert the words "shipment or delivery for shipment in," and strike out the word "and" and substitute therefor the word "or."

On page 106, line 9, at the beginning of the line, it is proposed to insert the words "shipment or delivery for shipment in."

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, what was the amendment on page 102?

The SECRETARY. On page 102, lines 12, 13, and 14, it is proposed to strike out "from any State, Territory, or District to or through any other State, Territory, or District, or to any foreign country," and to substitute therefor "in interstate or foreign commerce."

Mr. BRANDEGEE. All right.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that I wish he would have all these amendments which are offered printed in italics whether they are agreed to or not, so that we can tell just what they are.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Nebraska suggested that that would still be confusing.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Have all the committee amendments been adopted?

Mr. GORE. There are a few—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Then there would be no way of telling the proposed amendments from the committee amendments which are already printed in italics.

Mr. GORE. There are no committee amendments to the grain-grading section, as I believe.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not know about the section, but if there are any in the bill—

Mr. GORE. The printing of these amendments in italics would serve the Senator's purpose. There are no other amendments.

Mr. NELSON. There are no other amendments; and if these are printed in italics, that will identify them, if the Senator will have that done.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not want to be technical, Mr. President, but if these amendments appear in the bill printed in italics they will appear as pending amendments—absolutely so—so that can not well be done. I have thought that the Senator would not lose any time if he allowed them all to appear in the bill as pending amendments. We will agree to them just as quickly.

Mr. GORE. I know; but the Senator will see, from the character of the amendments already proposed, that most of them are simply clarifying the meaning; and to have the bill cluttered up with them, so to say, renders it more difficult to appreciate the really important parts of it.

Mr. GALLINGER. It will not take five minutes to agree to all those.

Mr. GORE. My only purpose has been to facilitate the consideration of the bill and to enable Senators to arrive at the real points involved.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then I will appeal to the Senator to let them be printed as pending amendments, and printed in italics. There will be no trouble about agreeing to them in a very few minutes.

Mr. GORE. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Chair understand that the Senator desires a reprint of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Only that part of it relating to grain grades.

Mr. CLAPP. If the Senator will pardon me, I will suggest that he take this section and have it printed by itself, with the amendments that he is proposing, and bring it in Monday morning in concrete form; and it will then show on the face of it the amendments that he proposes now, and thus avoid all confusion. He can have that done. The chairman of a committee can always have that done.

Mr. GORE. My request was that this section relating to grain grades should be printed separately. I have no objection to indicating these amendments as pending amendments. What I desire is to have this section of the bill in convenient form for Senators to consider Monday and in the most intelligent form for their consideration.

Mr. GALLINGER. That will be done in that way.

Mr. CLAPP. All that the Senator will have to do—and he will not have to have the consent of the Senate for it, either—will be to take the section, prepare his amendments to it, take it to the clerk, and have it printed in that form, showing the proposed amendments.

Mr. GORE. I understand that; but I thought that it would be better to adopt a lot of these verbal amendments to-day. I think it would be less confusing, when the bill is printed, to be rid of all these amendments substituting "interstate commerce" for the great rigmarole "between States, Territories, and Districts." It would simplify it a good deal; but if Senators prefer the other course, I have no objection. It was purely their convenience that I was considering. So I will ask to have this section reprinted separately from the bill, with the amendments which I have offered as pending amendments, including an amendment which I now send to the desk, but which need not be read under this arrangement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it will be so ordered; and Part B will be printed in amended form, showing amendments proposed by the committee printed in italics and pending.

Mr. CLAPP. I understand the chairman to say he did not care to have the last amendment read. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. CLAPP. Then I ask the attention of the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] and inquire whether he would have any objection at this time to voting pro forma to reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 23 was adopted and then have it passed over? In the interim I have no doubt he and I can arrange some terms that will fix it satisfactorily; and if we can not, he can later move again to adopt the amendment. I have no doubt that unless it can be amended—

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that I have no objection to a reconsideration at this time, but I would not like to waive final action on it.

Mr. CLAPP. No; I do not mean that. I suggest reconsidering the vote and having it passed over, and in the interim let us see if we can not agree on an amendment. I move, then, that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment

on page 23 was agreed to, beginning with the word "Provided," on line 8—

Mr. GRONNA. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. CLAPP. And terminating with the word "purposes," on lines 13 and 14. I move that the vote be reconsidered by which it was adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be reconsidered.

Mr. GORE. Now, Mr. President, I understand that a number of amendments were passed over a few moments ago, when I happened to be absent from the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. They were passed over the second time.

Mr. CLAPP. If necessary, I suggest that the amendment to which I have referred be passed over for the present.

Mr. GORE. On page 91 there is a committee amendment which I should like to have considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 91 it is proposed to strike out section 11, which includes down to the words "pursuant to this act," on page 94.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I agree with the report of the committee to strike out section 11 and section 11a; but I wish to call attention to the effect of section 11 as it was found in the bill which we passed in August, 1914.

Section 11 placed a tax of \$10 a bale upon sales of cotton made by persons in the United States in foreign exchanges unless those exchanges used the contract prescribed by the act of August, 1914, which was substantially the contract provided in this bill. During last fall and winter and during the past spring cotton has usually sold very much higher in Liverpool than it sold upon the American exchanges, and the impression has existed that the \$10 a bale tax upon sales made in the United States on those exchanges had caused an injury to the cotton trade in this country by preventing, except on payment of a tax on \$10 a bale sales on the Liverpool exchange. It has been thought by many that the Liverpool market was much higher than the American market and that the difference in price was not made up by the cost of shipment to Liverpool.

Through the aid of the Agricultural Department I have had compiled a table showing the relative prices upon the New Orleans exchange day by day of cotton sales, and upon the Liverpool exchange. I have also had prepared a table day by day showing the cost of shipment during these periods from New Orleans and from New York to Liverpool. The result of this work discloses the fact that the cost of transportation to Liverpool, added to the cost upon the New York exchange or the New Orleans exchange, nearly every day for the past 12 months, was such that the total of the price here plus the cost of delivery in Liverpool made a sum larger than the price of the Liverpool sales, and that really, had there been no \$10 a bale tax on transactions upon the Liverpool exchange, the proposed use of the Liverpool exchange amounted practically to nothing as a means of profit.

I ask leave of the Senate to put some of these figures in the RECORD, making comparison of prices—only a few of them that I will select—in demonstration of the statement I have made with reference to the matter. The report of the department showed comparison day by day. I will only print the statement of conclusion by the department and figures one day in each month.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

REPORT FROM DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

TABLE 1.—New Orleans spots and Liverpool futures.

This table covers the period of time from April 6, 1915, to April 29, 1916. It shows the price of cotton in New Orleans as represented by the spot quotations of that market, the estimated total approximate cost to deliver cotton from New Orleans on future contracts in Liverpool, the estimated value of cotton landed in Liverpool and delivered on future contract, the Liverpool future quotations for the month of delivery, and the difference between the value of the cotton and the price received on contract.

It will be observed that at no time, except on January 4, 1916, could cotton be purchased in New Orleans and landed at Liverpool and delivered on future contract without thereby incurring a loss. A discount of Liverpool futures under the true value of spot cotton as determined by its cost to purchase in New Orleans and deliver on contract in Liverpool is represented by the sixth column, the word "minus" being prefixed to the figures that show the relative discount of the Liverpool contract. It will be noted that during the greater part of the period under consideration Liverpool contracts were more than 1 cent per pound below the parity of American markets, but during April, 1916, the discount narrowed to an average of about 60 points. Under such conditions as disclosed by this table, it can not be maintained that the inability to hedge cotton in Liverpool was of serious detriment to the American cotton exporters.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Date.	New Orleans spots.	Estimated approximate cost to deliver on contracts at Liverpool (in cents).	Estimated approximate price to deliver on contracts in Liverpool (in cents). (Sums of columns 2 and 3.)	Liverpool futures (in cents).	Difference.
1915.					
Apr. 6.....	9.31	3.07	12.38	May-June. 11.33	-1.05
May 1.....	9.37	2.80	12.17	11.08	-1.09
June-July.					
June 1.....	8.93	2.45	11.38	10.09	-1.29
July-Aug.					
July 1.....	9.00	2.37	11.37	10.33	-1.04
Aug.-Sept.					
Aug. 2.....					
Aug. 3.....	8.69	2.26	10.95	10.38	-.57
Sept.-Oct.					
Sept. 1.....	9.31	3.13	12.44	11.53	-.91
Oct.-Nov.					
Oct. 1.....	11.75	2.72	14.47	13.41	-1.03
Nov.-Dec.					
Nov. 1.....	11.75	3.02	14.77	13.69	-1.03
Dec.-Jan.					
Dec. 1.....	12.00	3.44	15.44	14.65	-.79
1916.					
Jan. 3.....	11.88	3.72	15.60	Jan.-Feb. 15.57	-.03
Feb.-Mar.					
Feb. 1.....	11.56	4.73	16.29	15.05	-1.24
Mar.-Apr.					
Mar. 1.....	11.13	4.60	15.73	15.05	-.68
Apr.-May.					
Apr. 1.....	11.88	3.99	15.87	15.01	-.86

TABLE 2.—New Orleans spots and Liverpool spots.

This table covers the period of time from February 1, 1915, to April 29, 1916. It shows the price of spot cotton in New Orleans, the approximate cost to land cotton at Liverpool from New Orleans, the approximate value of the cotton landed at Liverpool, the current Liverpool spot quotations, and the difference between the Liverpool spot quotations and the value of the cotton landed at Liverpool.

An examination of these figures discloses that cotton might have been purchased in New Orleans on spot terms and sold on spot terms at published quotations at Liverpool occasionally at a profit, but that normally the Liverpool spot quotations were at a discount as compared with the cost of cotton purchased in New Orleans plus the charges to land it in Liverpool. At times this discount of Liverpool spot quotations was more than 1 cent per pound, but the average discount seems to have been about one-half cent per pound. As Liverpool spot prices are thus shown to be below the parity of spot cotton in New Orleans, it does not seem rational to conclude that Liverpool was the logical market in which to place a hedge or to consign cotton.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Date.	New Orleans spots.	Approximate cost to land at Liverpool (in cents).	Approximate price landed at Liverpool (in cents) (sum of columns 2 and 3).	Liverpool spot quotations (in cents).	Difference between Liverpool spot quotations and approximate price landed at Liverpool (in cents).
1915.					
Feb. 1.....	8.06	1.90	9.96	10.02	+0.06
Mar. 1.....	7.75	2.09	9.84	9.90	+ .06
Apr. 1.....	9.06	2.61	11.67	11.34	-.33
May 1.....	9.37	2.72	12.09	11.30	-.79
June 1.....	8.93	2.36	11.29	10.26	-1.03
July 1.....	9.00	2.28	11.28	10.44	-.84
Aug. 2.....	8.69	2.17	10.86		
Sept. 1.....	9.31	3.05	12.36	11.88	-.48
Oct. 1.....	11.75	2.66	14.41	13.94	-.47
Nov. 1.....	11.75	2.96	14.71	14.20	-.51
Dec. 1.....	12.00	3.39	15.39	14.90	-.49
1916.					
Jan. 3.....	11.88	3.67	15.55	16.02	+ .47
Feb. 1.....	11.56	4.69	16.25	15.48	-.77
Mar. 1.....	11.13	4.56	15.69	15.54	-.15
Apr. 1.....	11.88	3.94	15.82	15.40	-.42

TABLE 3.—Ocean freight rates from New York and New Orleans to Liverpool.

This table covers the period of time between January 2, 1914, and April 19, 1916. It shows the quoted freight rates on cotton in cents

per hundred pounds from New York to Liverpool and from New Orleans to Liverpool. It is understood that each quotation is in effect until the date of the next succeeding quotation.

It will be noted that the freight rates have increased more than tenfold over the normal rate that existed prior to the outbreak of war in Europe. This great increase in freight seems to have been the chief determining factor for the increase in the value of cotton in English over American markets.

1914	Freight on cotton from New York to Liverpool (per 100 pounds).	1914	Freight on cotton from New Orleans to Liverpool (per 100 pounds).
January 2.....	\$0.28	January 2.....	\$0.31
January 8.....	.20	January 6.....	.33
January 15.....	.28	January 13.....	.35
February.....	.28	January 24.....	.37
March 9.....	.20	February 5.....	.33
April.....	.20	February 17.....	.32
May.....	.20	March 11.....	.30
June.....	.20	April.....	.30
July.....	.20	May 15.....	.28
August.....	.20	June.....	.28
September 8.....	.40	July.....	.28
September 15.....	.35	August 3.....	.28
October.....	.35	September 24.....	.50
November 2.....	.50	October 15.....	.45
November 16.....	.60	October 23.....	.55
December 1.....	.75	October 29.....	.60
		November 11.....	.65
		December 1.....	.70
		December 4.....	.75
		December 11.....	.85
		December 12.....	1.00

1 \$0.33 nominal.

Each quotation is in effect until the date of the next succeeding quotation.

1915	Freight on cotton from New York to Liverpool (per 100 pounds).	1915	Freight on cotton from New Orleans to Liverpool (per 100 pounds).
January 15.....	\$1.00	January —.....	\$1.00
January 23.....	1.25	February 6.....	1.25
February 23.....	1.50	February 23.....	1.10
March 23.....	2.00	March 25.....	1.40
April 15.....	1.50	March 31.....	1.50
May 1.....	1.25	April 5.....	1.60
June 29.....	1.00	April 21.....	1.45
July.....	1.00	May 7.....	1.15
August.....	1.00	June 14.....	1.00
September 1.....	1.25	July 27.....	.90
October.....	1.25	August 4.....	1.00
November.....	1.25	August 10.....	1.15
December 8.....	1.75	September 1.....	1.25
December 22.....	2.00	September 22.....	1.10
		October 4.....	1.40
		October 14.....	1.30
		October 20.....	1.20
		November 2.....	1.35
		November 10.....	1.50
		November 19.....	1.60
		November 29.....	1.70
		December 8.....	2.00

Each quotation is in effect until the date of the next succeeding quotation.

1916	Freight on cotton from New York to Liverpool (per 100 pounds).	1916	Freight on cotton from New Orleans to Liverpool (per 100 pounds).
January 4.....	\$2.50	January 5.....	\$3.00
February 14.....	2.75	February —.....	3.00
February 19.....	3.00	March 2.....	2.90
March —.....	3.00	March 17.....	2.50
April 1.....	2.50	March 27.....	2.25
April 8.....	2.00	April 4.....	2.00
		April 17.....	2.10
		April 19.....	2.25

Each quotation is in effect until the date of the next succeeding quotation.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Oklahoma what his purpose is in the further consideration of this bill?

Mr. GORE. I will say to the Senator that I was under the impression that the pending amendment to strike out section 11 could be passed upon without any discussion and without any delay. It has been very thoroughly considered by the committee, and very thoroughly considered by the Senators who reside in the cotton States. Of course, that would not be conclusive; but generally their wishes are shown a great deal of deference in the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. Possibly there is no objection to it.

Mr. GORE. I do not think there is.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the question be put.

Mr. GORE. I suppose it would have been put if the Senator had not propounded the interrogatory. I will say if there be any objection to the adoption of the warehouse-act amendment I shall move a recess, but I know of no controversy on that. The uncontroverted points I wish to finish, and nothing that involves any debate or controversy will be taken up. I hope we can take a recess in a few minutes.

Mr. GRONNA. May I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is agreed to this provision?

Mr. GORE. I am not sure as to what the Senator's plans were. He offered no amendment to this in committee. If the Senator returns, however, on Monday, or before the conclusion of the bill, of course the matter could be reconsidered at his instance. There will be no difficulty about that.

Mr. GRONNA. I know he was very much opposed to this provision. That was my understanding at that time.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is mistaken; he was very much in favor of it, but desired to offer a substitute for section 5. We discussed it; he did not offer it in committee. I do not think that section 5 has any relation to section 11, which the Senator from South Carolina heartily favors.

Mr. SMOOT. Why not let it go over?

Mr. GORE. I would rather dispose of it now if we can do so.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There is no objection from any Senator to striking out section 11 and section 11a. The trade generally seems to desire the sections stricken out. One reason we put section 11 into the original bill was that there was a fear that the operators of the New York Cotton Exchange might move over to Canada to get rid of the tax and to continue their illegal speculative contracts; but now the large majority of the members of the New York Cotton Exchange recognize the fact that they can do business under an honest contract—a contract that gives the manufacturer who buys for future delivery something that he can spin—and there is no necessity for the section to prevent that danger.

While the Agricultural Department still approves the sections and hopes to force the Liverpool Exchange and other foreign exchanges to adopt our contract, the trade generally believes the Agricultural Department is mistaken about it. They think it is unwise to keep the two sections, and the Senate committee yielded to what we understood the trade wanted and most of the farmers preferred. I think the farmers were mistaken in supposing the provision injured them last year, and I myself do not believe it did injure them at all.

The figures I put into the RECORD show that the differences between the Liverpool prices and the New Orleans and New York prices were made up in the varying cost of transportation. That was not fully appreciated by the farmers of the country; but we all agree, I think, that sections 11 and 11a may be stricken out. I know the Senator from South Carolina is very anxious to have them stricken out.

Mr. SMOOT. Why can we not agree to the committee amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Everybody agrees to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. I will say that the warehouse-act amendment is of considerable length. It is substantially a bill that was passed through the Senate a couple of years ago. If Senators, however, think it will involve any discussion, I shall not insist on its consideration now.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it go over.

Mr. GORE. My desire is to dispose of any other item that can be got rid of now.

Mr. GRONNA. I do not see the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] here. I talked with him this afternoon, and he stated to

me that he is very much interested in that provision. I ask that it may go over until Monday.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then let us adjourn.

Mr. GORE. I know of no other matter to be considered this afternoon, and I am ready to move that the Senate take a recess.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3346) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to adjudicate the claims of the State of Massachusetts.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate on the bill (H. R. 14303) 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, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHEERLEY, Mr. RAUCH, and Mr. GILLETT managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3673. An act to establish a term of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals at Asheville, N. C.; and

H. R. 11148. An act transferring the counties of Osage and Pawnee from the western judicial district of the United States court, in the State of Oklahoma, to the eastern judicial district of said court in said State, for judicial purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

H. R. 6923. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across Little River at a point where the line between townships 12 and 13 north, range 8 east, crosses said river;

H. R. 7617. An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9615. An act to reimburse certain Indians for labor done in building a schoolhouse at Queets River, Quinault Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington;

H. R. 10849. An act granting the consent of Congress to Ashley County, Ark., to construct a bridge across Bayou Bartholomew;

H. R. 10925. An act authorizing Ashley County, Ark., to construct a bridge across Bayou Bartholomew;

H. R. 12197. An act authorizing Ashley County, Ark., to construct a bridge across Bayou Bartholomew; and

H. R. 14484. An act 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.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Department of California and Nevada, Grand Army of the Republic, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a Civil War Volunteer Officers' Retired List, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Redlands, Cal., praying for an appropriation for the construction of a military road from the Atlantic to the Pacific coasts; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis, of San Francisco, Cal., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit employees of the Public Health Service from becoming members of medical or health societies, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BORAH, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12365) to promote the reclamation of arid lands, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 578) thereon.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 6540) to repeal section 4411, Revised Statutes, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce; which was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 6553) granting a pension to Robert W. Irvine; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART:

A bill (S. 6554) granting an increase of pension to Sandford Peter Coan; and

A bill (S. 6555) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Reeder; to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. REED submitted an amendment providing that in any State which has or which may hereafter have a State grain-inspection department established by the laws of such State the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue licenses to the persons authorized and employed to inspect and grade grain under the laws of such State, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 12717), which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SMOOT submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$100,000 to enable the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the existence of artesian water and other underground water supplies suitable for irrigation in the arid and semiarid regions by boring wells, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 12717), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that the parcel of ground west of Ashmead Place and between it and Rock Creek, and the parcel of ground west of Twentieth Street NW., and between it and Rock Creek, be included as a part of the connecting parkway between Potomac Park, Zoological Park, and Rock Creek Park, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill (H. R. 15774), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SAULSBURY submitted an amendment proposing to include Philadelphia, Pa., Camden, N. J., and Wilmington, Del., in the list for specific plans for improvements of the harbors and connecting channels and for the defense of harbors, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 15947), which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. GRONNA submitted an amendment providing that no inspector or deputy inspector licensed by the Secretary of Agriculture to inspect or supervise the grading of grain shall, during his term of service, be interested, directly or indirectly, in the handling, storing, shipping, purchasing, or selling of grain, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 12717), which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. THOMPSON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for the development and improvement of American strains of sugar-beet seed and for the establishment of a permanent sugar-beet seed industry in the United States, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 12717), which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. PITTMAN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$200,000 for the purchase and maintenance of stallions for the production of horses for agricultural and military purposes, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 12717), which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 3673. An act to establish a term of the United States circuit court of appeals at Asheville, N. C.; and

H. R. 11148. An act transferring the counties of Osage and Pawnee from the western judicial district of the United States court in the State of Oklahoma to the eastern judicial district of said court in said State for judicial purposes.

RECESS.

Mr. GORE. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock Monday morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m., Saturday, July 1, 1916), the Senate took a recess until Monday, July 3, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, July 1, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou whose sacred influence has guided us and whose strong right arm has upheld us as a Nation through all the vicissitudes of the past, forsake us not, we beseech Thee, in the trying ordeals through which we are now passing, but let Thy spirit be in us, that we may be guided to a happy and peaceful solution of all the problems which confront us to the betterment of all mankind, and we will ascribe all praise to Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing the speech delivered by the President before the Press Club in New York on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing the President's speech before the Press Club in New York. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 14303, the fortification bill, to disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the fortification bill, to disagree to all Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will announce the conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHERLEY, Mr. RAUCH, and Mr. GILLET.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Speaker—

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

Mr. TAGGART. To ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting an article in the American Federationist of July, 1916, by Mr. Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, entitled "Promises and performances."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing an article by President Samuel Gompers, American Federation of Labor, on "Promises and performances." Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting the letter of Hon. Charles E. Hughes to Col. Theodore Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a letter from the Hon. Charles E. Hughes to Col. Theodore Roosevelt. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker—

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

Mr. RAKER. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. STAFFORD. On what subject? The gentleman seems to be very bashful to-day.

Mr. RAKER. On promises and performances generally.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman's party is very strong on the score of promises.

Mr. MANN. And short on performances.

Mr. RAKER. I will be able to show they have all been carried out except one—

The SPEAKER. This is not debatable. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

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

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by putting an editorial in the Record from a South Carolina newspaper.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing an editorial. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. On what subject—love, courtship, and marriage?

Mr. QUIN. Politics.

Mr. CANNON. On which side, for or against? [Laughter.]

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 6068. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to cancel and remit a certain income tax assessed against Charles L. Freer, of Detroit, Mich.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 14303) 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, had requested a conference of the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. BRYAN, Mr. LEA of Tennessee, and Mr. JONES as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On June 26, 1916:

S. 3423. An act to provide for the construction of a bridge across the Salt Fork of the Arkansas River near White Eagle Agency, in the Ponca Indian Reservation, Okla.

On June 27, 1916:

S. 3344. An act to authorize George H. Hervey, of Pensacola, Fla., to construct and operate an electric railway line on the Fort Barrancas and Fort McRee Military Reservations, Fla., and for other purposes; and

S. 5863. An act authorizing the health officer of the District of Columbia to issue a permit for the removal of the remains of the late Charles H. Bingham from Congressional Cemetery, District of Columbia, to Lock Haven, Pa.

On June 28, 1916:

S. 6. An act authorizing issuance of patent for certain lands to Thomas L. Griffiths;

S. 17. An act permitting H. L. Corbin to purchase certain lands;

S. 32. An act for the relief of William G. Williams, sr.;

S. 67. An act for the relief of Mathilda P. Hansen;

S. 3101. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to extend the lease issued under the act of August 23, 1912, entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of War to lease to the Chicago, Milwaukee & Puget Sound Railway Co. a tract of land in the Fort Keogh Military Reservation, in the State of Montana, and for a right of way thereto, for the removal of gravel and ballast material";

S. 3205. An act to amend "An act to protect the birds and animals in the Yellowstone National Park, and to punish crimes in said park, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1894;

S. 3436. An act for the relief of John Alexander Besonen;

S. 3536. An act to provide for the storing and cleansing of imported Mexican peas, commonly called "garbanzo";

S. 3929. An act validating certain applications for and entries of public lands;

S. 4085. An act to establish a Coast Guard station on the coast of Louisiana, in the vicinity of Baratavia Bay; and

S. 5244. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to exchange the land now occupied by the Schooner Ledge Range Front Light Station at the mouth of Crum Creek, Pa., for other lands adjacent thereto which are intersected by the axis of the Chester Range Line of the Delaware River, and authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to remove said Schooner Ledge Range Front Light Station after certain conditions have been complied with;

S. 5348. An act to authorize the exchange of lot 10, section 19, township 45 north, range 114 west, sixth principal meridian, for certain private lands needed in connection with the construction of Jackson Lake Reservoir, Wyo., and for other purposes;

S. 5495. An act for the relief of Edward J. Lynch, collector of internal revenue for the district of Minnesota;

S. 5339. An act to repeal paragraph 4 of section 21 of the public buildings act, approved March 4, 1913, providing for the construction of a national archives building;

S. 5910. An act authorizing the sale of the lighthouse reservation at Scituate, Mass.; and

S. 5911. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

On June 30, 1916:

S. 3203. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands to the city of Lemmon, S. Dak.;

S. 3405. An act for the relief of the Maine Central Railroad Co.;

S. 3722. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.;

S. 3928. An act to accept the cession by the State of Washington of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mount Rainier National Park, and for other purposes;

S. 4026. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to abrogate a contract lease of land and water power on the Muskingum River, Ohio;

S. 4368. An act for the relief of D. A. Barbour and Andrew P. Gladden;

S. 4476. An act extending the time for the commencement and completion of the bridge or bridges authorized by an act entitled "An act to amend an act to authorize the Dauphin Island Railway & Harbor Co., its successors or assigns, to construct and maintain a bridge or bridges, or viaducts, across the water between the mainland, at or near Cedar Point, and Dauphin Island, both Little and Big; also to dredge a channel from the deep waters of Mobile Bay into Dauphin Bay; also to construct and maintain docks and wharves along both Little and Big Dauphin Islands," approved June 18, 1912; and

S. 5777. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, as amended by Congress, relating to the granting of a franchise for the purpose of manufacturing, maintaining, distributing, and supplying of electric light and power within the Lihue district and the Koloa district, county of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii.

COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN FAMILIES OF THE DRAFTED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 16734, with committee amendment, together with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 16734, reading into it the committee amendment and also the amendment which he sends up. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16734) to pay to certain families of the men of the drafted forces of the United States a sum of money for their maintenance during the term of service of such drafted men in the service of the United States.

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$2,000,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, for the support of, at a cost of not more than \$50 per month, or so much of said amount as the Secretary of War may deem necessary, and not more than such enlisted man has been contributing monthly to the support of his family at the time of his being drafted, the family of each enlisted man of the National Guard called or drafted into the service of the United States until his discharge from such service, which family during the term of service of such enlisted man has no other income, except the pay of such enlisted man, adequate for the support of said family: *Provided*, That the action of the Secretary of War in all cases provided for in this act shall be final, and no right to prosecute a suit in the Court of Claims or in any other court of the United States against the Government of the United States shall accrue to such enlisted man, or to any member of the family of any such enlisted man, by virtue of the passage of this act: *Provided further*, That this act shall not apply to any such enlisted man called or drafted into the service of the United States who shall marry after the 1st day of July, 1916; and the word "family" shall include only wife, children, and dependent mothers.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the word "or" ought to be inserted in line 8, at the beginning of the committee amendment, so it would read, "\$50 per month or so much of said amount."

Mr. HAY. I think that the gentleman is correct. I ask the Clerk to insert the word "or."

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after the word "month," in line 8, the word "or."

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if the age of children ought not to be specified, not over 16 or 15 years of age. Suppose a child is 20 years old, a young man, abundantly able to work. I would like to suggest that the age limit ought to be specified in there.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I will state to the gentleman from Indiana that this provides for dependents wholly in the discretion of the Secretary of War, and I hardly think he would authorize the payment of any of this money to children who are supporting themselves or who are able to support themselves.

Mr. CULLOP. The word "dependent" would not altogether excuse one who is well able to work not under 21, because the obligation of parent would exist there. I make this suggestion to the chairman for his consideration at least.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DUPRÉ. May I inquire whether under this proceeding under suspension of the rules there will be a possibility to have a separate vote on the amendments reported by the committee? The SPEAKER. No; there will not.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I want to ask the gentleman from Virginia if it could not be possible for him to obtain unanimous consent that would permit us to operate under some proceeding of the House that will allow some of us, who think the committee amendment striking out the provision for discharge ought to be tested in the House, to make a motion.

Mr. HAY. So far as I am personally concerned, I would be very glad to have the House discuss the whole proposition under the five-minute rule, and if the gentleman will ask unanimous consent I will not object.

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent for what?

Mr. DUPRÉ. I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered under the five-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. Yes; but this is under suspension of the rules.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I am trying to avoid that. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] says he would have no objection to its being considered in that way, so that an opportunity may be afforded to Members of the House to express their views on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. They have 20 minutes in which to express their views.

Mr. DUPRÉ. But they can not register their views unless they vote against the whole bill, as I understand the rule.

The SPEAKER. All the Chair knows is that the gentleman from Virginia moves to suspend the rules and pass this bill. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SMALL. I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SMALL. I am.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered. Is there objection to the request that a second be considered as ordered? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I ask unanimous consent that an opportunity be given to vote as a separate proposition on the amendment offered by the committee striking out the provision in regard to the discharge of enlisted men under certain conditions.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Virginia wishes to modify the bill to that extent, he can make a motion to do so, but the House can not vote piecemeal on a bill under suspension of the rules.

Mr. HAY. "The gentleman from Virginia" is opposed to the provision that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ] wants to put into the bill.

Mr. DUPRÉ. But the gentleman is not opposed to opportunity being given the House to pass upon it?

Mr. HAY. No.

Mr. MANN. The regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded, and the regular order is that the gentleman from Virginia has 20 minutes and the gentleman from North Carolina has 20 minutes.

Mr. RAKER rose.

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

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

Mr. HAY. I can not yield out of my time.

Mr. RAKER. I think there will be no objection. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may proceed for two minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, was a second dispensed with?

The SPEAKER. Yes; a second was dispensed with, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it necessary to consume the time of the House in advocating this resolution, which has already been passed upon by the House without a dissenting vote.

I desire to ask unanimous consent to put into the RECORD a statement of the laws of other countries with regard to giving aid to dependents of soldiers. These countries include Austria-Hungary, Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Roumania, Russia, Sweden, and Switzerland.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HAY. Under the leave to extend remarks, I state that I have been requested by Mr. LITTLEPAGE and Mr. NEELY, of West Virginia, to state that they were unavoidably absent and were in favor of this bill.

The SPEAKER. There is no objection about it.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I thought the gentleman asked unanimous consent to insert a statement in the Record.

Mr. HAY. I asked unanimous consent to incorporate a statement of the laws referred to in my remarks.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Are they not the same statements, or composed of the same extracts, as were printed in the Senate proceedings a day or two ago?

Mr. HAY. I do not know.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. If so, I do not see any use in printing them over again. There is no use in doing it if they are already in the Senate proceedings; but I do not object, nor am I opposed to this proposition.

Mr. MANN. Will not the gentleman from Virginia ask unanimous consent that Members may have leave to print on this bill within five legislative days?

Mr. HAY. Yes. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that all Members may have leave to print remarks on this bill within five legislative days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen shall have the privilege of printing remarks in the Record for five legislative days on this bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAMILL].

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

Mr. HAY. I can not yield.

Mr. DYER. I wanted to ask the gentleman if his request to print these laws has not been granted?

Mr. HAY. I supposed it was.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the statement referred to:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington.

Allowances to the families of soldiers in European countries.

(Translated from Bulletin de la Statistique générale de la France T. IV, 1914-15, pp. 237-241, 365-367.)

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

I. AUSTRIA.

Under the act of December 26, 1912, the parents and relatives (wife, legitimate children, father, mother, father and mother in law, brothers and sisters, illegitimate mother and children) of a soldier called to the colors in case of mobilization are entitled to an allowance, provided they are dependent for their living on the soldier's work. The rate of such allowance is fixed and announced every year in advance.

In time of peace the parents and relatives (wife, legitimate and illegitimate children, father, mother, brothers, and sisters) of a soldier recalled to the colors for a drill period are entitled, if they are dependent for their living on the soldier's work, to an allowance which is fixed for all the parents and relatives together at 50 per cent of the ordinary pay of a day laborer in the place of residence of the soldier.

II. HUNGARY.

The granting of allowances to the destitute families of soldiers recalled to the colors is governed by the act of June 10, 1882. A law similar to the Austrian law of December 26, 1912, was contemplated in 1913.

BELGIUM.

I. IN TIME OF PEACE.

Under the act of March 21, 1902, personal service as militiaman entitled one to a monthly allowance of 25 francs in the infantry, 30 francs in the cavalry; the allowance is 30 francs for all short-term volunteers and 35 francs for long-term volunteers. Fifteen francs a month is deducted from this allowance, if necessary, to be paid to the father and mother (or grandparents, as the case may be); to the wife, if the soldier is married; to the person who cares for the children, if the soldier is a widower with children.

II. IN CASE OF MOBILIZATION.

Soldiers recalled to the colors under mobilization orders receive the allowance which was granted to them for effective service. When the mobilized soldier is the head of a family he receives 0.50 francs a day for one child and 1 franc for several children. Such allowance is paid to his wife or to the person who cares for the children.

FRANCE.

I. IN TIME OF PEACE.

Under section 12 of the act of August 7, 1913, the families of persons serving either with the army or the navy who, before being called, were actually the indispensable breadwinners of their families are, upon application, entitled to a daily State allowance of 1.25 francs a day, increased by 0.50 franc for every child under the age of 16 years who is dependent on the breadwinner of the family.

II. IN TIME OF WAR.

According to the act of August 5, 1914, such allowance shall be paid out by the State for the whole duration of the war, irrespective of the position of the person called or recalled to the colors.

GERMANY.

I. IN TIME OF PEACE.

Under the act of May 10, 1892, assistance is granted upon application to the families of soldiers called to the colors for a period of instruction as follows:

(a) For the wives, 30 per cent of the local salary of the male adult workmen at the place of residence of the men called. Such local salary is officially determined with a view to insurance against accident.

(b) For each of the other persons entitled to assistance (children, parents and grandparents, brothers and sisters, if dependent on the man called), 10 per cent of such salary.

In addition a special allowance is granted to the families having or having had three sons in the army, or in the navy; these families receive an allowance of 240 marks a year every time a new son is called to active service.

II. IN TIME OF WAR.

The act of February 28, 1888, as amended August 4, 1914, governs allowances to the destitute families of the men of the reserve, of the landwehr, of the ersatzreserve, of the reserve of the navy and of the landsturm.

The following persons are entitled to allowances:

(a) The wife of a soldier and his children under 15 years of age.

(b) His children above 15, his parents, brothers, and sisters; but only if dependent on the soldier and destitute as a result of his incorporation.

(c) His illegitimate children, if the soldier is under the acknowledged obligation, as their father, to provide for them. Subject to the conditions stated under letter (b), the parents of the wife, as well as her children from a former marriage, may be granted assistance. More distant relatives and wives separated from their husbands are not entitled to allowances.

The minimum allowance is: For the wife, 9 marks a month from May to October, 12 marks a month from November to April; for each child or person designated above letters (b) and (c), 6 marks a month.

For the money allowance may be substituted in part a supply of breadstuffs, potatoes, fuel, etc., which is payable in advance, semi-monthly. Payments are made by the Lieferungsverbande (combines for furnishing provisions), created in pursuance of the act of June 13, 1873, on military requisitions, which are refunded out of the Imperial treasury. The minimum allowance above determined is granted regardless of the relief which may be extended by private associations or persons.

The minimum allowance paid by local administrations and refunded by the Empire has been increased and completed by rent allowances, relief in kind, etc., in certain cities.

III. MATERNITY BENEFIT.

The ordinance of December 3, 1914, grants for the duration of the war a maternity benefit to any woman whose husband—

1. Performs military, sanitary, or other analogous service, or is prevented by death, injury, sickness, or captivity from continuing to render such service or from exercising a profession.

2. Was insured against sickness under the Imperial insurance code, or through a miners' sick fund, for at least 26 weeks during the 12 months preceding his departure to the colors or for at least 6 weeks immediately preceding such departure.

The maternity benefit consists of—

1. A cash payment of 25 marks to cover the expenses of the confinement.

2. An allowance of 1 mark a day, including Sundays and holidays, for a period of 8 weeks, not less than 6 of which shall fall after delivery.

3. A sum of 10 marks for the services of a midwife, or for medical attendance, should such be necessitated by pregnancy troubles.

4. In the case of women who nurse their infants, a nursing allowance of one-half mark a day, including Sundays and holidays, for a period of 12 weeks after delivery.

The ordinance of April 23, 1915, has extended the maternity benefit to women in destitute circumstances. Women shall be considered as such—

1. If during the year, or tax-assessment year, preceding the entry into the service, the combined incomes of the woman and her husband did not exceed 2,500 marks.

2. If the income remaining to the woman after the husband's departure does not exceed 1,500 marks for her own benefit, nor 250 marks for the benefit of each child under the age of 15 years.

GREAT BRITAIN.

I. ARMY.

The "allowance of the army" comprises "separation allowances to families" in time of peace as in time of war.

The rates have been so increased, beginning with October 1, 1914, that the total weekly income from such allowance and from the minimum allotment which the married soldier must make from his pay is as follows:

a. For the wife of a private or corporal, 12s. 6d. and 2s. 6d. for each of the three first children and 2s. for each other child.

b. For the wife of a noncommissioned officer, the weekly allowance varying, according to the grade, from 15s. to 23s., and 3s. for each of three first children and 2s. for each other child.

The extra 3s. 6d. a week is issuable to London families, and the special compensation allowance granted to families on the married establishment will continue to be paid as heretofore.

The separate allowance for motherless children will be at the rate of 3s. a week for each child, with the regulated allotment from the soldier in addition.

II. NAVY.

According to the royal ordinance of October 29, 1914, the weekly separation allowances to families of sailors and marines are:

1. For the wife, 6s., 8s., or 9s., according to the husband's grade.

2. Two shillings for each of the two first children.

3. One shilling for each of the other children.

4. Motherless children, 3s. each.

The payment in respect of children will be made to boys under 14 and girls under 16 years of age. Families residing within London are entitled to an additional allowance of 3s. 6d. per week.

No separation allowance is paid unless an allotment of at least 20s. a month is declared by the husband.

ITALY.

I. IN TIME OF PEACE.

By virtue of a ministerial order of 1899, modified in 1907 (Atto. No. 118 del 3 uoglio 1907, Giornale militare ufficiale), relief is extended to the destitute families of soldiers recalled to the colors for drilling, the restoration of public order, or any other cause.

The following persons are entitled to relief: The wife and the legitimate or recognized children under 12 years of age, or the children above that age whose incapacity to do any profitable work is evidenced by a medical certificate.

The daily allowance is 0.50 franc for the mother, 0.25 franc for each child in the capitals of Provinces or districts, and is reduced, respectively, to 0.40 franc and 0.20 franc in other communes.

As regards the destitute families of men called to the colors under conscription, the ministerial circular of November 8, 1911, No. 1340, grants, subject to certain conditions, a monthly allowance of 15 lire to the family of a married soldier.

For these two categories of allowances the appropriation asked for under item 80 of the army budget for 1913-14 was 800,000 lire.

II. IN TIME OF WAR OR MOBILIZATION.

Prior to 1914 there existed no special provisions, and the rules applicable to the soldiers recalled to the colors had necessarily to be applied. At the time of the war with Turkey the council of ministers decided on January 16, 1912, to double the amount of the daily allowances to the destitute families of recalled soldiers (classes of 1888 and 1889), and that in cases particularly worthy of interest a daily allowance of 1 lire could be granted to the father and mother of the unmarried recalled soldiers. (War ministry circular of Jan. 19.)

The royal decree of September 20, 1914, determines the daily allowance to be granted to the destitute families of soldiers recalled to the colors, as follows:

(a) 1.70 lire for the wife and 1.35 lire for each child under 12 years of age (or above 12 if unable to work), residing in the capital of a Province or district.

(b) 1.60 and 1.30 lire if they reside elsewhere.

(c) The destitute father and mother over 60 years of age dependent on an unmarried soldier recalled to the colors receive the same allowance as the wife, when one parent only is concerned. The father and mother who both fulfill the aforesaid conditions receive in all 1.10 lire in the capital of a Province or district, 1 lira elsewhere.

ROUMANIA.

The act of December 23, 1914 (January 5, 1915), authorizing the adoption of exceptional measures provides for an allowance to families of mobilized soldiers.

Under section 22, the State grants to the families of mobilized soldiers (privates or noncommissioned officers), from the day of mobilization to the fifteenth day following the declaration of a state of peace, an allowance of:

Fifteen francs a month per family in rural communes.

Twenty francs a month per family in urban communes.

In addition, families may receive assistance in the form of work to perform, issues of food and other articles of first necessity, medical relief, care of children in homes and infant asylums; they may even obtain a supplementary money allowance. There is created for this purpose a foundation called the "Fighters' family," with the privileges of a corporation, managed by a central committee established at Bucharest and by departmental and communal committees.

Under section 20 of the act, merchants and manufacturers whose establishments remain open during mobilization, who employ more than five workmen or clerks, either married or having a family dependent on them, who have been not less than two years in their service, are obliged to pay to such workmen or clerks, as long as mobilization lasts, one-half of their salary, as assistance extended to the family of the mobilized soldier. Such workmen or clerks have necessarily no right to an allowance from the Government.

Other sections deal with the assignments of pay to the families of officers and reenlisted men of the active army, officers of the reserve, and functionaries entitled to their salaries during mobilization.

RUSSIA.

The ordinance of June 25 (July 8, 1912) governs the conditions under which allowances are granted to soldiers of inferior rank and to their families (pensions to soldiers, widows, and orphans, relief, etc.).

An allowance is granted to the wife and children of a soldier of inferior rank in active service in the army or navy, in the first or second reserve: to his parents, grandparents, brothers, and sisters, if they are dependent upon his work.

Such persons are entitled to a maintenance grant in kind, corresponding to at least 1 pound and 28 pounds of flour, 10 pounds of groats, 4 pounds of salt, and 1 pound of hempseed oil per month and per person.

Children below 15 years of age are entitled to one-half of such grant, children above 17 years of age are not entitled to an allowance, unless incapable of work; married daughters are likewise excluded therefrom.

The value of the provisions comprised in the food allowances is fixed by the competent provincial authorities after the commencement of hostilities, and is revised on the 1st of September each year, and whenever there occurs a notable change in the prices of provisions.

According to an ordinance of the council of ministers of August 9 (22), 1914, the families of salaried persons called to the colors receive: The whole salary for the wife and more than five children, three-fourths of the salary for the wife and four or five children, two-thirds of the salary for the wife and no more than three children, one-half of the salary for the wife alone, one-third of the salary if the family consists of parents or grandparents or brothers and sisters dependent upon the mobilized soldier.

According to the same ordinance the families of workmen, salaried persons, and servants in Government establishments, factories, shops, and other similar undertakings, receive in addition to the food allowances above mentioned: One-half of the salary for the wife and more than three children, one-third of the salary for the wife and no more than three children, one-fourth of the salary for the wife alone.

In both cases, when in addition to the mobilized soldier's wife and own children, the family includes also parents or grandparents or brothers and sisters, each one of them is considered as a child.

SWEDEN.

I. IN TIME OF PEACE.

Assistance to the destitute families of soldiers called to the colors is governed by the royal ordinance of June 1, 1912, as amended September 17, 1914.

The amount of the allowance is fixed as follows for each day of service:

	Öre.
For the wife able to work and 1 child	75
For the wife able to work and no more than 2 children	100
For the wife whose capacity for work is limited	75
For the wife whose capacity for work is limited and 1 child	100
For the wife whose capacity for work is limited and no more than 2 children	125
For 1 child whose father is divorced or is a widower	75
For 2 children or more whose father is divorced or is a widower	100

Able-bodied wives without children receive no allowance.

The allowance is increased by 40 per cent when the soldier is on drilling periods of the reserve or of the landsturm.

Soldiers must contribute to the allowance to which their wives and children are entitled by paying such portion of their pay as exceeds 20 öre a day.

II. IN CASE OF MOBILIZATION.

The royal ordinance of August 13, 1914, governs the granting of allowances during all the time that a soldier is called in defense of the Kingdom or is retained for this purpose after his term of service in time of peace has expired. His family, in needy circumstances, receives from the Government an allowance of 1 crown per day, as well as an additional sum of 25 öre per day for each child under 15 years of age.

SWITZERLAND.

The ordinance of January 21, 1910, governs the granting of relief to families in destitute circumstances owing to their breadwinners serving in the army.

The wife and children of a soldier and the parents or relatives he supports or who are members of his household are entitled to allowances. They must be proportioned to the needs of the family and not exceed the average daily pay of the soldier, after deduction of an appropriate sum (1 franc, for instance) for his personal needs. For the purpose of determining such allowances the social position, number, age, and earning capacity of the entitled persons must be taken into account.

The allowance can not exceed 2 francs for the wife and 0.70 franc per child in cities; 1.50 francs for the wife and 0.50 franc per child in the country.

The allowances are paid by the communes; the cost is borne for three-quarters by the confederation and for one-quarter by the canton.

RÉSUMÉ.

In Great Britain the Government allowance to families is added by right to the allotment which soldiers or sailors must make from their pay.

In Belgium the previous deduction from the pay of militiamen is paid to the parents irrespective of their circumstances.

In other countries where military service is compulsory, allowances are granted only to families in destitute circumstances.

Translated from Bulletin de la Statistique générale de la France, T. IV, 1914-15, pp. 237-241, 365-367.

A. BERNARD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAMILL] is recognized.

Mr. HAMILL. It is a surprising thing that any opposition should be voiced against this bill or that any argument should be deemed necessary to bring about its enactment. To the ordinary American sense of fairness the proposition is so clear; it is so self-evident in its justice, propriety, and moderation as to call forth immediate and instinctive approval.

The theme of all the complaints we have heard in opposition simmers down to this statement, that it would, first of all, impose an unwise demand upon the Treasury at the present time, and that, furthermore, it would establish a practice which would cause these payments to be continued under the guise of pensions in the future. As to the last objection, I am sure we can safely refer that matter to be disposed of at the sessions of Congress which will come after us. They will deal then better than we can now with the situation if it arises. We need not anticipate and legislate with regard to a contingency which may or may not actually happen. At best it is only a speculation that it will happen.

Those guardians of our money vaults who condemn this appropriation because of cost should exercise discrimination and consider the purpose of it. This is one of the legitimate expenses of national defense. It is, after all, one of the lightest obligations the people are called upon to assume. To uphold the honor of our flag and to preserve our territory inviolate from the footsteps of the bandit and the spoiler may demand the expenditure not only of treasure but of life as well.

A few weeks ago I was one of the throng that lined the sidewalk to see the regiment of my home city marching out to its mobilization camp. The long lines of well-drilled guardsmen in their uniforms and accouterments were followed by files of youths who still wore civilian dress—new recruits who had enlisted a day or two before.

It was a thrilling sight, and the applause of the multitude broke forth in successive peals all along the route. It was a part of the great scene the American people were witnessing in every section of the country. It was the minutemen of 1916 answering in the spirit of 1776 the summons of the President. [Applause.]

Had the opponents of this bill been spectators of any of these scenes, I have no doubt they would have rent the sky with their cheers of encouragement. And such encouragement is commendable, so far as it goes; but the defect in it is that it does not go deep enough. It reaches only to the lungs, whereas it ought to extend deeper and reach the pocket as well.

Several of these men whom I personally know relinquished positions in the post office paying not less than \$100 a month. They are men with families, whose support is derived solely from their salaries. Most of the other soldiers had abandoned good positions in civil life, and were in a similar predicament.

Now, what about the loved ones these men have left behind? What about the true-hearted mothers and sisters and daughters

and wives who encouraged them to go forth under the flag, who greeted them possibly for the last time, and who may yet be called upon to mourn the loss of their unreturning brave?

There is neither excuse nor argument for withholding this appropriation. The great business houses of the country have decided to hold on their pay rolls at full salary the men who have gone to the front. These corporations who in theory of law own no soul have demonstrated by their generosity that they do possess a heart. The Government can not do less. The American people will not tolerate less. The overwhelming demand of the American people is for the passage of this bill. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, when the so-called drafting bill was before this House several days ago I voted for it, although it contained the substance of this bill. I did so because of the exigency which existed for the drafting of the National Guard into the regular service. But now that we have this question concretely presented in a separate bill, I feel free to voice my opposition to it and to express the reasons which actuate me.

I realize full well the fine sentiment behind the members of this House who favor this bill. I realize the force of their appeals to patriotism; but I insist that we should also appeal to the cool, sober judgment of ourselves and of the American people, and that this bill is not in the interest of real patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, this bill involves an unwarranted and unnecessary expenditure. No man can prophesy the amount which will be ultimately involved in it, even as applicable to the National Guard. In the debate at the other end of the Capitol it was said that from 10 to 25 per cent of the members of the Guard would make application under such a law for the support of their families. If you say 10 per cent, 10,000 out of the 100,000 men that it is supposed the National Guard will furnish, you have \$6,000,000 annually required to support their families under the provisions of such a law. When the bill was originally here \$1,000,000 was sought to be appropriated. Now, for some reason not explained by the committee, it has been increased to \$2,000,000. I ask in all sincerity, why has it been increased? What is the basis upon which the increase was made? And can any Member say that the amount named in this bill is sufficient for the purpose?

Mr. HAY. Does the gentleman want an answer to that?

Mr. SMALL. I will yield.

Mr. HAY. The reason it was increased was because after making careful inquiry the committee thought that this \$2,000,000 would be amply sufficient until the meeting of the next session of Congress.

Mr. SMALL. I will come to that part of it upon another phase of this question in a moment.

This bill does not provide for the Regular Army. I know it will be said that the Regular Army is composed of men who were enlisted without the burden and expense of a family upon them. Whether that is literally true or not I do not know; but I have, and I doubt not every Member of this House has, from time to time received applications from the families of men in the Regular Army asking for their discharge because the presence of the soldier was necessary for their support. And I take it there are instances—how numerous I do not know—in the Regular Army where, if this principle is to be applied, it ought to be applied to them. The result of any such legislation as this would be the demoralization and the disorganization of the Regular Army.

Some weeks ago we passed a bill increasing the Regular Army by 20,000 men, calling for volunteers to enlist. It has been stated, and I presume authoritatively, that up to this time less than 12,000 of the 20,000 men asked for have enlisted, although strenuous efforts have been made to secure them. Why was it? I have not the time or the inclination to go into the reasons for it, but I do insist that such legislation as this will not have a tendency to create a disposition upon the part of our citizens to enlist in the Regular Army, and that it will increase many fold the difficulties of securing sufficient enlistments to make up the larger Army which has been authorized in the national-defense act. This bill does not provide for volunteers. Gentlemen may say, "If volunteers are necessary, we will meet that question when we reach it"; but I contend that it ought to be reached now, that this is the time to perfect such legislation as will be applicable to every phase of this necessity which is said to exist, and which undoubtedly in time of war will exist.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. For a question.

Mr. MEEKER. What suggestion has the gentleman to offer for the caring for these needy families? If this is not done, how would you take care of them?

Mr. SMALL. I will endeavor to answer the gentleman directly. Further, this bill does not provide for the family of a soldier killed in action. We are seeking here to provide support for families—

Mr. HAY. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. HAY. The drafting resolution which was passed the other day provided for that.

Mr. SMALL. How much did it provide?

Mr. HAY. The pension law.

Mr. SMALL. Twelve dollars a month is the maximum, is it not?

Mr. HAY. That depends. I do not know. I am not sufficiently familiar with the pension law.

Mr. SMALL. We are seeking to provide a maximum of \$50 a month for the support of families of the National Guard actively engaged in the service; but if they shall surrender their lives in the service of their country, then they are relegated to the general pension law, and, as I understand, the maximum amount which the family can receive under such circumstances is \$12 a month. That is another illustration of the inconsistency of this proposed law.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The gentleman recognizes that that pension is for the remainder of the widow's life, while it is contemplated that this will be only during the service in this particular emergency.

Mr. SMALL. That is obvious in itself. Mr. Speaker, this legislation has not been requested by the National Guard, although the National Guard have been neither timid nor modest in asking for legislation which they desired of Congress. They were in evidence when we were framing the national defense act, and I was in sympathy with them; but they made known their wishes at that time, and I take it if any such exigency existed as would make this law necessary, there would have been evidence of some demand on the part of the National Guard for this legislation.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GORDON. The law authorizing the President to draft these men into the Army had not yet been passed nor even considered at the time the national defense act was passed.

Mr. SMALL. Oh, the gentleman is wrong about that.

Mr. RUBEY. Is not the very fact that the National Guard have not asked for this legislation the strongest argument in favor of it?

Mr. SMALL. It would not do to apply that formula to legislation generally in the House. How much time have I consumed, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Ten minutes.

Mr. SMALL. I want to hurry along. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] is wrong with regard to the enlistment of the National Guard. In the Dick bill, which we passed in the Fifty-seventh Congress in 1901 and 1902—I have not time to look up the date, but I have the bill before me—the President was given specific authority to draft the National Guard into the service, and the National Guard were not content with that.

But the Dick bill was amended in 1908, upon the insistence of the National Guard, to the effect that the National Guard should be first called to the service, ahead even of the volunteers. So that we have had for more than 10 years a statute authorizing the President to draft into the service the National Guard of the States.

Mr. HAY. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. HAY. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Attorney General declared that act to be unconstitutional?

Mr. SMALL. The Attorney General did not hold it to be unconstitutional except in this respect: He held that the President was not authorized to draft them into the service outside of continental United States. That was the opinion of the Attorney General, agreed to by the Judge Advocate General. With the exception of that construction of the act the President has had authority since the enactment of the Dick bill, and by the amendment of 1908, to draft the National Guard into regular service in time of emergency.

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. QUIN. Have we not authority under the present act, passed on the 3d of June, to take the National Guard to Chapultepec or to Mexico City?

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, there is no precedent that I know of for this legislation. I am willing to admit that when

it is necessary for the national defense that we should wage a war, a war of duration and of magnitude, that provision ought to be made, some equitable, fair provision, for the support of the dependent families of soldiers. But while there is no precedent for this, while it may be necessary in time of emergency, yet it ought to be well-considered legislation.

Let me point out some evidences familiar to the House that this bill has not been considered. It was brought in the other day with an appropriation of \$1,000,000, with no provision for the discharge of enlisted men in the guard who had dependent families. The chairman on yesterday introduced a bill increasing it to \$2,000,000, and continuing a provision by which men in the National Guard with dependent families might be discharged.

But the committee, in considering that bill, struck out the provision for the discharge of soldiers with dependent families, and although that provision was in the bill introduced by the chairman, yet the chairman to-day says he is opposed to it. And, after, as we may suppose, careful deliberation on the part of the committee drawing the bill of yesterday, to-day even we have committee amendments offered, amendments suggested by Members of the House which are accepted by the members of the committee—all indicating that this is half-baked legislation and does not properly meet such an exigency as it is intended to meet.

This bill leaves its administration to the War Department. We have had a demand from the Secretary of War which came to us a few days ago for additional appropriations for increase of clerical force, and now we are adding to the burdens of that department by the administration of this law. If it is to be passed at all the administration ought to be imposed on the Bureau of Pensions. Let them find the facts and let them reach conclusions, and, if necessary, leave the final approval with the War Department.

Mr. Speaker, the theory of this bill is based on compensation for service. I say deliberately, based on the glorious history of our own country and of every other country whose people have waged righteous and defensive wars, that compensation and patriotism do not go together. In the great Civil War, so far as the South was concerned, men upon both sides admitted the high principles which actuated the soldiers of the South, men on both sides admit the high patriotism which actuated those who fought for the preservation of the Union. That was patriotism with no thought of compensation behind it. Every war which we have fought, the men who stood by the flag and who exemplified the courage and high type of American citizenship, were actuated, not by thought of compensation, but by the high patriotic impulses. You can not mix the two together.

This country, through Congress, has been generous and liberal to the volunteers of the Civil War who fought for the Union. As a Southern man I have always voted for every piece of legislation which was brought in here, though some times reluctantly, for any increase of pension or recognition of those soldiers, but who will stand up to-day and contend that the type of patriotism of the country, of the sons from which these soldiers came has been heightened or increased by this liberality on the part of the Government?

Upon the contrary, the abuses which have crept into the administration of the pension law have evoked criticism from some of the most patriotic men of the country.

Mr. Speaker, these men who enlisted in the National Guard volunteered for service, and not for dress parade. Is there any member of that Guard or any Member of this House who will intimate that any member who enlisted in the National Guard did not enlist for actual service in time of war if this country demanded it? And yet it is said of them that they did not expect to serve in actual war, and that we must enact this half-baked legislation, which, I insist, is not in the interest of real patriotism nor does it make for the welfare of the Republic.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Would the gentleman be in favor of dependent families to be covered by this legislation being the recipients of the bounty and charity of the various cities and communities, or does he think that the Government owes the men who are serving the duty of looking after the people who are so unfortunate as to have no support?

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman will not induce me to commit myself to any suggestion that these families ought not to be cared for. I do insist that service in our Army, whether it be the Regular Army, the National Guard, or the Volunteer Army, must be based on the highest patriotic impulses of a true American citizen and not upon the idea of compensation. If legislation is necessary at this time for the support of dependent families of soldiers we should so draft and frame a law that it shall meet every contingency in the future, so that the dependent

families may have whatever is right and proper on the part of the Government.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Does the gentleman believe that the patriotism of one who enlists is affected if the General Government takes care of his family during the time he is engaged in the service?

Mr. SMALL. I will answer that question by saying that there is such a thing as pauperizing a citizen, chilling his patriotism with the thought of compensation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. STEDMAN]. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. STEDMAN. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the discussion of the bill under consideration by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], in which State both he and I had the good fortune to be born and reared, events which happened in that State more than 50 years ago have crowded thick and fast upon my memory. The unhappy Civil War was raging, and a supreme effort was being made by the people of North Carolina, directed by the consummate ability of their great war governor, Zebulon B. Vance, to provide for the comfort and efficiency of the North Carolina soldiers in the army of northern Virginia. How well that work was done is recorded in history. That was not all. Under the directions of this great governor, the people of North Carolina bestowed the same care and labor and effort to take care of the women and children and the helpless families of Confederate soldiers in North Carolina that they bestowed upon the soldiers who went to the battle field. [Applause.]

The soldiers of North Carolina who slept upon the battle fields of northern Virginia and dreamed at night as they looked up at the stars of those they loved at home rested calmly, for they knew that their helpless families who were left at home would be cared for by the great State which is represented in part by the gentleman and myself. That was not all, Mr. Speaker. There were many hundred Federal prisoners in Salisbury, N. C., in prison. From the depots of supplies which were furnished the families of soldiers in the Confederate Army those wives and children, the people left at home, at the request of the governor of North Carolina, took a part of their substance and carried it to the prison at Salisbury, did it constantly, and supplied the necessities of the Union soldiers, which were made inevitable by the result of the great Civil War. [Applause.]

Can it be possible that this great Government, standing for courage, for heroism, for advanced civilization in every civilized land, is unwilling to provide for its own soldiers, members of the National Guard, drafted on a few days' notice into the Regular Army, with the same comfort and care and kindness that the State of North Carolina bestowed upon its soldiers when it sent them to the Army of Northern Virginia more than 50 years ago? I have thought that if any Member of this House had a doubt as to how he should vote, if he would read the history of North Carolina, from which my friend comes and which I know full well, and then would go out to Statuary Hall and look at the bronze image of that great man who directed the efforts in behalf of humanity, he would discard all doubt and come back here and vote for this bill with joy, with delight, and with enthusiasm. [Applause.]

My heart prompts me to say just one word about the National Guard. I can not speak of the National Guard throughout the country at large, but I can speak for the National Guard of North Carolina, and I know all about that guard. I have seen some criticism with reference to the National Guard generally, comparing it with the Regular Army. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the National Guard of North Carolina, and I hope what I say is not improper or inappropriate, is equal, man for man, to any battalion of troops in the Regular Army of the United States, it matters not from which section of the country they come. [Applause.] That National Guard is faithful in its allegiance to this country. It is ready to carry the flag as far to the front as any troops in the Regular Army, and it will return that flag without tarnish and blemish when the war is ended to the people who sent them to the battle field. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I join in that.

The SPEAKER. The time is limited under the rule to 40 minutes.

Mr. STEDMAN. I ask for two minutes additional.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Several gentlemen ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not ask that. We have some other business that we ought to attend to.

Mr. STEDMAN. Two minutes is all I desire.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman takes two minutes, other gentlemen will want the same privilege accorded them.

Mr. RAKER. As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] is going to yield two minutes to me, I will relinquish it in favor of the gentleman from North Carolina. [Applause.]

Mr. HAY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. STEDMAN. Mr. Speaker, the sentiment expressed here so eloquently by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] in discussing this same subject a day or two ago found a responsive echo in my heart. I desire now to read two extracts from a message sent by Gov. Craig of North Carolina to the President of the United States on last Wednesday, which I find in a North Carolina paper this morning:

The National Guard of North Carolina is ready to obey the orders of the President of the United States and volunteer to go into Mexico, or elsewhere, as they may be ordered, regardless of the technical provisions of the Army reorganization bill. * * * Every man, from the brigade commander down to the private in the ranks, is ready to sign any enlistment volunteering his services to the United States anywhere and at any time.

This bill ought to be passed enthusiastically, without a dissenting voice. [Applause.]

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I want for a few moments to call attention to the remarkable record just established by Anderson County, S. C., which is in the congressional district that I have the honor to represent.

According to the census of 1910, Anderson County had a population of 69,568, of whom 43,232 are white. Since the President issued his call for the mobilization of the militia, Anderson County has sent into camp three companies of Infantry, a machine-gun company, and a regimental band—one of the best that I ever heard, by the way—all recruited to the required strength. On top of this another company has been organized and will be ready to go forward if there should be a call for volunteers. In other words, in a county of less than 45,000 white population, approximately 500 young men have responded to the call of their country to duty. This is a remarkable record. I am sure that I am safe in the assertion that no other county of equal population in the United States has made a record that comes anywhere near it.

Practically all of these young men who have volunteered are sons or grandsons of Confederate soldiers, and in looking over the roster of the companies I have noted with pride the names of quite a number of men who served with me in the First South Carolina Regiment in the War with Spain, in 1898.

Anderson County is one of the greatest counties in the United States. Its population is more than 99 per cent native born, and of the purest Anglo-Saxon stock. It is a great county in agriculture, a great county in manufacturing, a great county in civic righteousness, educational progress, and all that goes to make for good citizenship, and it has just shown in the most striking manner possible that it is a great county in patriotism and love of country.

It is a high honor, gentlemen of the House of Representatives, to represent such a constituency in the American Congress. I would be recreant to my duty if I did not make this statement here to-day, so that there may be preserved in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for as long as our civilization shall stand, this slight tribute to the greatness of Anderson County and her splendid people.

This bill is right, and should be passed unanimously, for it is our duty to provide liberally for the dependent ones of our patriotic men who have gone to the front. [Applause.]

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE].

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, a few days ago the Members of this House passed with practical unanimity this identical proposition as an amendment to the bill providing for drafting the National Guard into the Federal service, but forces outside of this House willed that it should be stricken from the bill. I hope that to-day this bill will pass with such an emphatic vote that even those who opposed the other proposition will consent that this measure become a law. I do not know whether it is wisdom to have a military system that permits married men to be enrolled in time of war before the single men are all exhausted, and I have not time now to discuss it; I do not know that the President of the United States has the power to call single men first by draft, and I have not the time to discuss that; but the fact remains

that there are many married men in the National Guard in the several States, and they have been drafted into the Federal service by the President. What is the result? They are taken from their usual vocations, many of them remunerative, and put into the Army at \$15 a month. Their wives and children and dependent mothers are left at home. What must follow? They must have assistance from some source. I am glad to know that many patriotic men of the country are offering to pay their men full salaries while they are in the service of the country, but should we ask that of them? Many patriotic societies are being organized to assist in the charitable work necessary to provide support for the wives, children, and dependent mothers of the soldiers. Many people are ready to give of their substance to aid them.

But, gentlemen of the House, is this the policy which our Nation should pursue toward the men called to arms as volunteers or drafted into the service? Shall we permit the humiliation not only of the soldier but of his dependent loved ones by refusing to assume the burden of their support while he is in the ranks serving the Nation, but leave it to the charitably inclined people in each community to carry in a little food or perhaps dole out a few dollars to the wife or mother, thus putting them in the class of dependents, and causing a blush to come to the cheeks of the wives and mothers when compelled to accept such charity. Surely many a proud-spirited mother or wife would want before accepting such aid from those who remain at home. More than that, it is wrong to place them in such a position. The soldier who leaves a wife or dependent mother and goes to the front, to do and to die, if necessary, for our common country, has troubles enough to bear without suffering the humiliation of knowing that his loved ones are in need on account of his absence, or compelled to take from the hand of charity the things necessary to sustain life. Is it not enough for the wife or mother to bear, to surrender the son or husband to the service of our country, without having added to their other sad thoughts as the shades of night fall about their abode the thought of food and fuel for the morrow? Surely their sacrifice is sufficient without this unnecessary and cruel requirement. Let us away with all subterfuge, all maudlin talk about patriotism and free service and sacrifice on the part of the soldier. This is a mighty Nation. Rich beyond all measure. Millions are wasted annually in one way and another by unwise and reckless appropriations of the public money, and now shall it be said of us as a nation that when we called into the service of the country men to serve as soldiers, taking them from their walk in life, where they have been permitted to support those dependent upon them, we will not care for their dependent ones? Shame on the Nation that would pursue such a course, and may God grant that it shall never be said of our country.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ].

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, I, of course, am in favor of this bill. I think it will have a very healthy effect for the Government of the United States to set such an example and that private employers throughout the country, who are already acting very liberally, will be stimulated to continue their patriotic course toward their employees who enlist. I regret the committee has seen fit to strike out that section giving authority to the Secretary of War under certain conditions to permit the discharge of men with dependent families. Such authority ought to be vested in him, because there are exceptional cases where unforeseen contingencies and extreme hardships may arise for which relief should be provided. It is not a reflection on the National Guard to make such a request. Such a privilege will not be abused, but I think some power, some authority, should be given that will make possible release from the service. The Senate has gone on record in its favor and this House should have been given an opportunity to express itself on this subject. [Applause.]

For the benefit of those who think the Secretary of War can now discharge members of the National Guard, even on proper showing, I insert copy of a letter this day received by me from The Adjutant General. According to him, "regardless of the merits of a case, the department has no discretion in the matter." If that be true, then Congress should act, and act quickly:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, June 30, 1916.

HON. H. GARLAND DUPRÉ,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: In response to your letter of the 28th instant, inclosing three telegrams (returned herewith) relative to _____, for whom it is desired to secure a release from military service or an indefinite leave, I beg leave to advise you as follows:

The department has received a considerable number of requests for the discharge of members of the National Guard who have been mus-

tered into the service of the United States, and with respect to whom it is claimed that their discharge would be either in the personal interest of the men themselves or in the interest of their dependent families or relatives. The subject has received careful and thorough consideration as to what might be done by the department in the way of granting relief in cases of this kind, and after such consideration the conclusion has been reached that there is no authority in existing law under which men of the class referred to can be released from military service.

You will see, therefore, that regardless of the merits of a case the department has no discretion in the matter and that all requests for discharge in cases such as that of ———— must be denied.

An indefinite furlough can not be granted to an enlisted man. Regretting that I am unable to advise you favorably in this matter, I remain,

Very respectfully,

H. P. McCain,
The Adjutant General.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I will yield one minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that those who stay at home in safety ought to provide for the families of those who risk their lives by going to the front. We ought not to make war at the expense of the wives and children [applause] of those who fight for the common honor and rights of us all. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the greatest commercial association in this world, I believe, is the Chicago Association of Commerce. The great heart of Chicago, speaking through that association, sends this message to Congress:

The Chicago Association of Commerce urges upon Congress the desirability of enacting legislation providing suitable allowances for the dependents of our enlisted men.

JOHN W. O'LEARY, President.

[Applause.]

I am proud of the association and happy of the opportunity to help by contributing my little mite—staying here—to help take care of those dependent on the ones who go to the front. [Applause.]

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

The SPEAKER. Five minutes.

Mr. HAY. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER].

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I concur heartily in the idea that the Federal Government make some provision for the dependents of those who are called out to the border of our country and may have to engage in war. In the city in which I live a company enlisted and is now in the service, and many of those were men who labored by the day for a living. They regretted the fact that they must go and leave their families dependent, but the citizens of that city said, "You go, and we will take care of your family until you return." [Applause.]

An association has been formed in that little city providing for a liberal contribution of the money of the citizens for members of the family of those soldiers whose families are dependent. Three other companies have gone from other towns of the district, and I have no doubt their citizens are equally generous with those left at home who were dependent. I am glad, my friends, to see that this House is making a precedent which is looking toward humanity in time of service of the boys of the country. It is easy to talk patriotism here, but let those who remain at home help pay for care of the families of those who are in the service. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration provides relief for dependent families of militiamen who were covered into the Regular Army by operation of law and went to the front to defend the country. When war is imminent it is necessary for certain of the citizenship to go to the front and defend the Nation. It always requires the very flower of the country to perform this patriotic and dangerous task; it selects from among all of us the bravest, the most patriotic, the most capable, and the ones who are well equipped in health, strength, and mental vigor. Harsh as this may seem, it is true, for certainly in a time of great stress it is never the weaklings who can defend us, but the strongest ones instead.

To every thoughtful man war is a terrible thing; to every thoughtful man it is a terrible thing to drag a citizen from his daily task of accomplishment and accumulation and put him into the war at a great sacrifice; but even worse than this is to make him suffer the dissolution of family and leave his loved ones behind that he may go to the front, that he may hazard his life, hazard his future, and run every risk and hazard known to man.

Inasmuch as it is necessary for them to go, inasmuch as the Congress has already decreed that they must go, we all must of necessity feel keenly their going. While our poor words

of sympathy, praise, and admiration will perhaps suffice to cheer them on to endurance, valor, and success, something far more substantial is needed for the wives and children and dependent ones left behind. For me and for mine, I reluctantly give my consent that these brave young, patriotic men should go at all to the front in defense of our country, thereby leaving us behind in health and strength with full opportunities for the betterment of our condition. For me and for mine, I shall not be content, I am not content, I never expect to be content, to allow these boys to go to the front without the one consoling fact that the great Government of the United States will not allow those left behind to suffer destitution, want, and degradation brought about by the absence of their loved ones who are defending the Nation. [Applause.]

Members here and Members in the other body oppose this legislation. They have asserted, and are making every effort to carry conviction with it, that to look after the helpless and dependent families left behind is a comingling of patriotism with money matters and sordid things. I assert all such argument is fraught with ignorance or hypocrisy. I assert such statements are far from the truth. I assert that it is pitiable that any such sentiments should prevail. The American Nation is to-day not only the richest Nation of all the world both in patriotism and wealth, but it is more capable now than ever before to look well after the wants not alone of our defenders at the front but of those left behind. I insist that it is the duty of Congress this day to take this step toward the protection and maintenance of our defenders' families left behind. I assert it is not too much for them to expect of us to do; I assert it is only what a great, patriotic Nation is willing to do, desirous to do, and ought to do in a time of great stress like this. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] stated the National Guard is not asking for this legislation. No, they have not asked for it, because they are too busy getting ready to go to the front to make a demand upon the Congress. The whole country believes Congress ought to do its duty without being asked. [Applause.] The gentleman says that this will affect enlistments in the Regular Army. Never in the history of this country, when there were militia and volunteer organizations to enlist in, have its people enlisted in the Regular Army. They prefer to enlist and serve with their friends and their brothers from their own communities. This legislation will not affect enlistments in the Regular Army. This legislation is intended for the purpose of letting these men go to the front with the knowledge that their loved ones at home are being taken care of, and that they can render arduous service with a free heart and an open mind without agonizing upon what may be occurring at home.

I therefore hope that this House will, by a unanimous vote, record its voice in favor of this legislation, which, whether it is a precedent or not, ought to be enacted into law now. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing this bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of suspending the rules and passing this bill will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 299, nays 2, answered "present" 5, not voting 129, as follows:

YEAS—299.

Abercrombie	Burke	Curry	Estopinal
Adams	Burnett	Dale, Vt.	Evans
Aiken	Byrnes, S. C.	Dallinger	Farr
Alexander	Byrns, Tenn.	Danforth	Ferris
Allen	Campbell	Davenport	Finley
Almon	Candler, Miss.	Davis, Minn.	Focht
Anderson	Cannon	Decker	Fordney
Anthony	Cantrill	Dempsey	Foss
Aswell	Caraway	Denison	Foster
Austin	Carew	Dent	Frear
Ayres	Carter, Mass.	Dickinson	Freeman
Bailey	Carter, Okla.	Dies	Gallagher
Barkley	Cary	Dill	Gallivan
Beakes	Casey	Dillon	Gard
Bell	Cline	Dixon	Gardner
Bennet	Coady	Doellittle	Garrett
Blackmon	Coleman	Doremus	Glass
Booher	Collier	Boughton	Glynn
Borland	Connelly	Dowell	Godwin, N. C.
Bowers	Conry	Dunn	Good
Britt	Cooper, W. Va.	Dupré	Goodwin, Ark.
Britten	Cooper, Wis.	Dyer	Gordon
Browne	Cox	Edwards	Gray, Ala.
Brumbaugh	Crago	Ellsworth	Gray, Ind.
Buchanan, Ill.	Cramton	Elston	Green, Iowa
Buchanan, Tex.	Crisp	Emerson	Greene, Vt.
Burgess	Cullop	Esch	Hadley

Hamill	Langley	Padgett	Steele, Iowa
Hamilton, Mich.	Lazaro	Page, N. C.	Steenerson
Hamilton, N. Y.	Lee	Park	Stephens, Cal.
Hamilin	Leibach	Parker, N. Y.	Stephens, Miss.
Hardy	Lenroot	Peters	Stephens, Nebr.
Haskell	Leshner	Price	Stephens, Tex.
Hastings	Lever	Quin	Sterling
Hawley	Lewis	Ragsdale	Stiness
Hay	Lieb	Rainey	Stone
Hayden	Liebel	Raker	Stout
Hayes	Lindbergh	Ramseyer	Sulloway
Heflin	Lloyd	Randall	Sweet
Helgesen	Lobeck	Rauch	Switzer
Helm	Longworth	Rayburn	Taggart
Helvering	McAndrews	Reavis	Tague
Hensley	McArthur	Reilly	Talbott
Hernandez	McClintic	Ricketts	Tavener
Hicks	McCracken	Roberts, Nev.	Taylor, Ark.
Hill	McCulloch	Rodenberg	Taylor, Colo.
Hilliard	McDermott	Rogers	Temple
Hinds	McGillcuddy	Rouse	Thomas
Holland	McKellar	Rubey	Thompson
Hollingsworth	McKenzie	Rucker	Tillman
Hood	McKinley	Russell, Mo.	Timberlake
Howard	McLaughlin	Russell, Ohio	Towner
Howell	McLemore	Saunders	Van Dyke
Huddleston	Madden	Schall	Venable
Hughes	Magee	Scott, Mich.	Vinson
Hull, Iowa	Mann	Sells	Volstead
Hull, Tenn.	Mapes	Shackleford	Walker
Humphrey, Wash.	Matthews	Shallenberger	Walsh
Humphreys, Miss.	Mays	Sherley	Wason
Igoe	Meeker	Shouse	Whaley
Johnson, S. Dak.	Miller, Del.	Siegel	Wheeler
Johnson, Wash.	Miller, Minn.	Sims	Williams, T. S.
Jones	Mondell	Sinnott	Williams, W. E.
Kearns	Moon	Sisson	Williams, Ohio
Keating	Mooney	Slomp	Wilson, Ill.
Kelley	Morgan, Okla.	Sloan	Wilson, La.
Kennedy, Iowa	Mudd	Smith, Idaho	Wingo
Kennedy, R. I.	Nelson	Smith, Mich.	Winslow
Kent	Nicholls, S. C.	Smith, Minn.	Wise
Kettner	Nichols, Mich.	Smith, N. Y.	Wood, Ind.
Key, Ohio	Nolan	Snell	Woods, Iowa
Kinkaid	Norton	Sparkman	Young, N. Dak.
Kitchin	Oakey	Stafford	Young, Tex.
Konop	Oldfield	Stegall	The Speaker
La Follette	Oliver	Stedman	

NAYS—2.

James Small
ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

Clark, Fla. London Platt Sears
Garner

NOT VOTING—129.

Adair	Farley	Kincheloe	Pou
Ashbrook	Fess	King	Powers
Bacharach	Fields	Kreider	Pratt
Barchfeld	Fitzgerald	Lafan	Riordan
Barnhart	Flood	Linthicum	Roberts, Mass.
Beales	Flynn	Littlepage	Rowe
Black	Fuller	Loft	Rowland
Browning	Gandy	Loud	Sabath
Bruckner	Garland	McFadden	Sanford
Butler	Gillett	Maher	Scott, Pa.
Caldwell	Gould	Martin	Scully
Callaway	Graham	Miller, Pa.	Sherwood
Capstick	Gray, N. J.	Montague	Slayden
Carlin	Greene, Mass.	Moore, Pa.	Smith, Tex.
Chandler, N. Y.	Gregg	Moore, Ind.	Snyder
Charles	Griest	Morgan, La.	Steele, Pa.
Chipherfield	Griffin	Morin	Summers
Church	Guernsey	Morrison	Sutherland
Cooper, Ohio	Harrison	Moss, Ind.	Swift
Copley	Hart	Moss, W. Va.	Tilgham
Costello	Haugen	Mott	Tinkham
Crosser	Heaton	Murray	Treadway
Dale, N. Y.	Henry	Neely	Tribble
Darrow	Hopwood	North	Vare
Davis, Tex.	Houston	Oglesby	Ward
Dewalt	Hulbert	Olney	Watkins
Dooling	Husted	O'Shaunessy	Watson, Pa.
Driscoll	Hutchinson	Overmyer	Watson, Va.
Drukker	Jacoway	Palge, Mass.	Webb
Eagan	Johnson, Ky.	Parker, N. J.	Wilson, Fla.
Eagle	Kahn	Patten	
Edmonds	Keister	Phelan	
Fairchild	Kiess, Pa.	Porter	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and he answered in the affirmative.

So, two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

- Mr. DEWALT with Mr. MCFADDEN.
- Mr. GARNER with Mr. BARCHFIELD.
- Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania with Mr. GRAHAM.
- Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.
- Until further notice:
- Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. MCKINLEY.
- Mr. FLYNN with Mr. PRATT.
- Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. POWERS.
- Mr. ADAIR with Mr. ROWE.
- Mr. BLACK with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.
- Mr. FLOOD with Mr. BUTLER.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. VARE.
Mr. EAGLE with Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania.
Mr. DAVIS of Texas with Mr. TREADWAY.
Mr. CROSSER with Mr. TILSON.
Mr. CARLIN with Mr. SWIFT.
Mr. HENRY with Mr. BACHARACH.
Mr. HULBERT with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania.
Mr. SHERWOOD with Mr. SANFORD.
Mr. POU with Mr. ROWLAND.
Mr. OVERMYER with Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts.
Mr. MOSS of Indiana with Mr. MOORES of Indiana.
Mr. MAHER with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.
Mr. FIELDS with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.
Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. FAIRCHILD.
Mr. WATSON of Virginia with Mr. GOULD.
Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. FULLER.
Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. WARD.
Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. GUERNSEY.
Mr. WATKINS with Mr. HAUGEN.
Mr. EAGAN with Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts.
Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.
Mr. HARRISON with Mr. HEATON.
Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. TINKHAM.
Mr. JACOWAY with Mr. LOUD.
Mr. OLNEY with Mr. KREIDER.
Mr. FARLEY with Mr. COSTELLO.
Mr. HART with Mr. GARLAND.
Mr. MORRISON with Mr. HUTCHINSON.
Mr. ASHBROOK with Mr. KAHN.
Mr. WEBB with Mr. GRIEST.
Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. SNYDER.
Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. CHARLES.
Mr. BARNHART with Mr. DRUKKER.
Mr. GANDY with Mr. EDMONDS.
Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. KING.
Mr. OGLESBY with Mr. HUSTED.
Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana with Mr. GRAY of New Jersey.
Mr. KINCHELOE with Mr. FESS.
Mr. GREGG with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.
Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. CAPSTICK.
Mr. CHURCH with Mr. COPLEY.
Mr. LOFT with Mr. HOPWOOD.
Mr. TRIBBLE with Mr. MORIN.
Mr. SUMNERS with Mr. LAFEAN.
Mr. PHELAN with Mr. MOTT.
Mr. PATTEN with Mr. SUTHERLAND.
Mr. SMITH of Texas with Mr. MARTIN.
Mr. NEELY with Mr. PORTER.
Mr. MURRAY with Mr. DARROW.
Mr. DOOLING with Mr. CARY.
Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. BRUCKNER.
Mr. SABATH with Mr. CHIPHERFIELD.
Ending July 5:

Mr. FITZGERALD with Mr. GILLETT.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

FORTIFICATIONS.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the fortifications appropriation bill, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER). The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a conference report on the fortifications appropriation bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the statement of the House conferees may be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the House conferees. The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 915).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14303) 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, 2, 5, 6, and 10.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 14, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. That except as expressly otherwise authorized herein no part of the sums appropriated by this act shall be expended in the purchase from private manufacturers of any material at a price in excess of 25 per cent more than the cost of manufacturing such material by the Government, or, where such material is not or has not been manufactured by the Government, at a price in excess of 25 per cent more than the estimated cost of manufacture by the Government: *Provided, however,* That whenever in the opinion of the President an emergency exists affecting the general welfare of the United States, he may waive the limitations contained in this section."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Renumber the section to read "7"; and the Senate agree to the same.

SWAGAR SHERLEY,
G. W. RAUCH,
F. H. GILLETT,

Managers on the part of the House.

N. P. BRYAN,
LUKE LEA,
WESLEY L. JONES,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

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. 14303) 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 said amendments, namely:

No. 1: Appropriates \$250,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$225,000, as proposed by the Senate, for protection, preservation, and repair of fortifications.

No. 2: Appropriates \$200,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$254,060, as proposed by the Senate, for mining casemates, cable galleries, etc., necessary for the operation and care of submarine mines.

Nos. 3 and 4, relating to the purchase, manufacture, and test of field-artillery ammunition: Appropriates \$6,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,700,000, as proposed by the House, and authorizes contracts in addition thereto in the sum of \$3,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,500,000, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 5 and 6, relating to the purchase, manufacture, and test of seacoast cannon: Strikes out the increases, proposed by the Senate, of \$480,000 in cash and \$500,000 in contract authorizations.

No. 7: Appropriates \$480,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$400,000, as proposed by the House, for practice ammunition for field artillery.

Nos. 8 and 9: Inserts the language, proposed by the Senate, requiring the President to approve the report of the special board of Army and Navy officers to be appointed to investigate and test radiodynamic torpedoes before the purchase of the invention is made.

No. 10: Strikes out the provision, inserted by the Senate, requiring the special board appointed to investigate radiodynamic torpedoes to report upon the "Clark and other similar" inventions.

No. 11: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that the Chief of Coast Artillery shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a major general.

No. 12: Inserts the section, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the use of \$50,000 of the sums appropriated in the bill for the services of skilled draftsmen and others in the office of the Chief of Ordnance.

No. 13: Appropriates \$10,000 instead of \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the rent of space in Washington for the drafting force of the office of the Chief of Ordnance.

No. 14: Changes the section number as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 15 and 16: Restores the matter stricken out by the Senate limiting the cost of material purchased to not to exceed 25 per cent of the cost of manufacturing the same at Government arsenals or not to exceed 25 per cent of the estimated cost of manufacturing at Government arsenals, modified so that the President may waive the limitations of the section whenever in his opinion an emergency exists affecting the general welfare of the United States. The amendments also change the section numbers of the bill.

SWAGAR SHERLEY,
GEO. W. RAUCH,
FREDK. H. GILLETT,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill as it passed the House carried cash appropriations of \$22,368,050 and contract authorizations of \$12,300,000, a total of \$34,668,050. The amount added by the Senate was: Cash, \$3,889,060; contract authorizations, \$2,000,000; or a total of \$5,889,060; making a grand total of \$40,557,110 as the bill passed the Senate.

The House receded on cash sums amounting to \$3,380,000 and on contract authorizations of \$1,500,000, making a total of \$4,880,000. The Senate receded on cash items of \$509,060 and on contract authorizations of \$500,000, or a total of \$1,009,060.

The bill as agreed upon now carries, cash \$25,748,050, and contract authorizations of \$13,800,000, or a total of \$39,548,050.

The increase as agreed upon over the bill as it passed the House amounts in cash and contract authorizations to \$4,880,000, which is largely the result of one increase by the Senate touching field-artillery ammunition. The bill as it passed the House carried for field-artillery ammunition \$2,700,000 cash, and contract authorizations of \$1,500,000, or total cash and authorizations of \$4,200,000. The bill as it passed the Senate and as agreed to in conference carries \$6,000,000 cash and \$3,000,000 in contract authorizations, or a total of \$9,000,000 for this purpose.

When the bill was being considered by the Committee on Appropriations, the Treat Board report, touching the amount of Field Artillery and the ammunition therefor to be accumulated as a reserve, had not been approved by the War Department, and the committee allowed all the estimates that were then asked. Since that time the report of the Treat Board has been approved, subject to certain modifications by the War Department, and in order to carry out with a reasonable degree of rapidity the recommendations embodied in that report it was believed by the War Department that the item as it passed the House should be increased. In view of the situation that confronts us, the fact that ammunition for field guns might be very necessary to have in sufficient quantities, the House conferees felt constrained to yield to the Senate in that particular.

The only other large amendment made by the Senate related to the manufacture of seacoast cannon, where they increased the cash appropriation of the House from \$1,084,500 to \$1,764,500, and increased the authorization for contracts from \$3,000,000 to \$3,500,000. That increase was made by the Senate evidently under a misapprehension as to the amount of money that would be needed at this particular time, and after a reconsideration of the matter the Senate receded from its position, and the items as they passed the House were restored to the bill.

The Senate agreed to the provision of the House touching the appointment of a board to report upon the Hammond torpedo and to purchase the same in the event that that report was favorable, with a slight modification. They provided that the money should not be expended until a favorable report by this board had been approved by the President. The House provision simply provided that the money should not be expended until and unless a favorable report had been made by this joint board of Army and Navy officers. The Senate required the approval of the President, and the House conferees were very glad to acquiesce in that further safeguarding of the provision.

The Senate also adopted a provision calling upon this joint board to investigate an invention alleged to have been made by a Mr. Clark, or any others that might be offered touching such weapons; but inasmuch as there had never been any report made on any of those inventions, and nothing was known of them except what was obtained from the statement of a Senator that he understood there were such inventions, we did not believe this joint board should be called upon to investigate them, especially in view of the fact that we carry a \$300,000 appropriation for the Board of Ordnance and Fortifications, which is a

statutory board created for the express purpose of investigating and passing on all inventions of this character. So that it is perfectly possible for these or other inventors to have a report made by the Board of Ordnance and Fortifications in the usual manner. The Senate accordingly receded from that amendment.

The Senate struck out of the bill a provision that was found in section 4, which provided that in the expenditure of the moneys appropriated in the bill contracts should not be let for a price in excess of 25 per cent more than the cost of making in the arsenals, where such articles had been made, or in excess of 25 per cent more than the estimated cost where such articles have not been made. The conferees restored the provision, with a proviso in the following language:

Provided, however, That whenever in the opinion of the President an emergency exists affecting the general welfare of the United States he may waive the limitation contained in this section.

In other words, it was believed that it might be desirable, in case of any emergency confronting the country, to give to the President the right to waive that limitation as to cost, in order that we might not be deprived of the opportunity of procuring munitions that might be of great value to the country. The Senate also inserted two provisions, one authorizing the services of clerical draftsmen to be used by the chief of ordnance and to be paid for out of the funds appropriated in the bill, not to exceed \$50,000. That was an amendment that would have been put on the bill by the Committee on Appropriations in the House, except that under a misapprehension they thought that the matter had been sufficiently cared for in the legislative appropriation bill. The House, therefore, receded from its disagreement to that Senate amendment, and it is let in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Did this provision result from a subsequent recommendation of the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance?

Mr. SHERLEY. It did.

Mr. STAFFORD. Because, when we framed the legislative bill, we granted to the department everything that was asked for and besides carried into the bill provisions adopted under the emergency resolution that passed the fore part of the session.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman is correct. In that legislative bill we carried a provision of \$140,000 for that purpose, but we have put 300 or 400 per cent more work on the ordnance people than heretofore by the increases in this bill and the Army bill. It did not seem the part of wisdom to handicap the ordnance people in doing the necessary drafting work in order to be in a position to spend these sums, and the House, therefore, receded.

The Senate also put in a provision authorizing not exceeding \$5,000 of the funds to be spent for renting suitable space in Washington for draftsmen. It had been believed when the legislative bill passed that under the rearrangement in the Army and Navy Building provided for, that space might be found necessary for the ordnance people. That has not proved to be practicable, and under representations made by the chief of ordnance the House agreed to the Senate amendment with an amendment increasing the amount to \$10,000. It requires a good deal of floor space in order to enable the draftsmen with their large tables to do their work and the House conferees believed it proper that they should have facilities to do this important work.

One other amendment of importance that was placed by the Senate upon the bill was the amendment which provides that hereafter the Chief of Coast Artillery shall have the rank, pay, and allowance of a major general. When the Army reorganization bill was up in the House there was an amendment offered on the floor by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS], in this same language, and it passed the House unanimously. The bill went to the Senate, and that provision was stricken out, and stayed out, as the result of the conferees' action.

The Senate on its own initiative placed this provision in the bill, and while it is not customary, as a rule, to carry such provisions on the fortification bill, inasmuch as the Senate insisted on its amendment and the House had already by its action at this session passed a provision in the same terms, the House conferees yielded, and the provision remains in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have enumerated every important amendment, and if any gentleman wishes to ask a question I will yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman explain why the Chief of Coast Artillery should have the rank and pay of a major general?

Mr. SHERLEY. The reason, in my judgment, is that the Chief of Coast Artillery is not merely a staff officer, but he is also practically a line officer; he has under him 40,000 men; he

has under him all the management and control of fortifications of all of our coasts and of our insular possessions and Panama. His duties are analogous to those of department commanders. He has control of all of the mine fields and mine operations, and it is believed that his duties are the duties of a line officer as much or more than they are the duties of a staff officer, and that his position is one of sufficient magnitude to warrant the rank that would correspond to a commander in the line having even a less number of troops under him.

Mr. Speaker, if there are no further questions, I ask for a vote.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, 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. 14303) entitled "An act 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."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD two letters received from prominent citizens of my district who are officers in labor organizations composed of railroad employees. These letters are in the nature of protests against congressional action or interference in a controversy now being had between the railroad and railroad employees involving the hours of labor—or the eight-hour-a-day proposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the letters referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT CALENDAR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order the Unanimous Consent Calendar is now in order, and the Clerk will read the first bill.

REVISED STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES.

The first business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 7619) to repeal section 3 of section 1342 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, enacted July 27, 1892.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

AMENDING ACT TO REGULATE COMMERCE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 722) to amend section 20 of an act to regulate commerce approved February 4, 1887, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

INVESTIGATION OF INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was Senate joint resolution 60, creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

AVIATION SERVICE, UNITED STATES ARMY.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was Senate joint resolution 65, creating a joint commission of Congress to investigate the Aviation Service of the United States Army.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

OVERISSUES OF SECURITIES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 563) to amend section 20 of an act to regulate commerce, to prevent overissues of securities by carriers, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have that go over.

Mr. ADAMSON. Very well. I ask that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it will be passed over without prejudice.

There was no objection.

PROTECTION OF STREAMS, ETC., IN CALIFORNIA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 1351) providing for the discovery, development, and protection of streams, springs, and water holes in the desert and arid public lands of the United States in the State of California, for rendering the same more readily accessible, and for the establishment of and maintenance of signboards and monuments locating the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

Subsequently,

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1351) providing for the discovery, development, and protection of streams, springs, and water holes in the desert and arid public lands of the United States in the State of California, for rendering the same more readily accessible, and for the establishment of and maintenance of signboards and monuments locating the same, be passed over without prejudice. It is No. 132 on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman asks that it shall remain on the calendar?

Mr. RAKER. That is all.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MINING ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS, ARIZONA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12426) to authorize mining for metalliferous minerals on Indian reservations in the State of Arizona.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the bill passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be passed over without prejudice.

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT MEMPHIS, TENN.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12999) extending the time for the completion of the bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn., authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Arkansas & Memphis Railway Bridge & Terminal Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn.," approved August 23, 1912.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I have not been furnished with the amendments that were suggested, and I ask unanimous consent that temporarily we may pass this over, so that the amendments can be furnished later.

Mr. MANN. I think it would better be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to passing the bill over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Possibly the gentleman can return to it later.

Mr. ADAMSON. In case the amendments are presented before the end of the day I will ask unanimous consent to return to it.

MARCUS A. JORDAN.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 888) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to confer upon Marcus A. Jordan the life-saving medal of the first class.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not see the author of the bill in the Chamber, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the bill going over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL PARK, GETTYSBURG, PA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13342) to improve and maintain certain public roads and parts thereof included within the limits of the national park at Gettysburg, as defined by the act of Congress entitled "An act to establish a national military park at Gettysburg, Pa.," approved February 11, 1895, and making an appropriation therefor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming objects.

DAMS ACROSS NAVIGABLE WATERS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 3331) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CUTTERS FOR THE COAST GUARD.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill S. 2719, providing for the construction or purchase of cutters for the Coast Guard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

THE LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 14340) to furnish all seagoing vessels in the Lighthouse Service and all other seagoing vessels of the Department of Commerce with radio equipment and auxiliary power for the operation thereof.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CUTTERS FOR THE COAST GUARD.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 515) providing for the purchase or construction of cutters for the Coast Guard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

THE LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 14338) to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to the general purpose of the bill except I question the propriety at this time of providing by omnibus provision for the increase of the salary of the lighthouse inspectors from \$2,400 to \$3,000. If the gentleman is willing to eliminate section 6, I have no objection to the remainder of the bill.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that the department appeared through the Secretary of Commerce and strongly urged that, and gave reasons the committee thought good. Of course if the House thinks differently, it has the right to vote it out.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to say to the gentleman that we had this same recommendation when we were considering the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and the committee did not think it was wise at this time, in view of the condition of the Treasury, to make such a liberal increase in salaries. I shall be constrained to object unless we can have an understanding about the elimination of section 6.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will not the gentleman relieve me of the necessity by moving it himself? Will not the gentleman move it?

Mr. STAFFORD. No—well, I will move it if I have an understanding—

Mr. ADAMSON. I will not resist it.

Mr. STAFFORD (continuing). That it will not be resisted by gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. ADAMSON. Well, make the motion; I will not resist it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill is on the Union Calendar. I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to establish, provide, or improve the following aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, under the Department of Commerce, in accordance with the respective limits of cost hereinafter respectively set forth, which shall in no case be exceeded:

Light keepers' dwellings and appurtenant structures, including sites therefor, within the limit of cost for each item fixed by the act approved February 26, 1907 (34 U. S. Stat., p. 996), \$75,000.

Constructing and equipping light vessels for general service on the Great Lakes, or for general service, \$150,000.

SECOND LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Constructing and equipping a lighthouse depot for the second lighthouse district, \$85,000.

THIRD LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Constructing or purchasing and equipping a lighthouse tender to replace tenders worn out in service in the third lighthouse district, or in the Lighthouse Service generally, \$150,000.

Improvement of the offices and laboratory at the general lighthouse depot at Tompkinsville, Staten Island, N. Y., \$21,000.

Improving the aids to navigation on the East River, N. Y., \$16,000.

FIFTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Constructing and equipping a light vessel for station off Cape Charles, Va., or for general service, \$130,000.

Improving lights and fog signals leading to Cape Charles, Va., \$12,800.

Improving aids to navigation and establishing new aids on the eastern shore of Chesapeake Bay and tributaries, Md. and Va., \$29,000.

NINTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Removal and rebuilding on another site of the light station and dwelling at or near Point Borinquen, P. R., \$85,000.

TENTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Aids to navigation at Huron Harbor, Ohio, \$4,500.

Improving the aids to navigation at Fairport Harbor, Ohio, \$42,000.

ELEVENTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Improvement at Detroit, Mich., lighthouse depot, \$53,000.

Light station and fog signal at or near Sand Hills, Mich., \$75,000.

Improving aids to navigation and establishing new aids at or near the entrance to Keweenaw Waterway Harbor of Refuge, Portage River, Mich., \$110,000.

TWELFTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Improving the light and fog-signal station at Manitowoc North Breakwater, Wis., \$21,000.

Removing and rebuilding Chicago Harbor Light Station, Ill., and establishing lights on the new breakwater in Chicago Harbor, \$142,000.

Establishing and improving aids to navigation at Indiana Harbor, Ind., \$100,000.

SIXTEENTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Aids to navigation and improvement of existing aids in Alaska, \$60,000.

NINETEENTH LIGHTHOUSE DISTRICT.

Constructing and equipping a temporary lighthouse depot at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, pending the establishment of a permanent depot, \$5,000; and authority is hereby granted to erect such temporary depot on land to be leased.

Construction and equipment of a lighthouse depot for the nineteenth lighthouse district, \$90,000.

SEC. 2. Hereafter the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, whenever he shall deem it advisable, to exchange any right of way of the United States in connection with lands pertaining to the Lighthouse Service for such other right of way as may be advantageous to the service, under such terms and conditions as he may deem to be for the best interests of the Government; and in case any expenses, not exceeding the sum of \$500, are incurred by the United States in making such exchange the same shall be payable from the appropriation "General expenses, Lighthouse Service," for the fiscal year during which such exchange shall be effected.

SEC. 3. Hereafter post-lantern lights and other aids to navigation may be established and maintained, in the discretion of the Commissioner of Lighthouses, out of the annual appropriations for the Lighthouse Service on the Mobile, Tombigbee, Warrior, and Black Warrior Rivers, Ala.

SEC. 4. Hereafter the appropriation "General expenses, Lighthouse Service," shall be available for the purchase, equipment, repair, and operation of motor-propelled vehicles for transporting passengers or freight for use of the Lighthouse Service in the Hawaiian Islands.

SEC. 5. Hereafter light keepers and assistant light keepers of the Lighthouse Service shall be entitled to medical relief without charge at hospitals and other stations of the Public Health Service under the rules and regulations governing the care of seamen of the merchant marine: *Provided*, That this benefit shall not apply to any keeper or assistant keeper who receives an original appointment after the passage of this act, unless the applicant passes a physical examination in accordance with rules approved by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 6. Hereafter the annual salaries of lighthouse inspectors, excepting the inspector of the third lighthouse district, shall not exceed \$3,000 each.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out section 6.

Mr. ADAMSON. I will not resist that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, strike out lines 20, 21, and 22, inclusive.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. Furnishing all seagoing vessels in the Lighthouse Service with radio equipment and auxiliary power for the operation thereof, \$60,000.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, some portion of this bill has already been enacted in a separate bill, and therefore I move to strike out sections 8 and 9 without having them read, and that section 7 be renumbered by making it section 6. I ask unanimous consent to do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to strike out sections 8 and 9 without reading. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. And to renumber section 7, making it section 6. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE AT NAVY YARDS, GUN FACTORIES, ETC.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 11168) granting 30 days' leave of absence each year, without forfeiture of pay during such leave, to employees at United States navy yards, gun factories, naval stations, and arsenals.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want a little information, if the gentleman from Maryland is in shape to give it. How much is this going to cost the Government?

Mr. FARR. About a million dollars, I think, on paper.

Mr. COX. What does the gentleman mean by saying a million dollars on paper?

Mr. FARR. I think the rest, recreation, and so forth, that these men will get will more than compensate for the cost in money, and it will be doing justice to a lot of men rather than have them discriminated against as they are to-day.

Mr. DYER. Equalize them with the others.

Mr. COX. Is it the intention to go forward with other legislation giving all Government employees 30 days' leave of absence?

Mr. TALBOTT. This will apply to a number of men working in the navy yards and arsenals.

Mr. COX. It applies to 40,000 men now.

Mr. TALBOTT. Thirty thousand, I think, originally.

Mr. COX. And it will cost the Government a million dollars a year if enacted into law?

Mr. FARR. On paper.

Mr. COX. Oh, well, it does not make any difference whether it is on paper or not; the cost will have to be paid by the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. TALBOTT. These are high-class mechanics, most of them.

Mr. DYER. Who work hard.

Mr. TALBOTT. Work hard and render this Government substantial service, and it puts them in equality with other people who are getting like salaries. They go down to these gun shops; they are intelligent people, and they do all kinds of important work for the Government; and the Committee on Naval Affairs, after due consideration, unanimously came to the conclusion that these people were entitled to this 30 days' leave of absence.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALBOTT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. How much leave of absence do men in Washington get in the departments?

Mr. TALBOTT. I think they get 30 days' leave.

Mr. MANN. What does that mean—30 calendar days? Does not the law provide for 30 days' leave of absence?

Mr. BORLAND. I will say to the gentleman that the comptroller recently made a ruling that that meant 30 working days. The comptroller recently made a ruling, in reference to the Government Printing Office, that it meant 30 working days.

Mr. MANN. I am talking of men in the departments. I do not think the comptroller has made a ruling which means 30 working days. Men who work by the day get paid by the day and get 30 working days' leave of absence, but men who work by the month, as most of them do, get a month's leave of absence. That is what they get. Why would it not be perfectly fair to give these men 30 days' leave of absence?

Mr. TALBOTT. If the gentleman will offer an amendment to that effect.

Mr. MANN. Instead of 30 working days give them 30 days' leave of absence.

Mr. TALBOTT. If the gentleman will offer an amendment of that kind I will accept it.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to giving them 30 days' leave of absence.

Mr. TALBOTT. We will accept that.

Mr. COX. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do I understand the gentleman from Illinois will offer such an amendment?

Mr. MANN. Yes; to strike out the word "working," so that it will stand "30 days' leave of absence."

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand that the comptroller has construed "30 days" to mean 30 working days, so that these employees would be granted something like 35 or 36 days in a year for the vacation period.

Mr. TALBOTT. We have accepted the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not a question of accepting the amendment. It is a question as to the real purposes, as to the number of days to be granted to these employees. This would mean that we would grant the employees in our arsenals and navy yards a furlough with pay for one-eighth of the working days in the year.

Mr. DYER. Thirty days including Sundays.

Mr. STAFFORD. At the present time Federal employees in mechanical pursuits get something in the neighborhood of 18 days and two or three Sundays and holidays in addition.

Mr. TALBOTT. They have now 15 days, and they ought to have 15 days more. It is a unanimous report from the committee. I do not want to take up the time of the House in discussing it. We accept the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would the gentleman accept, after the word "granted," "not exceeding 30 days"?

Mr. KEATING. No. They want 30 days' leave of absence. They want to be placed on an exact equality with the clerks.

Mr. STAFFORD. The phraseology, then, would be that each and every employee of the navy yards, arsenals, and repair stations "are hereby granted not to exceed 30 days' leave of absence each year."

Mr. KEATING. They might be granted only five days' leave of absence under that.

Mr. DYER. The department might grant them only 10 days.

Mr. FARR. Or only two days.

Mr. HOWARD. That would be all they might get.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would the gentleman say "30 days, including Sundays"?

Mr. KEATING. Why not treat them exactly as the clerks are treated?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, there is a different rule between the clerks and these men in the arsenals and workshops. The reason why these clerks in the departments are granted 30 days' leave of absence is because there is not as much work in the departments at the time of their vacation period, and for humanitarian reasons they grant them a leave of absence when their work is not so pressing.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am willing to withdraw my objection to it.

Mr. TALBOTT. We are willing to accept the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand you are willing to accept the amendment to strike out the word "working"?

Mr. MANN. They have already accepted that an hour ago. [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman should not be so impatient. The intention is to grant these employees 30 days in a year?

Mr. TALBOTT. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] asks unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each and every employee of the navy yards, gun factories, naval stations, and arsenals of the United States Government is hereby granted 30 working days' leave of absence each year, without forfeiture of pay during such leave: *Provided,* That pro rata leave with pay shall be allowed to those serving fractional parts of a year: *And provided further,* That in all cases the heads of divisions shall have discretion as to the time when the leave can best be allowed.

With a committee amendment as follows:

On page 1, line 7, after the word "Provided," strike out the words "That pro rata leave with pay shall be allowed to those serving fractional parts of a year," and insert "That it shall be lawful to allow pro rata leave only to those serving 12 consecutive months or more."

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out, in line 5, the word "working."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Speaker, having myself introduced a bill granting 30 days' leave of absence to the several classes of employees named in the pending bill, it almost goes without saying that I am heartily in favor of this legislation. It is surprising to me that this just and proper action was not taken long ago and the unjust discrimination removed in the matter of leave of absence to these employees of our Military Establishments by placing them upon an equality with the 40,000 Government employees in the service here in Washington and elsewhere who are enjoying the benefits of 30 days' leave without forfeiture of pay. Why this discrimination should ever have existed, or why it should have been allowed to exist for so long a time, is more than I can understand. I suppose when the original leave of 15 days was allowed to the men who labor hard in our navy yards, naval stations, arsenals, and so forth, opposition was encountered from men who would save money to the Government at the cost of denying recreation to these artisans and laborers, and rather than lose all holidays these employees were content to take what they could get. There is no good reason now, if any ever existed, why we should not accord to the men, both skilled and unskilled, who work in Government establishments the same degree of consideration for their health, comfort, and happiness as is shown toward those who perform clerical services in the departmental service. This is a humanitarian proposition. These men literally earn what they get by the sweat of their brows. I know that the employees at the United States Naval Academy and at the Indianhead Proving Ground, in my district, perform hard, manual labor under hazardous conditions. They need and require respite for the period of at least 30 days in a year. To give them this rest from labor, with pay, conserves their physical and mental resources and produces a greater degree of efficiency, of which the Government will get the benefit.

I sincerely hope this bill, that will bring joy, renewed hope, and vigor into many homes, will pass this House and become law at this session.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

WAGES OF EMPLOYEES IN NAVY AND WAR DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the next bill (H. R. 9548), to regulate the wages of certain employees in or under the Navy and War Departments of the Government, be passed over without prejudice. It is the next bill on the calendar, No. 185.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY] asks unanimous consent that the next bill, Calendar No. 185, be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next one.

WOMAN'S TITANIC MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the resolution (H. J. Res. 104) granting permission to the Woman's Titanic Memorial Association to erect a memorial on public ground in the city of Washington, D. C.

The title of the resolution was read.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

The Clerk will report the next bill.

EXCLUSION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS FROM NATIONAL PARKS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 6814) to exclude intoxicating liquors from national parks and national forest reserves.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McDERMOTT. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The Clerk will report the next bill.

MOQUI AND NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATIONS, ARIZ.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 10115) authorizing the adjustment of the rights of settlers on the Moqui and Navajo Indian Reservations in the State of Arizona.

The title of the bill was read.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL AID TO INDIGENT TUBERCULOUS PERSONS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 11864) to provide Federal aid in caring for indigent tuberculous persons, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The Clerk will report the next one.

COPYRIGHTS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13981) to amend the copyright law.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the act of March 4, 1909, entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," be amended by adding thereto the following proviso:

Provided, however, That in the case of any work referred to in this section wherein copyright has been secured by publication of the work with notice of copyright which by reason of its character, bulk, fragility, or because of dangerous ingredients can not expediently be filed, the register of copyrights may determine that there shall be deposited in lieu of two complete copies of such work such identifying photographs or prints, together with such written or printed descriptions of the work as he shall find sufficient to identify it: *And provided further,* That in the case of motion-picture photoplays and motion pictures other than photoplays, whenever deposit has been made as required by the provisions of the act of Congress (Public, No. 303) approved August 24, 1912, and registration has been secured thereunder, such deposit and registration shall hereafter be held to be sufficient for all purposes, and copies of such photoplay or motion picture if it is later reproduced in copies for sale; and the provisions of the amendatory act of August 24, 1912, are hereby made to apply to motion-picture photoplays and motion pictures other than photoplays that have been reproduced in copies for sale or otherwise published."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 8, strike out the word "Numbered" and insert the word "Number."

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 2, line 10, after the word "nineteen" insert the word "hundred."

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 2, line 12, after the word "sufficient" strike out the words "for all purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANN: Page 2, strike out all after the word "Act," in line 8, down to and including the word "three," in line 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "entitled 'An act to amend sections 5, 11, and 25 of an act entitled 'An act to amend and consolidate the act respecting copyrights,' approved March 4, 1909.'"

Mr. MANN. That is to give a proper description of the act which they refer to in the bill as "Public, Numbered 303," which means nothing, because every Congress has a different series of numbers.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15316) to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is under consideration on Calendar Wednesday, and I think it should go off this calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. MANN. I object to its present consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The bill will be stricken from this calendar.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15522) to establish a national park service, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, those in charge of this bill have agreed to reduce these salaries somewhat. If they will offer such an amendment and will agree to do their best to hold the amount in conference as it passes the House, reducing the salary of the director to \$4,500, I shall not object.

Mr. LENROOT. It is my purpose to offer such an amendment.

Mr. COX. And I suppose the gentleman will hold that in conference if he can?

Mr. LENROOT. We will attempt to follow the wishes of the House, of course.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. KEATING. Reserving the right to object, I shall have to object to the present consideration of the bill—although I am very much in favor of the measure as a whole—unless some provision can be made by which isolated monuments which are entirely within the forest reserves may continue under the jurisdiction of the Agricultural Department.

Mr. LENROOT. It is my intention to offer an amendment to accomplish that very purpose. I shall offer an amendment striking out the words "and the Department of Agriculture," so as to leave the monuments within the national forests still within the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. KEATING. I withdraw my objection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman inform the House whether it was the purpose, under the proviso to section 3 on page 4, to permit the Secretary of the Interior to impose terms when he grants the privilege to graze live stock within any national park?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I wish gentlemen would speak a little louder, so we can hear them.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was inquiring of my colleague whether it was the purpose, under the phrase "under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe," to grant authority to the Secretary of the Interior to impose terms for the grazing privilege in national parks.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, yes.

Mr. KENT. The idea is this: A number of these parks have large areas where the grass goes to waste, and where it is beneficial to the park to have a certain amount of grazing. The intention is to put such areas as that, where the grazing would be no injury but a benefit, under such rules and regulations as are common to all the national forests.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the intention is to make a proper charge for the grazing privilege?

Mr. KENT. Oh, yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. And the phraseology "under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe" would cover the terms for the use of the privilege?

Mr. KENT. Oh, yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is another provision for one assistant director at \$2,500. What is the pressing need for that? We have not created assistant directors of other bureaus, and I can not see any urgent need for one in this case, though I realize that the director may for a good portion of the time be called away from his post of duty here in Washington.

Mr. LENROOT. That is the reason for it. There are 13 national parks, comprising over 4,000,000 acres of land. The director, in fact, will be absent from Washington during a very large portion of the time. That is not true of any other department of Government here at Washington. That is the reason in this case why we provide for an assistant director.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of an objection.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, the bill is on the Union Calendar, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read section 1 of the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created in the Department of the Interior a service to be called the national park service, which

shall be under the charge of a director, who shall be appointed by the Secretary and who shall receive a salary of \$5,000 per annum. There shall also be appointed by the Secretary the following assistants and other employees at the salaries designated: One assistant director, at \$2,500 per annum; one chief clerk, at \$2,000 per annum; one draftsman, at \$1,800 per annum; one messenger, at \$600 per annum; and, in addition thereto, such other employees as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem necessary: *Provided*, That not more than \$8,100 annually shall be expended for salaries of experts, assistants, and employees within the District of Columbia not herein specifically enumerated unless previously authorized by law. The service thus established shall promote and regulate the use of the Federal areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations hereinafter specified by such means and measures as conform to the fundamental purpose of the said parks, monuments, and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to section 1.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$4,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I have another amendment to section 1.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out the words "the Secretary of the Interior shall deem necessary" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Congress may from time to time provide for by appropriation or other act."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 20, strike the words "and the Department of Agriculture"; also on page 2, line 25, strike out the words "situated within or."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin what his idea is about this matter?

Mr. LENROOT. I will state frankly that I ought to have consulted the gentleman from Colorado, but the chairman of the committee consulted with me and found there was a considerable degree of objection to including national monuments within forest reserves.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If they are wholly within the reserve that might be true.

Mr. LENROOT. That is what this does.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Does it apply to monuments wholly within the forest reserve or partially within the forest reserve?

Mr. LENROOT. It applies to both cases. It permits cooperation of the Secretary of Agriculture with the Secretary of the Interior where the monument is contiguous to a forest reserve.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. How about monuments that are not connected at all with forest reserves?

Mr. LENROOT. They are left with the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The committee decided unanimously to put national monuments under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department. We want to have a systematic distribution of improvements and the expenditure of money under the service. If the monuments are left with the forest reserve, they may not be improved as rapidly or systematically in the way of roads and otherwise as if they were put under this park service and all of them provided for in an orderly way.

Mr. LENROOT. I consulted with various members of the committee; I did not consult with the gentleman from Colorado, but when it was learned that there was objection to the action of the committee in that respect, the members individually thought it wise to meet that objection by eliminating that feature from the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. As far as any one small monument is concerned entirely within the forest reserve, it is all right, but the general policy of a systematic control of improving the monuments as parks and places of amusement ought to be under the Interior Department, and the committee agreed to that proposition.

Mr. LENROOT. As far as any monument is concerned partially within a forest reserve, the President may by proclamation at any time take it out of the forest reserve, and it would then fall under the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman will permit me, I wish to say that the President has authority to transfer the jurisdiction of national monuments from one department to another. I sincerely hope his amendment will be adopted. I have given the matter some study.

Mr. MANN. These amendments were agreed upon in order to get the bill up.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; objection would have been made to the bill unless we agreed to make these amendments.

Mr. BORLAND. I would like to ask the gentleman who has charge of the bill if there is not a bill before the Public Lands Committee, or possibly on the calendar, making the Grand Canyon a national park instead of a monument.

Mr. HAYDEN. I can answer that question. The Secretary of the Interior prepared such a bill and gave it to me for introduction. I have not introduced it because of an objection by the Secretary of Agriculture who now has jurisdiction over the Grand Canyon National Monument. There is a disagreement between the two departments as to where the boundary lines should be. I have been informed, however, that the interested officials have practically agreed upon the limits of the proposed national park. As soon as a definite understanding is reached I shall introduce the bill, because I am heartily in favor of transferring the Grand Canyon to the jurisdiction of the Interior Department.

Mr. BORLAND. The Grand Canyon ought to be a national park, for it is adjacent to and surrounded by a national forest. The two ought to be separate. The Grand Canyon ought to be under the jurisdiction of the park department.

Mr. HAYDEN. I can say that everybody, not only the departments but the people throughout the country generally, are in favor of making the Grand Canyon a national park. You will remember, however, that when the last national park in Colorado was established there were serious disagreements, but finally an arrangement was made that was entirely satisfactory to the people of Colorado and to the department officials.

Mr. BORLAND. Then the gentleman thinks the bill is practically agreed upon and will soon be ready for passage?

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand so, except for some details.

Mr. KENT. Will the gentleman permit me to read a paragraph from Secretary Houston's report?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. KENT (reading)—

Unquestionably the Grand Canyon should be established as a national park and placed under the direct administration of the national park service. Such a plan and measure would meet with the department's earnest approval. In addition, the Mount Olympus national monument, which is the only other monument under the administration of this department embracing any considerable area, should be given careful consideration as a possible national park, and if not included in such park by congressional action should be restored to its original status as national forest land. If it should eventually be found desirable to transfer to the park service any of the other nine national monuments in the national forests, this may be accomplished at any time for any particular area by the issuance of a presidential proclamation vacating the national forest withdrawal in so far as it covered the national monument area. This would have the effect of transferring jurisdiction to the national park service.

Mr. BORLAND. There is no question about that, and I think it should be done.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I will state that I have taken this matter up with the governor of my State, with the State land commission, and the board of supervisors of the county wherein the Grand Canyon is located. I find that everyone is favorable to the creation of such a park, if its boundaries are properly limited. There has been some objection upon the part of persons who are now grazing live stock within the monument and the adjacent national forest, but I am sure that an arrangement can be made that will properly protect their interests, because the use of the adjacent range can in no way interfere with the scenic beauties of the canyon. I am also satisfied that the water power and mineral resources of the Grand Canyon can be made available for use without detracting from its grandeur in the slightest degree.

Mr. BORLAND. I am very glad that that is true.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Interior shall make and publish such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or proper for the use and management of the parks, monuments, and reservations under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, and any violations of any of the rules and regulations authorized by this act shall be punished as provided for in section 50 of the act entitled "An act to codify and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909, as amended by section 6 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 U. S. Stat. L., p. 857). He may also, upon terms and conditions to be fixed by him, sell or dispose of timber in those cases where in his judgment the cutting of such timber is required in order to control the attacks of insects or diseases or otherwise conserve the scenery or the natural or historic objects in any such park, monument, or reservation. He may also provide, in his discretion, for the destruction of such animals and of such plant life as may be detrimental to the use of any of said parks, monuments, or reservations. He may also grant privileges, leases, and permits for the use of land for the accommodation of visitors in the various parks, monuments, or other reservations herein provided for, but for periods not exceeding 20 years; and no natural curiosities, wonders, or objects of interest shall be leased, rented, or granted to anyone on such terms as to interfere with free access to

them by the public: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of the Interior may, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, grant the privilege to graze live stock within any national park, monument, or reservation herein referred to when in his judgment such use is not detrimental to the primary purpose for which such park, monument, or reservation was created.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 4, line 7, after the word "regulations" insert the words "and on such terms."

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

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it adds anything, but I have no objection to it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It is not necessary. They will regulate it enough.

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

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. The last proviso in section 3, down to and including line 12, answers practically all of the objections that have been made in regard to national parks, and in this bill in particular, that the parks, monuments, and reservations shall be used and live stock may be permitted to graze therein when it will not in any way interfere with the general park purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That nothing in this act contained shall affect or modify the provisions of the act approved February 15, 1901, entitled "An act relating to rights of way through certain parks, reservations, and other public lands."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, lines 13 and 14, strike out the words: "That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed: *Provided*."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

BERKSHIRE TROUT HATCHERY.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 218) authorizing the acceptance of the gift of the Berkshire trout hatchery, Berkshire County, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This resolution is on the Union Calendar.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the United States of America hereby accepts from Mrs. Mary E. Scully, as a memorial to her husband, title to the lands known and to be known as the Berkshire Trout Hatchery, located in Berkshire County, Mass., together with the buildings, ponds, and other improvements located thereon and the water and other rights pertaining thereto, and the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to receive from Mrs. Mary E. Scully a deed for the said property. The title to said property is accepted upon the terms and conditions prescribed by the donor, namely, that it shall be used by the United States Bureau of Fisheries, Department of Commerce, as a fish hatchery and for experimental work in fish culture.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BURKE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the House joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

FORT ASSINNIBOINE MILITARY RESERVATION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 3646) to amend the act of February 11, 1915 (38 Stat. L., 807), providing for the opening of the Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

RACE-GAMBLING BETS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15949) to prevent the nullification of State antigambling laws by international or interstate transmission of race-gambling bets or racing odds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COADY. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland objects, and the bill will be stricken from the calendar.

SHOSHONE TRIBE OF INDIANS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 489) authorizing the Shoshone Tribe of Indians, residing on the Wind River Reservation, in Wyoming, to submit claims to the Court of Claims.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

Mr. LOBECK. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a minute?

Mr. MANN. No; it is too late. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

LANDS FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15096) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, providing for the selection of lands for educational purposes in lieu of those appropriated," and to authorize an exchange of lands between the United States and the several States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FLANDREAU, S. DAK.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 14944) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make transfer on certain conditions of the south half of lot 14 of the southeast quarter of section 21, township 107, range 47, Moody County, S. Dak., to the city of Flandreau, to be used as a public playground.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FISH-CULTURAL STATIONS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill H. R. 15617, to establish fish-hatching and fish-cultural stations in the States of Alabama, Louisiana, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina or North Carolina, Maryland or Virginia, Oregon or Washington, Texas, Oklahoma, Illinois, Washington, Arizona, New Mexico, Michigan, Idaho, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Delaware or New Jersey, and Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the bill is stricken from the Calendar.

STANDARDS OF CLASSIFICATION FOR COTTON.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill H. R. 15913, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish uniform standards of classification for cotton; to provide for the application, enforcement, and use of such standards in transactions in interstate and foreign commerce, to prevent deception therein, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INTERSTATE USE OF AUTOMOBILES, ETC.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 208) to regulate the interstate use of automobiles and all self-propelled vehicles which use the public highways in interstate commerce.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COADY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman withdraw his objection?

Mr. COADY. I am sorry, but I can not accommodate the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. This is not debatable. The Clerk will report the next bill.

PUBLIC LANDS IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15156) granting public lands to the State of Oklahoma.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman from Colorado desires to have this bill passed over.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks that the bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13224) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when does this authority expire under the law? I do not happen to recall it at this second.

Mr. ALEXANDER. About the 1st of September; on the 2d of September, the report says.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] was giving some attention to this and was making some investigation of it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is of vital importance to our shipping interests to continue it if the war continues.

Mr. MANN. I do not think it is. I think perhaps there would be time—the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not here—

Mr. ALEXANDER. I hope the gentleman will not object. I want to get this off my mind.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is not here to-day, I think, did not know this bill would be reached to-day. Of course this is not the usual unanimous-consent day. I do not like to stand in the way—

Mr. ALEXANDER. Well, of course I think the bureau ought to be extended, in view of the conditions in Europe at this time; but the only concern I have is that it may become a law before Congress adjourns.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question may be submitted to the House on the bill H. R. 13224 next Wednesday right after the reading of the Journal as to whether there is objection to the consideration of the bill or not.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is all right; I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. What was the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MANN. That on next Wednesday, after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table, the Speaker shall submit to the House the question whether there is objection to the immediate consideration of H. R. 13224, the war-risk insurance bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that next Wednesday, after the reading of the Journal, and so forth, that the Chair submit to the House a unanimous-consent request to take up the war-risk insurance bill referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman, Will that take any considerable portion of the time of the House that day if there is no objection?

Mr. MANN. Well, I should say it would not take any time at all whether it is objected to or not.

Mr. DYER. The McGhillcuddy bill—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken in that; the McGhillcuddy bill is not up on Wednesday. Yesterday was next Wednesday in the House.

Mr. DYER. I have no objection.

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

CLASSIFICATION OF SALARIES, VETERINARY INSPECTORS, ETC.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 16060) providing for the classification of salaries

of veterinary inspectors and lay inspectors (grades 1 and 2) employed in the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

THE VIRUS, SERUM, AND TOXIN.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15914) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to license establishments for and to regulate the preparation of viruses, serums, toxins, and analogous products for use in the treatment of domestic animals, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the bill passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks to have the bill passed without prejudice. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

HOURS OF SERVICE FOR RAILROAD EMPLOYEES.

The next business on the calendar for unanimous consent was the bill (H. R. 9216) to amend sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of an act entitled, "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

LANDS WITHIN CRATER NATIONAL PARK.

The next business on the calendar for unanimous consent was the bill (H. R. 14868) to accept the cession by the State of Oregon of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Crater National Park, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, approved January 25, 1915, ceding to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the territory embraced within the Crater Lake National Park, are hereby accepted and sole and exclusive jurisdiction is hereby assumed by the United States over such territory, saving, however, to the said State the right to serve civil or criminal process within the limits of the aforesaid park in suits or prosecution for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed in said State but outside of said park, and saving further to the said State the right to tax persons and corporations, their franchises and property, on the lands included in said park. All the laws applicable to places under the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the United States shall have force and effect in said park. All fugitives from justice taking refuge in said park shall be subject to the same laws as refugees from justice found in the State of Oregon.

SEC. 2. That said park shall constitute a part of the United States judicial district for Oregon, and the district court of the United States in and for Oregon shall have jurisdiction of all offenses committed within said boundaries.

SEC. 3. That if any offense shall be committed in the Crater Lake National Park, which offense is not prohibited or the punishment for which is not specifically provided for by any law of the United States, the offender shall be subject to the same punishment as the laws of the State of Oregon in force at the time of the commission of the offense may provide for a like offense in said State; and no subsequent repeal of any such law of the State of Oregon shall affect any prosecution for said offense committed within said park.

SEC. 4. That all hunting or the killing, wounding, or capturing at any time of any wild bird or animal, except dangerous animals when it is necessary to prevent them from destroying human lives or inflicting injury, is prohibited within the limits of said park; nor shall any fish be taken out of the waters of the park in any other way than by hook and line, and then only at such seasons and in such times and manner as may be directed by the Secretary of the Interior. That the Secretary of the Interior shall make and publish such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and proper for the management and care of the park and for the protection of the property therein, especially for the preservation from injury or spoliation of all timber, mineral deposits other than those legally located prior to the passage of this act, natural curiosities, or wonderful objects within said park, and for the protection of the animals and birds in the park from capture or destruction, and to prevent their being frightened or driven from the park; and he shall make rules and regulations governing the taking of fish from the streams or lakes in the park. Possession within said park of the dead bodies, or any part thereof, of any wild bird or animal shall be prima facie evidence that the person or persons having the same are guilty of violating this act. Any person or persons, or stage or express company, or railway company, who knows or has reason to believe that they were taken or killed contrary to the provisions of this act and who receives for transportation any of said animals, birds,

or fish so killed, caught, or taken, or who shall violate any of the other provisions of this act or any rule or regulation that may be promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior with reference to the management and care of the park or for the protection of the property therein, for the preservation from injury or spoliation of timber, mineral deposits other than those legally located prior to the passage of this act, natural curiosities, or wonderful objects within said park, or for the protection of the animals, birds, or fish in the park, or who shall within said park commit any damage, injury, or spoliation to or upon any building, fence, hedge, gate, guidepost, tree, wood, underwood, timber, garden crops, vegetables, plants, land, springs, mineral deposits other than those legally located prior to the passage of this act, natural curiosities, or other matter or thing growing or being thereon or situate therein, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$500 or imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both, and be adjudged to pay all costs of the proceedings.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAKER. Is this bill open to amendment now?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. I want to offer an amendment at the end of section 4; I think that is an oversight.

The SPEAKER. Send the amendment up.

Mr. RAKER. Page 4, line 19, strike out at the end of the line the words "and be," and all of line 20. The provision stricken out is as follows:

And be adjudged to pay all costs of the proceedings.

I wish the Clerk would report it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, lines 19 and 20, strike out the following language, beginning after the word "both," in line 19, "and be adjudged to pay all costs of the proceedings."

Mr. MANN. It has been in all these other bills. Do not the costs follow the convictions always?

Mr. RAKER. That is what I wanted to find out. The committee has spent a good deal of time on the other bills that went through, but somehow or other this has not been called to our attention.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will look at the report of the Secretary of the Interior he will find that the Secretary reports that the provisions of this bill are identical, except as to the necessary changes of the name, with the Crater Lake and Mount Rainier bills.

Mr. MANN. I think it would be the case, regardless of putting it in this bill.

Mr. RAKER. If that is the case in the other bills, I shall not object.

Mr. LENROOT. It is now the same as in the law with respect to Glacier National Park.

Mr. MANN. It was in the bill that we passed the other day.

Mr. RAKER. By unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I ask to withdraw the proposed amendment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman withdraw his amendment?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That all guns, traps, teams, horses, or means of transportation of every nature or description used by any person or persons within said park limits when engaged in killing, trapping, ensnaring, or capturing such wild beasts, birds, or animals shall be forfeited to the United States and may be seized by the officers in said park and held pending the prosecution of any person or persons arrested under charge of violating the provisions of this act, and upon conviction under this act of such person or persons using said guns, traps, teams, horses, or other means of transportation, such forfeiture shall be adjudicated as a penalty in addition to the other punishment provided in this act. Such forfeited property shall be disposed of and accounted for by and under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] whether the language of this section is identical with the language of the similar section in the Yosemite Park bill, if he knows. I want particularly to call his attention to the word "shall," in line 25, page 4. The language is the same as the language in the case of the Glacier National Park bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; and the Mount Rainier bill.

Mr. MONDELL. I am not sure that is the same as the language in the Yellowstone Park bill. It seems rather drastic. It provides that all teams, horses, means of transportation, guns, and traps shall be forfeited on conviction.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It seems to me that is unnecessarily drastic. But we do not know anything about the comparison with the Yellowstone National Park bill. It seems that the guns and traps should be confiscated, but a man's horses and wagons should not be confiscated unnecessarily.

Mr. MANN. It would only happen where a man deliberately goes in for that purpose.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. I think the Yellowstone Park bill is prior to the Mount Rainier and Glacier Park bills. Those two bills were the first ones, and this is intended to follow those two bills. The committee and the various departments have gone over it fully.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move, in line 17, page 4, to strike out the word "situation" and insert the word "situated."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. That all process issued by the commissioner shall be directed to the marshal of the United States for Oregon, but nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to prevent the arrest by any officer or employee of the Government or any person employed by the United States in the policing of said reservation within said boundaries without process of any person taken in the act of violating the law or this act or the regulations prescribed by said Secretary as aforesaid.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend, page 6, line 25, by inserting, before the word "Oregon," the words "the district of."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 25, at the beginning of the line, insert the words "the district of."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That the commissioner provided for in this act shall be paid an annual salary of \$1,500, payable quarterly: *Provided*, That the said commissioner shall reside within the exterior boundaries of said Crater Lake National Park, at a place to be designated by the court making such appointment: *Provided further*, That all fees, costs, and expenses collected by the commissioner shall be disposed of as provided in sections 11 and 12 of this act.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is now being read for amendment. There are two amendments in section 9. By the way, I think we did not agree to the committee amendment in section 4.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 3, line 2, by striking out the word "personal."

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 7, line 14, by striking out the word "sections" and inserting the word "section."

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 7, line 14, by striking out the words "and twelve."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with and concluded the reading of the bill.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

BRIDGE ACROSS FLINT RIVER, GA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 16287) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Sumter, or to the county of Dooly, both of the State of Georgia, acting jointly or separately, and their successors and assigns, to construct a bridge across the Flint River.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the county of Sumter, or to the county of Dooly, both of the State of Georgia, acting jointly or separately, and their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Flint River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Murrays Ferry, Ga., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

UNCOMPAGHRE INDIAN RESERVATION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 43) in relation to the location, entry, and patenting of lands within the former Uncompahgre Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, containing gilsonite or other like substances, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The bill will be stricken from the calendar.

Mr. HOWELL. Will the gentleman allow it to be passed without prejudice?

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to passing it without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent to pass over the bill without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SIoux TRIBE OF INDIANS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 4371) authorizing the Sioux Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

Mr. GANDY. Has the gentleman any objection to letting the bill go over without prejudice?

Mr. MANN. I do not think so.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from South Dakota any request to make?

Mr. GANDY. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GANDY. The next bill on the calendar, numbered 282 (H. R. 10774), is identical, being the corresponding House bill. I make the same request as to that.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will be passed without prejudice.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER, KANSAS CITY, MO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 16097) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Missouri River near Kansas City, Mo., authorized by an act approved June 17, 1914.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by the act of Congress approved June 17, 1914, to be built across the Missouri River near Kansas City is hereby extended to one year and three years, respectively, from the 17th day of June, 1916.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

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

PUBLIC LANDS FOR PARK PURPOSES, GUNNISON, COLO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 20) authorizing the county of Gunnison, Colo., to purchase certain public lands for public-park purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the county of Gunnison, Colo., is hereby authorized for a period of five years and after the passage of this act to purchase, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to convey to said county for public park purposes, for the use and benefit of said county, the following-described lands, or so much thereof as the said county may desire, to wit: The southeast quarter of southwest quarter, section 11, the east half of the northwest quarter, the southwest quarter, and the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 14; the west half of the northeast quarter, the northwest quarter, the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter, the west half of the southeast quarter, and the southwest quarter of section 23; and the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter, the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter and west half of the southeast quarter of section 22, all in township 48 north, range 5 west, New Mexico principal meridian, in Gunnison County, containing 1,000 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. That the said conveyance shall be made of the said lands to the said county by the Secretary of the Interior upon the payment by said county for the said land, or such portions thereof as they may select, at the rate of \$1.25 per acre, and patent issued to said county for the said land selected to have and to hold for public park purposes, subject to the existing laws and regulations concerning public parks, and that the grant hereby made shall not include any lands which at the date of the issuance of patent shall be covered by a valid, existing, bona fide right or claim initiated under the laws of the United States: *Provided*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all oil, coal, and other mineral deposits that may be found in the land so granted, and all necessary use of the land for extracting the same: *And provided further*, That said county shall not have the right to sell or convey the land herein granted, or any part thereof, or to devote the same to any other purpose than as hereinbefore described; and that if the said land shall not be used as a public park, the same, or such parts thereof not so used, shall revert to the United States.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "years," insert the word "from."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the next committee amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "patent," insert the word "be."

Mr. MANN. That certainly does not improve the language any, notwithstanding the department recommended it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think the gentleman is right; but the department recommends it, and the committee thinks it does not hurt anything to put it in.

Mr. MANN. Some clerk up there who did not understand grammar recommended it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think that is correct.

Mr. MANN. If you want to deface your bill by agreeing to the amendment, I shall not object. It was properly drawn by the gentleman in the first instance.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The gentleman thinks it ought not to be agreed to?

Mr. MANN. I think it ought not to be inserted in the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I ask that the House disagree to the amendment.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

In lines 15 and 16, strike out the words "subject to the existing laws and regulations concerning public parks."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend line 17 by striking out the words "and that" and insert the word "but."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 2, line 17, by striking out the words "and that" and inserting the word "but."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I accept the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

BRIDGE ACROSS BLACK RIVER, BENNETTS FERRY, ARK.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 16068) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a wagon bridge across the Black River at or near Bennetts Ferry, Ark.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the county of Clay, in the State of Arkansas, be, and it is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Black River at or near Bennetts Ferry at a place where the public highway leading from Corning to Piggott crosses said river, and at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, in line 7, strike out the word "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

By unanimous consent, the title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Black River at or near Bennetts Ferry, Ark."

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

COAL LANDS, KAYCEE, WYO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 3986) granting certain coal lands to the town of Kaycee, Wyo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, what does the gentleman expect to do with this bill?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will state very frankly to the gentleman—

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not wish to have a derivation of the words "Kay Cee," but what is the purpose of the bill under consideration?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The town of Kaycee, Wyo., as I understand it, desires to either purchase or lease 40 acres of coal land for the use of the inhabitants of the town. It is a long ways from a railroad, an interior place, and they desire to lease or buy this tract of land.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; certainly.

Mr. MANN. There was at one time a very celebrated man and horse in the State of the gentleman from Wisconsin called K. I. C. I wanted to know whether they stole that name from him.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, the gentleman from Illinois is not a good sport. That horse was J. I. C.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was a horse bearing the initials of the famous J. I. Case.

Mr. MONDELL. For the gentleman's information, I will state if he will yield—

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman who is an authority on Celtic names.

Mr. MONDELL. A citizen of my native State of Missouri years ago, wandering northwest in search of a better country, established a ranch and used as his brand the letters K. C. In the course of time a small village grew up at the ranch and the letters Kay Cee were written as written in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was there any trade-mark on it?

Mr. MONDELL. No; no trade-mark as far as I know.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object to the bill, I want some information in regard to it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman permit an additional statement on my part?

Mr. MANN. Gladly.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will say that so far as the city of Grand Junction, Colo., is concerned, I have had a bill here for a number of years authorizing the city of Grand Junction to open a municipal coal mine. That city is situated near a large coal belt, and there is one tract especially advantageous for the use of the town. The coal companies have been more or less practicing extortion on the inhabitants of the city for many years. It is a city which is operated under a commission form of government. It desires to open up a coal mine of its own and see if they can not work it economically and advantageously.

In view of the fact that the committee has several times favorably reported the bill, I was authorized to add this provision to the Wyoming bill that has already passed the Senate, and I feel that it is along the line of wise and beneficial

conservation and the economical use of the coal, especially when the city is in the midst of coal land, it would look as though the inhabitants of the town should have a right to relieve themselves from unnecessary expense. I can not see how anyone can object to this bill, and I hope the gentleman will not object to the Wyoming bill or the Grand Junction provision which is an amendment to the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I have always been in favor of public utilities owned by a municipality. I think it is a wise thing for cities to own their waterworks, but it is perfectly evident, I think, to everyone that a municipality or Government and private parties can not compete in furnishing the same thing. If the municipality or Government is to do a thing, it is inevitable that it must have exclusive control. You can not have the private individual or corporation successfully compete with the governmental agency, because they will not permit it.

Here is a proposition at the very start that where private parties want to furnish coal they have to pay the Government for it. But when you let the municipality do it you give it to them for nothing. If you are going to do a thing of that sort, it means in the end that you are going to endeavor to put out of business those engaged in it privately, and have the governmental agency do that business. If you undertake that policy, you have to consider whether you will discriminate in favor of the municipality that gets coal as against one that can not get coal or own a coal mine close by.

It is a very intricate and very important subject. I do not believe that we ought to enter into it without knowing what we are doing. I know that in the bill we recently passed we undertook to discriminate in favor of the municipalities owning coal mines. I also know that that bill has not yet passed.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. And probably will not.

Mr. MANN. My recollection is, although I may be mistaken, that certain gentlemen occupying very distinguished positions in various States around Colorado, and possibly including Colorado, have not been fretting themselves into a fury in an effort to get the bill passed.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think the gentleman's surmise is correct.

Mr. MANN. My friend from Colorado did not vote for it when it was in the House.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I did not vote for a general law for the Government to lease everything that we have in our western country; of course not.

Mr. MANN. I am not criticizing the gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman permit another suggestion?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I want to say that the very reason that the gentleman from Illinois gives, namely, that the municipality can not compete in cost of production with the coal company, is the reason that the land is to be leased to them without a royalty, because if we compelled the municipality to pay the same price as a private company pays for the coal land, of course they could not compete at all, in most cases.

But my thought about this coal land and water power for municipalities free of royalty is that the mere possibility of competition will be sufficient to beneficially reduce the charges for coal to these various municipalities on the public domain in the West. My idea is that if a city adjoins a hundred thousand acres of coal land, and can mine coal at a dollar and a half or \$2 a ton, where it is now being charged \$6 a ton, it is no discrimination to a city 100 miles away that would have to pay for it anyway. I can not see any reason why a city advantageously located like that should not have cheaper coal for its inhabitants if it can get it.

Mr. MANN. I do not know what they charge for coal in the district represented by my colleague Mr. FOSTER—in fact, I am not sure that they have coal mines in his district.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes.

Mr. MANN. But all over the State of Illinois I am sure that you can buy coal at the mines for \$1.25 or \$1.50 a ton.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. You can not in many places in Colorado.

Mr. MANN. You can wherever a private individual is permitted to open a coal mine.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. In many places the coal companies will not sell you coal at the mines; moreover, the inhabitants of a city can not go to a coal mine off several miles and buy coal.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; they will.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not think the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co. will sell coal at the mine by retail at \$1.25 or \$1.50 a ton or at all.

Mr. MANN. That may be.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope the gentleman does not quote the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co. as an example of what other coal companies in the country do. I think they are a law unto themselves; at least they have been up to within a very short time since in the State of Colorado.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I am simply trying to prevent extortion by coal companies and to let one town which has an abundance of coal land near it have a municipal coal mine. It seems to me there can be no higher or better use of that coal than that. If the coal companies are not charging more than they should, they can not be hurt by this bill.

Mr. MANN. I suppose it is possible that the people in these towns may put themselves under the pleasure of reading what the gentleman says and the burden of reading what I say about this; but if they want to get this permission, I would suggest to those gentlemen that they use their influence to get the general leasing bill enacted into law.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, well, the gentleman would have them swallow Federal bureaucracy, with all its evils, and surrender our State's birthright to get a little cheaper coal.

Mr. MANN. They do not swallow anything. It does not hurt them. They want it for themselves, but they do not want it for anyone else.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Millions of acres of Government coal land are lying idle. We want all the people to be given an opportunity to obtain fuel at a fair price and not be held up. If they could buy coal as they ought to be able to, I would not ask for this kind of legislation.

Mr. MADDEN. I suppose they might influence the gentleman to vote for the general leasing law.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No. I would not correctly represent the sentiment of my district if I voted for the general leasing bill on everything we have out there, and put all our resources on a Federal royalty basis. It is not, in my judgment, fair or just or reasonable to ask us to accept or burden our country with that kind of a proposition.

Mr. MADDEN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that no person could buy coal at the mines in his State?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh! They might at some of the mines.

Mr. MADDEN. Unquestionably anywhere else in the United States they can do it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. This bill is intended to obviate this very condition. To bring about a situation whereby the people can get coal at what is a fair price, considering the cost of production.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the matter with the State laws of the State of Colorado that you can not do that?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. You can not regulate everything by State laws.

Mr. MADDEN. Anybody can buy coal at the mines if they want more than a ton—if they want a carload.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If the coal companies charge you \$6 a ton for it, it does not do you any good.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman knows that they do not charge any such price as that.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. They charge twice what they ought to.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does the gentleman say that the consumers of coal in a city adjacent to a coal mine can not get the coal for that community from this coal mine near by?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. They can not get it without paying what the companies that produced the coal charge for it, and what they believe to be at least twice what they could mine it for themselves.

Mr. MADDEN. What could they mine it for?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. They think they can mine it and sell it for about \$3 a ton.

Mr. MADDEN. How do they know what they can mine it for?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The coal company pays only about 75 cents a ton to mine it, and it would not cost much to haul it into town.

Mr. MADDEN. How much does it cost the coal companies to mine it?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. In many cases I understand it is from 75 cents to a dollar a ton.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, you can not mine it for that. They might pay that to the labor, but there is a charge other than the amount paid to the miner.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I understand, but at the same time there is no reason why they should charge \$6 a ton for it. This town had to pay \$6,000 for coal at one time several years ago, and they have been appealing to me five or six years to pass this bill and relieve that situation.

Mr. COX. What is the population of the town?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. About 8,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I trust the gentleman will not object to this bill.

Mr. MANN. Well, if the gentleman wants to make a demand for the regular order I will make a point of no quorum. The gentleman wants unanimous consent for something for himself; that is the only way the gentleman can get up his bill. I think we ought to know—

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I hope in the interest of these towns the gentleman will not object, because it is certainly beneficial to both, and we have adopted this policy in the House in the general leasing bill and why should not we be consistent?

Mr. MANN. Oh, we have not adopted this policy in the House.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; we passed the general leasing bill providing all cities, municipalities, and so forth, shall have coal mines free of royalty.

Mr. MANN. That is true; and the gentlemen was opposed to it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; but I was not opposed to that provision. In fact, that provision allowing towns to mine coal free was my own amendment to the bill.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not my colleague think the gentleman from Colorado ought to be encouraged a little bit in his ideas of conservation?

Mr. MADDEN. I think the gentleman from Colorado ought to be consistent. He ought not to be opposed to a measure which gives the very privilege he seeks here and then come in and ask for an exception to be made to a rule which he helped to make himself.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I was the author of that provision in both the coal-leasing bill and the water-power-leasing bill, allowing cities and towns to have both without paying royalties.

Mr. MADDEN. But the gentleman voted against the provision of which he was the author.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; I voted against the whole bill. The bill contained a hundred things besides that.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman certainly was not very consistent.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If there had been nothing else in the bill but that, I would have certainly voted for it. If the bill was going to pass, as I knew it would, I wanted to get at least one good feature injected into it.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman voted against the bill, and then he comes in here and asks the same thing to be done to a town in his State.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not see anything inconsistent. I am in favor of all cities and towns having the freest possible right to mine and sell coal as cheaply as possible to its inhabitants. I see nothing wrong or inconsistent in that.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the gentleman is proud of his consistency in being inconsistent.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think the chances are that the city will never be required to open this mine at all. I think when this bill is passed the coal companies will promptly drop the price of coal about \$3 a ton. I think that is what it amounts to.

Mr. MADDEN. I think if the gentleman is refused the privilege of having this law passed, the House will be doing a great favor to the community it is presumed to be trying to favor, because when they undertake to mine coal, if they get the privilege, they will discover it will cost twice as much as they pay now, and then they will be taxing the poor men who have little homes on the outskirts of the town to pay the losses.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, no; the people of Grand Junction are willing to take chances on that.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman might think so in Illinois, but not in Colorado.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Both gentlemen from Illinois object.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentlemen allow the bill to remain on the calendar?

Mr. MADDEN. I have no objection to the bill remaining on the calendar, but I would like to be here when it is called up again.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object to the bill being passed without prejudice?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

H. SNOWDEN MARSHALL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter from the Sergeant at Arms.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 26, 1916.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, United States:

Pursuant to the command of the warrant of the House of Representatives, signed by the Speaker of the House and dated the 22d day of June, 1916, I arrested H. Snowden Marshall at the city of New York on the 26th day of June, 1916, and immediately after said arrest I was served with a writ of habeas corpus, issued by the Hon. Augustus N. Hand, one of the justices of the District Court of the United States for the Southern district of New York, requiring me to produce the body of the said H. Snowden Marshall before said court, and the said justice made a direction upon said writ that, pending the said habeas corpus proceedings, the said H. Snowden Marshall should be at liberty to go upon his own recognizance.

Thereupon I produced the said H. Snowden Marshall before Mr. Justice Hand, sitting in the said district court, and made a return to the said writ, whereupon further proceedings on said writ and the hearing in the said habeas corpus matter were adjourned by the said court to the 30th day of June, 1916, at 9.30 o'clock a. m., and the justice of the court directed that the said H. Snowden Marshall be permitted to go on his own recognizance to appear in said court at the time last above mentioned.

Respectfully submitted.

R. B. GORDON,
Sergeant at Arms, House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Ordered filed.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAKER. Should not that communication from the Sergeant at Arms be printed in the RECORD, instead of being filed?

Mr. MANN. It will be printed, having been read.

Mr. RAKER. But the Speaker said it was simply to be filed.

The SPEAKER. That is the only order for the Chair to make, because, being read, it goes in the RECORD anyway.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

H. R. 7617. An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes;

H. R. 14484. An act 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;

H. R. 12362. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Dallas & Southwestern Motorway Co. to construct a bridge across the Brazos River, in the State of Texas;

H. R. 15347. An act to amend existing laws relating to the use of alcohol, free of tax, by scientific institutions or colleges of learning;

H. R. 7256. An act providing for the refund of duties collected on certain tobacco cuttings;

H. R. 12954. An act for the establishment of Northport, Chopaka, and Laurier, in the State of Washington, as ports of entry for immediate transportation without appraisement of dutiable merchandise;

H. R. 14303. An act 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; and

H. R. 13715. An act granting the consent of Congress to C. M. Simpson, Z. T. Hedges, J. C. Hackney, and Mark Brown to construct a bridge across Bayou Bartholomew, Ashley County, Ark.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

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

S. 6068. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to cancel and remit a certain income tax assessed against Charles L. Freer, of Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Claims.

BRIDGE ACROSS SAVANNAH RIVER.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 16641) granting the consent of Congress to Julian B. McCurry, A. G. McCurry, P. W. Walton, and J. J. Fretwell to construct a bridge across the Savannah River. This is a bridge bill that did not reach

the Unanimous Consent Calendar in time. It is very important, and I ask unanimous consent that it be called.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 16641, Calendar No. 291, a bridge bill, which was not put on the calendar three days in advance. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Let it be reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to Julian B. McCurry and A. G. McCurry, of Hartwell, Ga.; P. W. Walton, of Madison, Ga.; and J. T. Fretwell, of Anderson, S. C., and their successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Savannah River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near McDonalds Shoals, between McDonalds Shoals and Hanks Ferry, in the county of Hart, State of Georgia, on the west, and the county of Anderson, State of South Carolina, on the east, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Amend, page 1, line 5, by striking out "J. T. Fretwell" and inserting "J. J. Fretwell."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended in accordance with the text.

There was no objection.

ISSUANCE OF LAND PATENTS TO MYTON AND DUCHESNE, UTAH.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the request of the Senate for the appointment of conferees on Senate bills 35 and 36 be granted, and I ask that the conferees whose names I send to the desk be reported to the House.

Mr. MANN. The bills will have to be laid before the House first.

The SPEAKER. Of course. What is the number of the bills?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Senate No. 35 and Senate No. 36.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 35) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to the town of Myton, Utah.

A bill (S. 36) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to the town of Duchesne, Utah.

Mr. MANN. What are the Senate amendments?

Mr. MAYS. They are House amendments. The amendments were offered in the House and the Senate refused to concur.

Mr. MANN. Did the amendments provide that they should pay \$1.25 an acre?

Mr. MAYS. That is one of the amendments.

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman if the amendments go out in conference there will be no more bills of that kind passed by the House by unanimous consent while I am here.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The gentleman will give the conferees credit for the action they have taken.

Mr. MANN. I should think the Senate took action without consultation with the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] asks that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, Mr. FERRIS, and Mr. LENROOT.

STATE ANTIGAMBLING LAWS.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 15949) to prevent the nullification of State antigambling laws by international or interstate transmission of race gambling bets or racing odds.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that there is no quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] moves that the House do now adjourn. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order previously made, until Wednesday, July 5, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication of the Secretary of State submitting an urgent estimate of appropriation for the relief and transportation of destitute American citizens in Mexico (H. Doc. No. 1271); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of War submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations required for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, for fortifications, Panama Canal (H. Doc. No. 1272); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of War submitting additional estimates of deficiencies required by the War Department for the service of the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1273); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and a joint resolution were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BEAKES, from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6915) granting indefinite leaves of absence to superannuated employees of the Postal Service, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 907), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LONDON, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 250) to provide for the appointment of a commission to prepare and recommend a plan for the establishment of a national insurance fund and for the mitigation of the evil of unemployment, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 914), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16380) granting the consent of Congress to the board of supervisors of Highland Township, Pennington County, Minn., to construct a bridge across Red Lake River, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 908), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOREMUS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 6242) authorizing the counties of Nassau, Fla., and Charlton, Ga., to construct a bridge across the St. Marys River between Florida and Georgia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 909), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PARKER of New York, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16554) to extend the time of the Hudson River Connecting Railroad Corporation for the commencement and completion of its bridge across the Hudson River in the State of New York, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 910), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16185) to give the consent of the Congress to the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River near and above the city of New Orleans, La., and for other purposes, reported the same with

amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 911), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DEWALT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16534) to authorize the commissioners of Lycoming County, Pa., their successors in office, to construct a bridge across the West Branch of the Susquehanna River from the foot of Arch Street, in the city of Williamsport, Lycoming County, Pa., to the borough of Duboistown, Lycoming County, Pa., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 912), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16604) to authorize the commissioners of Lycoming County, Pa., and their successors in office, to construct a bridge across the west branch of the Susquehanna River from the borough of Montgomery, Lycoming County, Pa., to Muncy Creek Township, Lycoming County, Pa., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 916), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MONTAGUE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15736) to provide for aviation in the Coast Guard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 917), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. MILLER of Delaware, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3296) for the relief of Gertrude Becherer, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 913), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE.

Under clause 4 of Rule XXVII, motion to discharge committee was filed as follows:

By Mr. GORDON: To discharge the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4713) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the United States Marine Hospital reservation in Cleveland, Ohio.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 16763) to increase the revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESHNER: A bill (H. R. 16764) to authorize the commissioners of Northumberland and Union Counties, in Pennsylvania, their successors in office, to construct a bridge across the West Branch of the Susquehanna River from the borough of Watsontown, Northumberland County, Pa., to White Deer Township, Union County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 16765) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Waynesburg Park Association, Waynesburg, Greene County, Pa., two bronze cannon or field-pieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 16766) to further amend an act to amend an act to amend section 4400, title 52, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, concerning the regulations of steam vessels, approved August 2, 1882, and also to amend section 4414, title 52, of the Revised Statutes, "Regulation of steam vessels," approved March 1, 1895; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 16767) for relief from forfeiture to purchasers of the unallotted lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 16768) to provide for the establishment of a military post or permanent mobilization camp at Camp Stafford, Alexandria, La.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KITCHIN: Resolution (H. Res. 289) for the consideration of H. R. 16763; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: Resolution (H. Res. 290) for a reprint of the soil survey of the New Orleans area, Louisiana; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 16769) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Kiger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 16770) for the relief of the estate of John H. Piatt, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 16771) for the relief of the Knight Motor Co., a corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 16772) granting an increase of pension to Mary Lahey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 16773) granting an increase of pension to George N. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESHNER: A bill (H. R. 16774) granting a pension to Sarah E. Burns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16775) granting a pension to Emma Crewitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 16776) for the relief of W. K. Ellis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOONEY: A bill (H. R. 16777) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Devol; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 16778) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Donnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 16779) for the enrollment of A. O. Mallory and others as citizens by blood of the Choctaw Nation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STOUT: A bill (H. R. 16780) to validate the homestead entries of Anna W. Thrailkill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 16781) granting an increase of pension to W. K. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 16782) granting an increase of pension to Albert Lincoln; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 16783) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16784) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Paul; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16785) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Dragoo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16786) granting an increase of pension to Bernard Hardy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 16787) granting a pension to James G. Whalin; to the Committee on Pensions.

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): Memorial of committees representing men in engine and train service on the Frisco Railroad, relative to eight hours of work; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of Mary B. West, vice president National Probation Association of Memphis, Tenn., indorsing Senate bill 1092 and House bill 42; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. J. Malcolm Forbes, executive board Massachusetts Branch of Women's Peace Party of Boston, in re ultimatums; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARR: Memorial of Industrial Board of the Department of Labor and Industry, Harrisburg, Pa., favoring House bill 16207, relative to creation of a woman's division in the Federal Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of the Friday Morning Club of Los Angeles, Cal., and M. M. Starr and 12 others, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring freedom of the press and opposing House bill 13778; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of S. W. Mudd and 15 others, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring Senate concurrent resolution 12; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of State Board of Equalization and County Auditors' Association of California; Board of Supervisors, Alameda, San Mateo, Contra Costa, Monterey, and Ventura Counties, Cal., protesting against Federal inheritance tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, July 3, 1916.

(Legislative day of Friday, June 30, 1916.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12717) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, there are only half a dozen Members present, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Gore	Overman	Smoot
Brady	Gronna	Page	Sutherland
Brandegge	Husting	Pittman	Swanson
Broussard	James	Polindexter	Taggart
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	Pomerene	Thomas
Catron	Johnson, S. Dak.	Ransdell	Thompson
Chamberlain	Jones	Reed	Vardaman
Clapp	Kenyon	Saulsbury	Walsh
Clark, Wyo.	Kern	Shafroth	Warren
Cuberson	La Follette	Sheppard	Weeks
Cummins	Lane	Sherman	Williams
Fletcher	McLean	Simmons	Works

Mr. WALSH. I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. MYERS] is absent on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I was requested to announce the absence of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON], who is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

The pending amendments are the amendments offered by the committee to part B of the bill.

Mr. GORE. I desire to revert now to the first amendment passed over and to take up the amendments passed over in the order in which they were passed over. I will say that I desire to dispose of the amendments to the bill as an appropriation bill before considering amendments that are so-called riders.

Mr. REED. I did not hear the statement.

Mr. GORE. I was suggesting that I desire to consider the several amendments passed over for further consideration, and I wish to consider all the amendments pending to the bill as an appropriation bill properly before proceeding to the consideration of the amendments which are so-called riders.

Mr. PITTMAN. In view of the statement made by the chairman of the committee, I suggest that on Saturday we reached the amendment on page 14. In view of the notice given by the chairman, I call his attention to the fact that the first amendment passed over and not disposed of is the committee amendment on page 14 and the amendment I offered to it.

Mr. GORE. I will say that I referred to committee amendments and not to amendments that have been presented by Senators. Where any Senator has offered an amendment to a committee amendment that committee amendment will be passed over for the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first amendment passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 14, line 9, the committee report to strike out "\$208,320" and insert "\$214,320," so as to read:

For all necessary expenses for investigations and experiments in animal husbandry, etc., \$214,320.

Mr. GORE. I will ask that that be passed over in view of the fact that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] desires to present an amendment to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is, on page 21, line 9, to strike out "\$88,770" and insert "\$109,920," so as to read:

For investigating the handling, grading, and transportation of grain, including the grain sorghums, and the fixing of definite grades thereof, \$109,920.

Mr. GORE. I will make the same request with reference to this amendment, that, in view of the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, it be passed over until the grain rider is considered.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is, on page 23, to strike out lines 8 to 14, inclusive.