

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 4 (legislative day of August 1), 1916.

POSTMASTERS.

CONNECTICUT.

Albert B. Goodrich to be postmaster at Berlin, Conn., in place of H. L. Porter. Incumbent's commission expired July 23, 1916.

ILLINOIS.

A. R. Godknecht to be postmaster at Palatine, Ill., in place of William Wilson. Incumbent's commission expires August 9, 1916.

MARYLAND.

John W. D. Jump to be postmaster at Easton, Md., in place of R. R. Walker. Incumbent's commission expires August 6, 1916.

MASSACHUSETTS.

James J. Hunt to be postmaster at Winchendon, Mass., in place of W. H. Pierce. Incumbent's commission expired March 21, 1916.

NEW YORK.

William S. Charles to be postmaster at Hornell, N. Y., in place of J. C. McGreevy (not commissioned), resigned.

Alfred Cox to be postmaster at Hawthorne, N. Y., in place of Alfred Cox. Incumbent's commission expires August 6, 1916.

Edward C. Elliott to be postmaster at Orangeburg, N. Y., in place of Thomas Havey, declined.

Benjamin Franklin to be postmaster at Ovid, N. Y., in place of Charles H. Kinne, resigned.

OREGON.

Elizabeth Thompson to be postmaster at Nyssa, Oreg., in place of Elizabeth Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1916.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

C. H. Bonnin to be postmaster at Wagner, S. Dak., in place of C. H. Bonnie, to correct name of appointee.

TEXAS.

J. L. Wilson to be postmaster at Celina, Tex., in place of T. S. Hunter. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1916.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 4 (legislative day of August 1), 1916.

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF CHARITIES.

David J. Kaufman, to be a member of the Board of Charities of the District of Columbia for a term of three years.

POSTMASTERS.

DELAWARE.

Fredonia C. Lofland, Lewes.

GEORGIA.

W. W. McMillan, Thomaston.

ILLINOIS.

William F. Meyer, jr., Arlington Heights.

MISSISSIPPI.

Mary C. Booze, Mound Bayou.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, August 4, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

We bless Thee, Infinite Spirit, our heavenly Father, for that spark of divinity which Thou hast imparted unto us, which lifts us above the brute creation and makes us Thy children. "When it breathes through the intellect it is genius; when it breathes through the will it is virtue; when it flows through the affections it is love." Help us to appreciate the dignity thus bestowed upon us, that we may stoop to no mean nor petty thing in our transactions with our fellow men, but rise continually unto the larger, grander, purer, nobler life in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 2, 1916, was read and approved.

CANAL ZONE.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Speaker to lay before the House the bill (H. R. 15955) which is on the Speaker's desk, with Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the bill (H. R. 15955) with Senate amendments. The Clerk will report it by title and also the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (H. R. 15955) extending certain privileges of canal employees to other officials on the Canal Zone and authorizing the President to make rules and regulations affecting health, sanitation, quarantine, taxation, public roads, self-propelled vehicles, and police powers on the Canal Zone, and for other purposes, including provision as to certain fees, money orders, and interest deposits.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were concurred in was laid on the table.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. DALE of New York was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Adolf Hartman, H. R. 1332, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 13391) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, had agreed to the conference asked for by the House, and had appointed Mr. OWEN, Mr. HITCHCOCK, and Mr. NELSON as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3069) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,'" approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, and to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission," approved March 4, 1915.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments to the bill (H. R. 15774) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also 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. 12717) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that in accordance with the provisions of the resolution (H. Con. Res. 50) agreed to July 26, 1916, the Vice President had canceled his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 12197) entitled "An act authorizing Ashley County, Ark., to construct a bridge across Bayou Bartholomew."

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 14483. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Williston, N. Dak.;

H. R. 12208. An act adding certain lands to the Teton National Forest, Wyo.;

H. R. 13785. An act for the relief of Sarah S. Plank;

H. R. 14534. An act permitting the Missouri River Transportation Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River in the State of Montana;

H. R. 15635. An act for the relief of the Eastern Transportation Co.;

H. R. 5864. An act for the relief of Thomas P. Sorkilmo;

H. R. 8318. An act for the relief of De Barbieri & Co., of Valparaiso, Chile;

H. R. 15322. An act granting the consent of Congress to Traill County, N. Dak., to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North;

H. R. 10116. An act for the relief of certain settlers under reclamation projects;

H. R. 16554. An act 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;

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution providing for one year's extension of time to make installment payments for the land of the former Fort Niobrara Military Reservation, Nebr.;

H. R. 10931. An act for the relief of Drs. Blair and Blake, Dr. W. J. Maxwell, Dr. R. C. Evans, and J. B. Blalock;

H. R. 14823. An act to authorize the Savage Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Yellowstone River in the State of Montana;

H. R. 15318. An act granting the consent of Congress to the village and township of Hendrum, Norman County, Minn., and the township of Elm River, Traill County, N. Dak., to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North on the boundary line between said States;

H. R. 16097. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Missouri River near Kansas City, Mo., authorized by an act approved June 17, 1914;

H. R. 11749. An act for the relief of the administrator of the estate of John M. Waples;

H. R. 3896. An act for the relief of John H. Janssen;

H. R. 2534. An act to adjudicate the claims of certain settlers in Sherman County, Oreg.;

H. R. 486. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the old post-office building and site thereof at York, Pa.;

H. R. 10305. An act to grant certain lands to the State of Oregon as a public park for the benefit and enjoyment of the people; and

H. R. 2209. An act for the relief of W. W. Blood.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on August 3, 1916, they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills and joint resolution:

H. R. 5411. An act for the relief of Olaf Nelson;

H. R. 9994. An act for the relief of Samuel H. Walker;

H. R. 9378. An act for the relief of Ella Stone;

H. R. 9377. An act for the relief of Cynthia Ramey;

H. R. 9173. An act for the relief of the Union Oil Co.;

H. R. 11679. An act for the relief of Samuel D. Kingsbury;

H. R. 10858. An act for the relief of William A. Hutson;

H. R. 8325. An act for the relief of Borden H. Mills;

H. R. 5729. An act for the relief of Dr. E. E. Johnson;

H. R. 3255. An act for the relief of James Houyde;

H. R. 7423. An act for the relief of Elizabeth M. Dodge;

H. R. 11304. An act for the relief of Martha A. Moffitt;

H. R. 10642. An act for the relief of Louis Jones;

H. R. 11690. An act for the relief of Mathilda Hesterman;

H. R. 11377. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Bye;

H. R. 9082. An act for the relief of Frank P. Sammons;

H. R. 9172. An act for the relief of the M. Kondo Fisheries Co.;

H. R. 5185. An act for the relief of George H. Hammond;

H. R. 1592. An act for the relief of George W. Trahey;

H. R. 5096. An act for the relief of Nabor and Victoria Leon;

H. R. 12267. An act for the relief of Wallace L. Bell;

H. R. 2536. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Buckholdt;

H. R. 2554. An act for the relief of Mrs. Joseph Cameron;

H. R. 8697. An act for the relief of Collector of Internal Revenue A. S. Walker;

H. R. 8108. An act for the relief of the legal representatives and heirs of Elizabeth Bruce, deceased, widow of the late John H. Bruce;

H. R. 1161. An act to pay Cowden & Cowden, of Amory, Monroe County, Miss., for the loss of a horse while being used by the Department of Agriculture;

H. R. 13728. An act for the relief of the J. L. da Roza Estate (Inc.), of Elk Grove, Cal.;

H. R. 13027. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to credit the stamp account of Isaac R. Strouse, collector for the seventh internal-revenue district, in the sum of \$14,570.42;

H. R. 16640. An act to amend an act entitled "An act granting a franchise for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a street railway system in the district of South Hilo, county of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii," approved August 1, 1912, as amended by an act approved July 25, 1914;

H. R. 12365. An act to promote the reclamation of arid lands;

H. R. 3032. An act authorizing the county of St. Louis to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between Minnesota and Wisconsin;

H. R. 11958. An act to provide for the sale of certain Indian lands in Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11156. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cause to be appraised and to sell the Boise & Arrowrock Railroad, and for other purposes;

H. R. 16185. An act 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;

H. R. 16068. An act to authorize the construction, mainte-

nance, and operation of a bridge across the Black River at or near Bennetts Ferry, Ark.;

H. R. 13298. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make payments to certain Indians of the Rosebud Sioux Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, who were enrolled and allotted under decisions of the United States district and circuit courts for the district of South Dakota;

H. R. 348. An act to establish the Lassen Volcanic National Park in the Sierra Nevada Mountains, in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4767. An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cotton seed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10668. An act to repeal section 4 of the act of Congress approved June 11, 1906, known as the forest homestead act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2184. An act providing for the refund of certain additional duties collected on pineapples; and

H. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to credit the stamp account of Joseph J. Scott, as collector of internal revenue of the first collection district of California, in the sum of \$300, being the representative value of certain internal-revenue special-tax stamps which were lost from the office of the said collector.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a short speech by Hon. John A. Edwards, of Eureka, Kans., on the subject of the live-stock-marketing problem, delivered by him at the forty-fifth annual meeting of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a speech made at the Kansas Agricultural Association. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the object of printing this speech of somebody entirely outside of Congress, I take it?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is a very prominent cattle raiser in Kansas, and the speech was delivered at the meeting of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture in January of this year. It is illuminating on the subject of the live-stock-marketing problem.

Mr. MANN. How long is it?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. And it also bears on the resolution now pending in Congress to investigate the packing industry. It is about four and a half pages of this size.

Mr. MANN. Of course the gentleman knows he could introduce it, if he wanted to, before the committee and have it printed by the committee. I shall not object, although I think we are running into the ground these insertion of speeches in the Record.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. It is a very valuable addition, I am sure, to the Record.

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

H. SNOWDEN MARSHALL.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I desire to file the report of the Committee on the Judiciary on House resolution 90, being the resolution in which Representative BUCHANAN, of Illinois, preferred impeachment charges against H. Snowden Marshall. (H. Rept. 1077.)

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 90, preferring charges of misfeasance and malfeasance against H. Snowden Marshall, United States district attorney for the southern district of New York.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed and referred to the House Calendar.

LILLIE B. RANDELL.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has passed a bill, H. R. 6180, with amendments. I desire to have the bill taken from the Speaker's table and laid before the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the bill H. R. 6180 with Senate amendments. The Clerk will report it by title and also read the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6180) for the relief of Lillie B. Randell.

The Senate amendments were read.

The question was taken, and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

LETITIA W. GARRISON.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Senate has also passed the bill H. R. 6181 with amendments, and I ask that that bill be laid before the House.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6181) for the relief of Letitia W. Garrison.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

LIME-BARREL BILL.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the report of the committee on conference of the bill S. 5425, commonly known as the lime-barrel bill, and move its adoption.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman to let that go over for a day or two.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. That will be agreeable.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his request.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter written by the President to Mrs. Henry Smith, of Winamac, Ind., stating the reason why the militia are retained on the Mexican border.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, letter from whom?

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. From the President to Mrs. Henry Smith, the mother of one of the guardsmen on the border.

Mr. MANN. If he gives any light on the subject, I will be glad to have it; nobody else knows why they are kept there. Oh, I read the letter in the press, but it did not give any information. The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letter is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 26, 1916.

MY DEAR MADAM: Your letter of July 23 distresses me a good deal, because it shows that you have not been correctly informed as to the purpose of having the National Guard at the border. It is not for the purpose of drill, but for the purpose of protecting the country. The service the men are performing there is an honor to them and a necessity to the United States. I can not believe that the men in the National Guard would wish to be excused from it or would lose heart because of the discomforts and inconveniences of the service.

The War Department has the camps on the border under the most careful inspection and is using every means known to make them sanitary and safe against disease. The health record of the men on the border, both the Regulars and the National Guardsmen, is exceptionally good.

I would not have you think that I do not sympathize with your distress in the absence of your son, but I beg that you will take these larger matters into consideration.

Sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Mrs. HENRY SMITH,
Winamac, Ind.

OMNIBUS PENSION BILLS.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House omnibus pension bills H. R. 15494 and H. R. 16290 be taken from the Speaker's table, the Senate amendments thereto disagreed to, a conference requested, and conferees appointed on behalf of the House.

The Clerk will report the bills by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15494) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of certain soldiers and sailors of said war.

Also:

A bill (H. R. 16290) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of certain soldiers and sailors of said war.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bills just reported, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER announced the following conferees on both bills: Mr. BURKE, Mr. SHOUSE, and Mr. LANGLEY.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HARRISON. I rise to ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, if the House meets on that day, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for one hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] asks unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of business on the Speaker's table, he may be permitted to address the House for

not exceeding one hour. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Of course, all of this speech making is subject to the usual restriction, which has been stated a number of times.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the District appropriation bill, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the District appropriation bill, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (H. R. 15774) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the district of Columbia for the year ending June 30, 1917 and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Senate the other day adopted an amendment imposing a tax upon intangible property. It seems to me that the House ought to have an opportunity to vote on that amendment.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I agree with the gentleman that that is a matter of enough importance that the House should have an opportunity to express itself on it—the membership and not the conferees—and I will say to the gentleman that there are a number of amendments that I think I can say to him the conferees will not dispose of without bringing them before the House.

Mr. ANDERSON. Personally, I would like to have a chance to vote that way.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman from North Carolina think that the bill will be back several times before there is an agreement on it?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I am inclined to think so; yes.

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

The SPEAKER announced the following conferees: Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, Mr. McANDREWS, and Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to put in conference on the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 15947) an item that is not strictly in conference, for this reason: The system that has prevailed heretofore with reference to the limitation upon the expenditure out of lump-sum appropriations for the clerical, drafting, and inspection force of the various bureaus is that we have had a limitation out of the appropriation of the amount that might be expended for these services. In the Bureau of Yards and Docks, on account of the provision put in the bill for the creation of the armor-plate factory and the projectile factory and other matters at the time that the bill was before the House committee, the chief of that bureau has prepared to submit what would be the amount of the limitation. I said to him to have the Senate make the amendment and it would then be in conference. The Senate, instead of adhering to the line that we have always pursued heretofore as to limitations, put in an amendment reducing the amount of those limitations—the amount that could be expended—and they struck out the drafting and inspection force from the language in that limitation and put it under the total appropriation.

The House conferees have not been willing to agree to the Senate amendment changing the policy, and insist that the employment of the drafting and inspection and clerical force shall remain as it has always been, subject to the limitation of the appropriation; and on that account the Senate did not increase the limitation in a sufficient amount to provide for the Bureau of Yards and Docks, but, rather, reduced it. If we adhere to the policy and the legislation that the House has always carried and insisted upon, it is necessary that there should be some increase; and in order to have that in I am asking that that particular amount be put in in conference. It does not increase the appropriation. It only increases the amount of appropriation that may be used for that purpose out of the appropriation authorized in the bill.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman a concurrent resolution to offer? The gentleman knows that the House can not confer jurisdiction on the conferees.

Mr. PADGETT. The Senate said they had no rules prohibiting it if the House granted it. Once upon another occasion the House granted this privilege, and it went through all right.

Mr. MANN. I doubt whether any Senator knew what the rules were over in the Senate. [Laughter.]

Mr. PADGETT. They stated that they had no rules fixing—

Mr. MANN. I think it is largely true that they have no rules that they adhere to. I think we ought to have a concrete proposition before us in some way. If the gentleman is willing to take a mere House resolution, then he ought to have his proposition reduced to a House resolution asking unanimous consent. This way would not do any good, because somebody has to reduce this to writing. The Clerk would have to give a copy of it to the House conferees.

I do not understand, I am frank to say, even with this explanation, without examination, what the situation is; but I think the gentleman should reduce his proposition to writing and introduce it as a House resolution to-day and call it up to-morrow.

Mr. PADGETT. There are so many amendments depending on this that we wanted to dispose of it.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I do not apprehend that there are any other amendments depending on it. It has nothing to do with the rest of the bill.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, yes; there is a whole line of amendments that are based upon the change of legislation which they have inserted in the bill.

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman ought to reduce it to writing and introduce it.

Mr. PADGETT. Upon another occasion the same thing arose, and I made the request. It was granted in the House, and the Senate acted upon it and accepted it. I am just pursuing the same line that was pursued two years ago with reference to a similar request.

Mr. MANN. I shall object for the present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 12717).

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] calls up the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill. The Clerk will read the report.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the accompanying statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement.

The statement was read.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1065).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12717) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, 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, 3, 5, 8, 9, 12, 14, 19, 20, 24, 26, 30, 31, 35, 37, 39, 41, 48, 51, 52, 53, 56, 57, 58, 60, 63, 64, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 77, 84, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 109, 110, 111, 121, 165, 166, 174, 179, 211, and 214.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 10, 13, 17, 18, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 55, 59, 61, 62, 66, 67, 68, 75, 76, 79, 80, 81, 82, 85, 86, 87, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 168, 169, 170, 171, 175, 176, 177, 180, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 189, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 212, 213, 217, 218, 219, 220, and 221, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$1,431,200" insert "\$1,411,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$1,767,260" insert "\$1,747,260"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of the Senate amendment after the word "cheese"; 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: In lieu of "\$2,436,276" insert "\$2,277,776"; 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: In lieu of "\$3,179,246" insert "\$3,020,746"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "The," in the first line of the Senate amendment, and in lieu thereof insert "Provided, That the"; strike out the period at the end of the Senate amendment; insert the Senate amendment as thus amended after "\$87,175," in line 2, page 19, of the bill; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$1,900,490" insert "\$1,866,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$2,318,730" insert "\$2,537,120"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$3,213,415" insert "3,188,415"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of the Senate amendment after the word "thereof," in line 7 of said amendment, and in lieu thereof insert "shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$578,230"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$130,000" insert "\$122,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$2,981,680" insert "\$2,969,680"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter contained in the Senate amendment and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"Sec. 6a. That no tax shall be levied under this act on any contract of sale mentioned in section 3 hereof if the contract provide that, in case cotton of grade or grades other than the basis grade specified in the contract shall be tendered in performance of the contract, the parties to such contract may agree, at the time of the tender, as to the price of the grade or grades so tendered, and that if they shall not then agree as to such price, then, and in that event, the buyer of said contract shall have the right to demand the specific fulfillment of such contract by the actual delivery of cotton of the basis grade named therein and at the price specified for such basis grade in said contract, and if the contract also comply with all the terms and conditions of section 5 hereof not inconsistent with this section: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be so construed as to relieve from the tax levied by section 3 of this act any contract in which, or in the settlement of or in respect to which, any device or arrangement whatever is resorted to, or any agreement is made, for the determination or adjustment of the price of the grade or grades tendered other than the basis grade specified in the contract by any 'fixed difference' system, or by arbitration, or by any other method not provided for by this act.

"Contracts made in compliance with this section shall be known as 'Section 6a contracts.' The provisions of this sec-

tion shall be deemed fully incorporated into any such contract if there be written or printed thereon, or on the memorandum evidencing the same, at or prior to the time the same is signed, the phrase "Subject to United States cotton-futures act, section 6a."

"Section 10 of this act shall not be construed to apply to any contract of sale made in compliance with section 6a hereof."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 148: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 148, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the Senate amendment insert "ninety"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 154: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "may" in said amendment insert "sell, offer for sale, or consign for sale"; after the word "ship" in said amendment insert a comma; strike out the words "not sold" in line 9, page 97, of the bill; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 155: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 155, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the comma inserted by the Senate amendment; strike out the words "offered for sale" in line 9, page 97, of the bill; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 156: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter inserted by the Senate amendment; strike out the words "by grade" in line 9, page 97, of the bill; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 157: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter inserted by the Senate amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 158: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 158, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "act," where it first occurs in the Senate amendment, strike out the words "when shipped from a place at which no such licensed inspector is located"; after the comma following the word "inspection," where it occurs the second time in said amendment, insert "which inspection shall be"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 167: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 167, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed in the Senate amendment and in lieu thereof insert as a separate paragraph at the end of section 7 of part B, as a part thereof, the following:

"The Secretary of Agriculture shall require every inspector licensed under this act to keep complete and correct records of all grain graded and inspected by him, and to make reports to the Secretary of Agriculture, in such forms and at such times as he may require, showing the place of inspection, the date of inspection, the name of the elevator or warehouse, if any, to which the grain was delivered or from which it was shipped, the kind of grain, the quantity of each kind, the grade thereof, and such other information as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary. The Secretary of Agriculture, on each first Tuesday in January and each first Tuesday in July of each year shall make publication of a summary of such facts as are ascertained, showing in as great detail as possible all the facts, including a summary as to the amount and grade of grain delivered to the elevator or warehouse and the amount and grade of grain delivered from such elevator or warehouse, and the estimated amount received on sample or type by such elevator or warehouse, and the estimated amount delivered therefrom on sample or type."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 172: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 172, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the comma in said amendment insert the word "or"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 173: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 173, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert "either with or without reinspection"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 178: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178,

and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert after the word "fee," where it occurs the second time in line 4, page 100, of the bill, the following: ", in case of an appeal"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 181: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert "signed by him or by such officer or officers, agent or agents, of the Department of Agriculture as he may designate"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 188: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 188, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Insert a comma after the word "commerce," in line 22, page 100 of the bill; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 190: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 190, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the word "standard" in said amendment insert "standards"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 202: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 202, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "Provided further, That no person licensed by the Secretary of Agriculture to inspect or grade grain or employed by him in carrying out any of the provisions of this act shall, during the term of such license or employment, be interested, financially or otherwise, directly or indirectly, in any grain elevator or warehouse, or in the merchandising of grain, nor shall he be in the employment of any person or corporation owning or operating any grain elevator or warehouse"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 215: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 215, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$55,000" insert "\$60,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 216: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 216, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the comma following the word "hereafter" in said amendment insert "nothing in this paragraph or in"; strike out the word "not" in line 5 of said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 222: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 222, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of said amendment insert the following: "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 disease 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, including necessary investigations to determine whether said diseases have been completely eradicated in districts where they previously existed"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendments numbered 50, 54, 112, and 223: On the amendments of the Senate numbered 50, 54, 112, and 223 the committee of conference have been unable to agree.

A. F. LEVER,
GORDON LEE,
THOS. L. RUBEY,
G. N. HAUGEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

E. D. SMITH,
HOKE SMITH,
MORRIS SHEPPARD,
A. J. GRONNA,

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. 12717) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying

conference report as to each of the amendments of the Senate, namely:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment increases the appropriation for farm-management work by \$10,000. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3: These amendments represent amended totals.

Amendment No. 4: This amendment makes an appropriation of \$22,500 for a building for the Weather Bureau at Cape Henry, Va. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 5: This amendment appropriates \$20,000 for a building for the Weather Bureau at Cheyenne, Wyo. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 6 and 7: These amendments represent amended totals.

Amendment No. 8: This amendment provides for the extension of the inspection and quarantine work to the eradication of Malta fever in goats. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 9: This amendment increases the appropriation for the eradication of southern cattle ticks by \$150,000. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 10: This amendment gives specific authority for dairy-demonstration work as a part of the demonstration work done in tick-freed areas in the South. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 11: The first part of this amendment increases the appropriation for the dairy industry by \$5,000 for the extension of the work in cheese investigations. The second part of the amendment limits expenditures under the paragraph making appropriations for the dairy industry to States which shall contribute in equal amount to the work. The House agrees to this amendment with an amendment striking out the second part of the amendment.

Amendment No. 12: This amendment adds \$8,500 to the appropriation for animal husbandry investigations. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 13: This amendment increases by \$50,000 the appropriation for investigating diseases of animals, so as to provide that amount for the investigation of contagious abortion of animals. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 14: This amendment gives specific authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to expend a portion of the appropriation for investigating the disease of hog cholera in the testing of serums, vaccines, and other preventives of hog cholera. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16: These amendments represent amended totals.

Amendment No. 17: This amendment corrects a typographical error. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 18: This amendment corrects a typographical error. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20: These amendments increase by \$5,000 the appropriation for investigations of plant diseases and add specific language covering diseases of tobacco. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 21: This amendment reappropriates the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$300,000 included in the urgent deficiency act of February 28, 1916, for combating the citrus canker, and makes it available for the fiscal year 1917. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 22: This amendment reappropriates the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$20,000 included in the urgent deficiency act of February 28, 1916, for combating the white-pine blister rust, and makes it available for the fiscal year 1917. The House agrees to the amendment with an amendment making the matter included in the amendment a proviso of the preceding paragraph relating to the diseases of forest and ornamental trees.

Amendment No. 23: This amendment increases by \$5,000 the appropriation for drug-plant investigations. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 24: This amendment increases by \$21,150 the appropriation for grain-standardization investigations. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 25: This amendment increases by \$3,000 the appropriation for studying and testing commercial seeds and amends the seed importation act by extending its provisions to rye grass and vetch and by prescribing a minimum standard of quality for seed as regards germination and freedom from dirt and other foreign matter. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 26: This amendment adds the words "and flax wilt" to the paragraph making appropriation for the investigation and improvement of cereals. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 27: This amendment increases by \$7,500 the appropriation for the investigation and improvement of cereals. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 28: This amendment increases from \$10,000 to \$20,000 the amount set aside by the proviso for the investigation of black rust and stripe rust. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 29: This amendment inserts the words "oats" and "barley" in the proviso relating to black rust and stripe rust. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 30: This amendment sets aside \$5,000 of the appropriation for paper-plant investigations to be used in investigating flax fiber in the manufacture of crash and linen. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 31: This amendment substitutes the words "sugar plant" for the words "sugar beet." The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 32: This amendment adds the words "and beet seed" to the paragraph making appropriation for sugar-beet investigations. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 33 and 34: These amendments increased by \$10,000 the appropriation for sugar-beet investigations and provide that this sum shall be used for investigations looking to the development of an American sugar-beet seed industry. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 35: This amendment increases by \$3,000 the amount appropriated for investigations in economic and systematic botany and provides that this sum shall be used in the standardization of botanical names in horticultural use. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 36: In the bill as passed by the House, the second proviso in the paragraph making appropriation for dry-land agriculture investigations, in effect, prohibited the distribution of trees from the Mandan station except for experimental or demonstration purposes. The Senate amendment, in effect, provides that the restriction of the proviso shall not apply to distribution in the district now covered, in accordance with Bulletin No. 2, issued from the Mandan station. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 37 and 38: Amendment No. 37 reduces by \$5,000 the amount appropriated for the purchase of new and rare seeds. Amendment No. 38 eliminates the proviso setting aside \$5,000 for a survey of the noxious-weed situation in the spring wheat areas. The Senate recedes as to amendment No. 37 and the House recedes as to amendment No. 38.

Amendment No. 39: This amendment appropriates \$10,000 for the purchase and distribution of seeds to destitute flood sufferers in Alabama and Mississippi. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 40: This amendment represents an amended total.

Amendment No. 41: This amendment strikes out the paragraph providing for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 42: This amendment represents an amended total.

Amendment No. 43: This amendment increases the salary of one forest supervisor from \$2,600 to \$2,800. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 44: This amendment represents an amended total.

Amendment No. 45: This amendment corrects a typographical error. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 46: This amendment strikes out the appropriation for the Dakota National Forest, N. Dak. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 47: This amendment represents the total appropriated for the maintenance and general administration of the national forests specified in the bill. The amendment changes the amount in order to conform to the action of the Senate in striking out the appropriation for the Dakota National Forest in amendment No. 46. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 48: This amendment increases by \$25,000 the appropriation for investigations relating to the utilization of forest products, and gives specific authority for commercial demonstrations of improved methods. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 49: This amendment represents an amended total.

Amendment No. 50: This amendment appropriates \$3,000,000 for continuing the purchase of lands under the provisions of the Weeks law—\$1,000,000 for the fiscal year 1917 and \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year 1918. The committee of conference failed to agree as to this amendment.

Amendments Nos. 51 and 53: The purpose of these amendments is to enable the Department of Agriculture to perform certain legal work incident to the acquisition of lands under the terms of the Weeks law. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 52: The effect of this amendment is to extend the provisions of this paragraph to any additional funds that may be appropriated for the purchase of lands under the terms of the Weeks law. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 54: This amendment represents an amended total. As the \$3,000,000 appropriated by amendment No. 50, upon which the committee of conference failed to agree, is included in this total, the committee of conference consequently failed to agree on this amendment.

Amendment No. 55: This amendment authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the prospecting, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of lands acquired under the terms of the Weeks law. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 56 and 57: The effect of these amendments is to substitute three clerks of class 1 for four clerks at \$900 each. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 58: This amendment increases by \$9,000 the appropriation for investigating the marketing and handling of poultry and eggs. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 59: This amendment, in effect, alters the language of the appropriation provided by the House bill for color investigations. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 60: This amendment increases by \$25,000 the appropriation for the enforcement of the Food and Drugs Act. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 61 and 62: The effect of these amendments is to broaden the language of the paragraph relating to naval stores so as to authorize investigations of the transportation of these articles. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 63 and 64: These amendments represent amended totals.

Amendment No. 65: This amendment makes an appropriation of \$175,000 for the establishment of an experimental plant to investigate and demonstrate the best method of obtaining potash on a commercial scale and provides that the product obtained from such experimentation may be sold and the receipts from the sale used in continuing such experimentation. The House agrees with an amendment providing that the amount derived from the sale of the product of the plant shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Amendments Nos. 66 and 67: These amendments represent amended totals.

Amendment No. 68: This amendment specifically authorizes an investigation of the Hessian fly and the chinch bug. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 69: This amendment increases by \$10,000 the appropriation for the investigation of insects affecting southern field crops. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 70: This amendment provides an appropriation of \$10,000 for the erection of an entomological laboratory at Wellington, Kans. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 71 and 72: These amendments represent amended totals.

Amendment No. 73: The effect of this amendment is to limit the experiments and demonstrations in destroying animals injurious to agriculture and animal husbandry to the lands owned by the United States. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 74: This amendment increases by \$25,000 the appropriation made by this paragraph for investigating the food habits of North American birds and mammals, and for other purposes. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 75 and 76: The effect of these amendments is to segregate the funds provided for the destruction of predatory animals injurious to agriculture and animal husbandry and the funds provided for the suppression of rabies. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 77 and 78: These amendments represent amended totals.

Amendments Nos. 79 and 80: The effect of these amendments is to substitute one skilled laborer at \$840 for one skilled laborer at \$720. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 81 and 82: These amendments represent amended totals.

Amendment No. 83: This amendment increases by \$15,000 the appropriation for miscellaneous expenses of the department. The House agrees with an amendment providing an increase of \$7,500.

Amendment No. 84: This amendment increases by \$15,000 the appropriation for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 85 and 86: The effect of these amendments is to substitute two clerks at \$1,000 each for three clerks at \$720 each. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 87: This amendment represents an amended total.

Amendment No. 88: This amendment reduces by \$16,000 the appropriation for farmers' cooperative demonstrations. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 89, 90, and 91: The effect of these amendments is to increase by \$12,000 the appropriation for the experiment stations in Alaska and to provide \$10,000 for a substation in Porto Rico. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 92 and 93: These amendments represent amended totals.

Amendment No. 94: This amendment increases by \$5,000 the appropriation for road-material investigations. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 95: This amendment gives authority for demonstration work in irrigation from underground supplies of water through the construction or reservoirs and the use of windmills. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 96: This amendment increases by \$2,500 the appropriation for irrigation investigations and provides that such part of this sum as may be necessary shall be used for the establishment of an overhead system of irrigation at or near Denver, Colo. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 97: This amendment provides an appropriation of \$10,000 for a survey of the Black Canyon irrigating project in Idaho. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 98: This amendment provides an appropriation of \$100,000 for determining the existence of artesian water for irrigation. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 99: This amendment increases by \$7,805 the appropriation for rural engineering investigations. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 100 and 101: These amendments represent amended totals.

Amendment No. 102: This amendment adds the words "and other products" to the paragraph making appropriation for a market news service. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 103: This amendment provides an appropriation of \$65,000 for gathering and disseminating information in regard to live stock. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 104: This amendment gives specific authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to promote the use of cotton standards. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 105: This amendment increases by \$15,000 the appropriation for cooperation between the State and Federal Governments in market investigations. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 106: This amendment represents an amended total.

Amendment No. 107: The effect of this amendment is to make the appropriation provided by the paragraph available for the enforcement of the legislation known as the cotton-futures act, included in the present bill. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 108: This amendment represents an amended total.

Amendment No. 109: This amendment increases by \$5,260 the appropriation for the enforcement of the insecticide act. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 110: This amendment represents an amended total.

Amendment No. 111: This amendment repeals the act authorizing the admission of tick-infested cattle from Mexico into that part of Texas below the southern cattle quarantine line. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 112: This amendment represents an amended total. As the \$3,000,000 appropriated by amendment No. 50, upon which the committee of conference failed to agree, is included in this total, the committee of conference consequently failed to agree on this amendment.

Amendment No. 113: This amendment provides an appropriation of \$20,000 for making an exhibit at the International Farm Congress and Soil Products Exposition, to be held at El Paso, Tex., and authorizes the President to extend invitations to other nations to appoint representatives to this congress. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 114: This amendment provides an appropriation of \$15,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make an exhibit at the meeting of the National Dairy Show Association to be held at Springfield, Mass. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 115: This amendment authorizes the President to extend invitations to other nations to appoint representatives to attend the International Irrigation Congress to be held at El Paso, Tex. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 116: This amendment authorizes the President to set aside as game preserves portions of the lands acquired under the terms of the Weeks law. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 117, 118, and 119: The effect of these amendments is to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to include in his findings in any dispute under the cotton-futures bill, even though only one question be referred, a complete classification

of the cotton for the purpose of delivery on future contracts. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 120: This amendment provides an additional form of contract that may be traded in on cotton-future exchanges. Under the terms of this contract, if cotton other than the basis grade is tendered in performance of the contract, the buyer and the seller may agree as to the price of the grade tendered, and, in case they are not able to agree, the buyer has a right to demand specific delivery of cotton of the grade named in the contract. The House agrees with an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, making certain changes in and additions to the language proposed by the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 121: The effect of this amendment is to provide for reasonable variations in the delivery of cotton upon the contract provided for in section 10 of the cotton-futures bill. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 122 and 123: Sections 11 and 11a of the bill, as passed by the House, provide for a tax under certain circumstances upon orders for future delivery of cotton transmitted from the United States to foreign countries and from foreign countries to the United States. Amendments Nos. 122 and 123 eliminate these sections from the bill. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, and 144: These amendments are incidental to the changes made in the bill by the elimination of sections 11 and 11a. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 145 and 146: These amendments substitute the word "standards" for the word "grades" in the title of the bill. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 147: This amendment brings forward from the eleventh section of the bill the definitions of the various terms used in the bill and specifically defines the phrase "in interstate or foreign commerce" as used in the bill. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 148: The bill as it passed the House required the Secretary to give at least 60 days' notice before making effective any standards for grain. The Senate amendment changes the time from 60 to 120 days. The House agrees with an amendment making the time 90 days.

Amendment No. 149: This amendment is a substitution of the phrase "in interstate or foreign commerce" in accordance with the definition contained in amendment No. 147. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 150, 151, 152, and 153: These amendments extend the provisions of section 4 to grain "consigned for sale." The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 154, 155, 156, and 157: The managers of the conference rewrote the language of the proviso which had been amended by the Senate, and the net result of these four amendments is to extend the provisions of the proviso to grain "consigned for sale" and to clarify the language of the proviso.

Amendment No. 158: In addition to altering the language of the proviso as passed by the House, the effect of the Senate amendment is to compel inspection both at point of shipment and at destination except when shipped from a point at which there is no inspector. The House agrees to the amendment with an amendment that will obviate the necessity of double inspection when shipped from a point at which there is an inspector to a point at which there is an inspector.

Amendments Nos. 159, 160, and 161: These amendments extend the terms of the proviso to grain "consigned for sale." The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 162 and 163: These amendments were intended to clarify the language. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 164: The effect of this amendment is to obviate the necessity that the Secretary issue a formal certificate showing the grade of the grain involved in any dispute referred to him. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 165: The effect of the first part of this amendment is to withhold the operation of the act from a State which has not established, either by its laws or by commercial practice, a system of inspection. The effect of the second part of this amendment is to introduce into the bill the question of price regulation. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 166: This amendment provides for the establishment of a board of grain appeals. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 167: The effect of the first part of this amendment is to provide for the appointment of grain supervisors, to be stationed at the important grain terminals of the United States. The second part of the amendment provides that the Secretary collect and report to Congress information relative to the quantity, quality, and grade of grain received at and shipped from terminal elevators.

The House agrees to the Senate amendment with amendments, the effect of which are to strike out the first part of the Senate amendment, ample authority and funds for the employment of such persons and means to insure just and fair grading being fully provided in section 12, as amended by the Senate and agreed to by the managers of the conference, and to broaden the scope of the second part of said amendment.

Amendment No. 168: The effect of section 5, as passed by the House, was to nullify certain provisions of section 4 providing for the shipping of grain without inspection. The effect of the Senate amendment is to assure the operation of the provisions of section 4. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 169 and 170: The effect of these amendments is to extend the provisions of section 5 to grain "consigned for sale." The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 171 and 172: These amendments slightly alter the language of the bill as passed by the House and extend the provisions of section 6 to grain "consigned for sale." The House agrees with an amendment, inserting the word "or" after the comma in amendment No. 172.

Amendments Nos. 173 and 174: The effect of these amendments is to require reinspection and appeal to local authorities before appeal can be made to the Secretary of Agriculture. The House agrees to amendment No. 173 with an amendment substituting other language, and the Senate recedes on amendment No. 174. The effect of the action of the managers of the conference is to make optional reinspection and appeal to local authorities before appeal to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Amendment No. 175: The effect of this amendment is to broaden the meaning of the language with reference to an appeal so as to cause the appeal to cover both examination and certification of the grain. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 176: The effect of this amendment is to provide that a fee shall be charged not only when an appeal is taken to the Secretary of Agriculture but when a dispute is referred to him. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 177: This amendment is intended to clarify the language. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 178: The effect of this amendment is to limit the assessment of the fee to cases of appeal. The House agrees to this amendment with an amendment which provides, in effect, that the fee shall be returned in case an appeal is sustained, but not in the case of a dispute.

Amendment No. 179: The amendment provides that if the appeal is sustained the fee shall be paid by the shipper who has shipped the grain of the wrong grade. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 180: This amendment is intended to clarify the language. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 181: The effect of this amendment is to authorize the signing of the findings of the Secretary of Agriculture, as to grade, by him or by such officer or officers of the department as he may designate, upon an appeal or dispute. The House agrees with an amendment authorizing the signing by the Secretary or by such officer or officers, agent or agents, of the department as he may designate, and eliminating the restriction as to appeals and disputes.

Amendment No. 182: This amendment is intended to clarify the language. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 183, 184, 185, and 186: These amendments are intended to clarify the language and to confer upon inspectors specific authority to certificate the grade of grain inspected by them for shipment or delivery for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce under the act and under the regulations prescribed thereunder. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 187: The amendment prohibits employees of partnerships, as well as of the other organizations enumerated in section 7, from certifying to the grade of grain unless they hold unsuspended or unrevoked licenses. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 188: This amendment is intended to clarify the language. The House recedes with an amendment inserting punctuation.

Amendments Nos. 189 and 190: These amendments are intended to clarify the language. The House recedes from 189 and recedes from 190 with an amendment substituting the word "standards" for "standard."

Amendments Nos. 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, and 196: These amendments make it mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture to issue licenses to persons employed to inspect and grade grain by States which have or may hereafter have State grain-inspection departments established by law. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 197, 198, 199, and 200: These amendments are intended to clarify the language. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 201: Under the terms of this section, as passed by the House, the Secretary of Agriculture was au-

thorized to suspend or revoke the license of any person who "knowingly" violated any provision of the bill. The Senate amendment strikes out the word "knowingly." The House recedes.

Amendment No. 202: This amendment provides that no inspector shall be interested in the storing or merchandising of grain or be employed by any person or corporation financially interested in the storing or merchandising of grain. The House agrees with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Amendment No. 203: Section 9 of the bill provides a penalty for violation of certain provisions of the bill. This amendment limits the penalty to violations "knowingly" committed. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 204 and 205: The effect of these amendments is to provide that the merely careless inspecting, grading, or certification of grain shall not subject the inspector to the penal provisions of the bill. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 206: This amendment is intended to clarify the language. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 207: This amendment strikes out the definitions of terms used in the bill, these definitions having been transferred to section 2, as noted under the statement relative to amendment No. 147. The amendment also provides that if any part of the act shall be adjudged invalid, such judgment shall not affect any other part of the act. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 208: This amendment increases to \$250,000 the appropriation for carrying out the provisions of the bill. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 209 and 210: These amendments are intended to clarify the language. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 211: This amendment provides that the terms of this bill shall not prevent selling or buying grain by sample, regardless of its grade. The Senate recedes, the purpose of the amendment being accomplished by the first proviso to section 4, as amended by the managers of the conference.

Amendment No. 212: This amendment authorizes the inclusion of the requirements of fire insurance in the terms and conditions of the bonds required from warehousemen censed under the bill.

Amendment No. 213: This amendment authorizes the purchase of live stock and the erection of barns and other necessary buildings in connection with experiments in dairying and live-stock production in the semiarid and irrigated districts of the western United States. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 214: This amendment increases by \$47,500 the appropriation providing for experiments in dairying and live-stock production in semiarid and irrigated districts of the western United States. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 215: This amendment reduces from \$70,000 to \$55,000 the amount authorized to be expended for the purchase and operation of passenger-carrying vehicles. The House agrees, with an amendment making the amount authorized to be expended for this purpose \$60,000.

Amendment No. 216: This amendment provides that section 5 of the legislative, executive, and judicial act for the fiscal year 1915 shall not be construed to apply to the hire of passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of the field work of the department. The House agrees, with an amendment including the present paragraph within the provision of the Senate amendment. The managers of the conference believe that this amendment as agreed to is in entire harmony with the purpose of the section referred to, and is essential to the efficient conduct of the field work of the department in districts removed from the ordinary means of transportation. A provision of this kind is made necessary by a very recent ruling of the comptroller, and without it the department would have to discontinue much of its work.

Amendment No. 217: This amendment inserts a title for the succeeding paragraph. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 218: This amendment directs the Secretary of Agriculture to submit annually to Congress a statement showing the activities of the department which have been completed and may be discontinued. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 219: The effect of this amendment is to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant to the employees of the department who are members of the National Guard such leave with pay as they are entitled to. This will extend to the employees of the Department of Agriculture the same privilege enjoyed by employees of other branches of the Government. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 220: This amendment substitutes the word "existence" for the word "outbreak" in the paragraph making appropriation for the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 221: This amendment reduces the appropriation for the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease from \$2,500,000 to \$1,250,000. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 222: This amendment authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make payment for animals and property which he may destroy in combating foot-and-mouth disease and prescribes the basis for appraising animals so destroyed. The House agrees, with an amendment providing that the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1916 shall be available for expenditure during the fiscal year 1917.

Amendment No. 223: This amendment represents an amended total. As the \$3,000,000 appropriated by amendment No. 50, upon which the committee of conference failed to agree, is included in this total, the committee of conference consequently failed to agree on this amendment.

A. F. LEVER,
GORDON LEE,
G. N. HAUGEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution covering the matter which I brought before the House a few moments ago.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution No. 336.

Resolved by the House, That the managers on the part of the House in consideration of Senate amendment No. 40 to House bill 15947 may have authority to increase the amount of \$399,000 in conference, and in consideration of Senate amendment No. 145 they have authority to change the word "is" to the words "shall be."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask what this amendment is?

Mr. PADGETT. It does not increase the appropriation at all. It is just a redistribution in order to carry out the policy which the House committee reported, and to have the Senate recede from their amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a brief submitted by myself to the Committee on the Judiciary on the H. Snowden Marshall impeachment case.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a statement he has prepared as to the impeachment proceedings inaugurated against H. Snowden Marshall. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object—but I do not intend to object—the resolution was reported this morning. I would like to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB], if I can, with reference to when it will be voted on? Does my colleague intend to oppose the report of the committee?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Oh, yes. The report of the committee, in my opinion, is erroneous and subjects the committee to just criticism, and will subject this House to public criticism if it is adopted by the House.

Mr. MANN. I did not even hear the report or know what it was. I knew the resolution was reported in this morning. Then it can not be disposed of now?

Mr. WEBB. No; the report is short, and simply recommends that no further proceedings be had on these impeachment charges and that the impeachment resolution lie on the table.

Mr. MANN. I make no objection to the request of my colleague [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield 10 minutes to one of the most efficient and attentive members of the Committee on Agriculture, a gentleman who has justly earned for himself the title of friend of the farmer. I refer to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER]. [Applause.]

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield to me just a minute? I want to ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for one hour on the question of the eight-hour day on Tuesday next, following the usual calendar business and matters on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] asks unanimous consent that on next Tuesday at the close of the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] he be permitted to address the House for not to exceed one hour on the eight-hour day. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 45 minutes on next Tuesday, immediately following the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] asks unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, at the close of the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN], he be permitted to address the House for not to exceed 45 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 12717). The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he was a little premature in putting the question. How much time was yielded to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER]?

Mr. LEVER. Ten minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MANN. There is no time to yield. The conference report has been agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask unanimous consent to cancel the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think I was the only Member of the House who voted to agree to the conference report when the Chair put the question. I desire to withdraw my vote, and I hope the vote will be vacated.

Mr. MANN. I do not think it ought to be vacated. The gentleman from Mississippi can get time without that.

Mr. LEVER. Then I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may address the House for 10 minutes, and I include in that request the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] for 15 minutes. These gentlemen have requested time on the conference report. I am very glad the report has been adopted, but I do not wish to deprive these gentlemen of their opportunity to speak.

Mr. MANN. Is there not a further motion to be made in connection with the Agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. LEVER. There is.

Mr. MANN. Why can not the motion be made, and then these gentlemen get time on that?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I suggest to the gentleman from South Carolina that he make that motion.

Mr. STEENERSON. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] have 10 minutes following the other two.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Will the gentleman make my time 15 minutes?

The SPEAKER. What is the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] each have 15 minutes in which to address the House.

Mr. CANNON. Are these gentlemen to follow the Members who have already obtained unanimous consent to-day? I think my colleague [Mr. RODENBERG] has an hour.

Mr. MANN. I think he will get his time all right. These gentlemen want to speak on subjects relating to the Agricultural bill.

Mr. CANNON. That is all right.

Mr. STEENERSON. I understood the gentleman from South Carolina submitted the conference report.

The SPEAKER. He did submit the conference report.

Mr. STEENERSON. I was not aware that it was to be voted on without discussion. I wanted to ask some questions of the chairman of the committee before the House agreed to the conference report, and the Speaker put the question when the time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] had not expired. I want a chance to find out the effect of the conference report before it is agreed to. It seems to me that that was taking snap judgment on the House.

The SPEAKER. Well, it was—entirely by inadvertence.

Mr. STEENERSON. The action ought to be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Nobody seemed to be wanting to speak, and the Chair put the question on the conference report, and nobody said a word.

Mr. STEENERSON. At that time the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] had the floor.

The SPEAKER. That is true; but the Chair did not know it.

Mr. STEENERSON. Then it was a mistake of fact.

The SPEAKER. Why, of course. It was a mistake on the part of the Speaker.

Mr. STEENERSON. I think I had a right to rely on the fact that the question would not be put until the time of the gentleman from Mississippi had expired.

Mr. MANN. Not at all.

The SPEAKER. The easiest way, as the Chair suggested a while ago, is to cancel the action of the House in adopting the conference report and proceed in the usual way. The Chair asked unanimous consent to do that.

Mr. MANN. I do not think that that ought to be done. The gentleman can get his information all right—

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I will have to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. STEENERSON. We may not want to agree to that conference report. It revolutionizes grain inspection.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his objection. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The vote on agreeing to the conference report is canceled, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] is recognized.

Mr. LEVER. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER]. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate from the bottom of my heart the very kind words spoken by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, of which I have the honor to be a member, in yielding time to me to discuss the Agricultural appropriation bill now before the House. I am a member of the Agricultural Committee, ranking third upon that committee. I was chairman of the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic. The Democratic caucus passed a resolution providing that no Member of the House who had membership on any one of the large committees—in which is included the Committee on Agriculture—should have membership, much less chairmanship, of any other committee. For that reason I resigned the chairmanship of the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic, in order to retain my membership on the Committee on Agriculture, believing that I could be more useful to the people of my district as well as to the people of the United States by serving upon the Committee on Agriculture rather than by serving as chairman of the other committee. Being third upon the committee, I was a member of the subcommittee that framed this Agricultural appropriation bill. I helped in connection with other members of the subcommittee to write the present bill now pending and the one for last year and others preceding it. Therefore, I feel naturally a great interest and pride in the agricultural legislation which is contained in the bill which is now reaching the final stages of its passage in the consideration of the conference report now pending before the House.

Since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives I have taken a great interest in agricultural subjects and agricultural legislation, and in increasing the convenience of the postal facilities for the people in my district as well as the people throughout the country.

INCREASED APPROPRIATIONS FOR AGRICULTURE.

Everybody here knows that I do not believe in any extravagance or the wanton expenditure of money, but while believing in economy, still, nevertheless, I have advocated during my service in this House increased appropriations for agriculture. When I became a Member of the House of Representatives the total appropriation for the agricultural interests of the United States was \$3,000,000.

I have attended session after session and made speeches at various times in favor of increased appropriations, and I am glad that this bill to-day under consideration at the present time, together with the permanent annual appropriations, amounts in round numbers to the sum of \$30,000,000. While \$30,000,000 is a considerable sum, it is comparatively a small amount to take care of the great agricultural interests of the United States of America. This great country is but one great farm, because agriculture is the foundation of every other business throughout the land. [Applause.]

The appropriation of \$30,000,000 to take care of the great farm which, as I said, the United States of America really is, is a small sum when you remember we produce annually \$10,000,000,000 of agricultural products and \$20,000,000,000 of manufactured products, making a total production of \$30,000,000,000—thirty million is a small amount for investment to carry on a business which yearly produces the sum of \$30,000,000,000.

For this reason I have from time to time contended for these increased appropriations, always pointing out, however, that they should be devoted to those objects which will bring the greatest results and benefits to the greatest number of people. [Applause.]

BUREAU OF MARKETS.

In this bill under consideration there is a provision for the Bureau of Markets. It has been increased in this bill over what it was last year, and last year it was increased over what it was the year before. The original item which went into the Agricultural bill establishing the Bureau of Markets was prepared by the chairman of this committee, the Hon. ASBURY F. LEVER, of South Carolina, in consultation with me at the time. He and I sat down at a table together and talked it over and arrived at the language which established this bureau and put it in operation. He wrote it during this consultation, and it was offered to the committee, was adopted, came to the House of Representatives, and became the law of the land. It has begun to furnish the people all over the country with the information they desire. It has begun to furnish them the ways and means of bringing closer together the producer and the consumer, and to eliminate the middleman, so that the producer can get something like the real value of the products he has for sale. [Applause.]

THE FARMERS' WAREHOUSE BILL.

In this bill is also contained the farmers' warehouse bill. I was on the subcommittee which drafted it, and it was reported to the full committee and reported by the full committee to the House of Representatives.

Under this bill the warehouse keeper can receive a Federal license which will secure to the farmers the supervision of the Government, and then the farmer can take his cotton or other product and place it in the warehouse, with the supervision and control of the United States Government behind it, and get his warehouse receipt, which will be a guaranty to anybody to whom he presents it, and he can go to any member bank of the Federal Reserve System or any other bank in the land and secure a loan thereon at a reasonable rate of interest. [Applause.]

It is a measure that the farmers have been asking for, to my knowledge, since I was a boy. They have been knocking at the door and asking Congress to give them recognition, and at last it was left to the Democratic Party to give them that recognition which put the law on the statute book. [Applause.]

FARMERS' GRAIN-GRADING BILL.

Another law included in the appropriation bill is the farmers' grain-grading bill. This is another bill that the farmers throughout the land have been asking for, especially the western farmers, who are more interested in it than are the farmers in my section of the country. Under that the farmers can, no matter where they may be, have their grain graded and have it guaranteed under the supervision of the Government of the United States that it will be correct not only in quality but in quantity and get his just reward for the labor he has bestowed upon it. [Applause.]

GOOD-ROADS BILL.

I favored and supported in this House the bill making an appropriation of \$85,000,000 for good roads, which has passed and become the law of the land. Under it every State in this Union will receive help. The bill gives the further benefit of the recognition of the principle that the United States Government is going to help the people throughout the United States and the States of this Union in building highways throughout the country. That will bring as great benefit to the people as anything else on the face of the earth. [Applause.]

THE PARCEL-POST LAW.

Mr. Speaker, I helped to pass the parcel-post law, which the farmers of this country and the people throughout the land were asking for. I did what I could in securing the enactment of that law. The express companies had been robbing the people of the country, and we passed the parcel-post law and gave quick communication under proper supervision and direction at reasonable rates. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The enactment of that law immediately brought about a reduction even in the express rates of 50 per cent and took that burden off of the American people.

THE RURAL-CREDITS LAW.

Not only that, but I supported during the Congresses preceding and in this Congress the rural-credits bill, which the farmers of the land and the people throughout the country everywhere were demanding, and which every political party in its platform had promised. That is now a law upon the statute books, and it will give to the farmers great relief in furnishing them long-time loans at the lowest possible rates of interest.

RURAL DELIVERY SERVICE.

Not only that, but when I came to Congress there was not a single rural delivery route of any kind in the district which I have the honor to represent upon this floor. I secured every one that is now in operation in the first congressional district in Mississippi. [Applause.] To-day the rural delivery is blessing the people of that district by carrying daily to them their mail and delivering it to them promptly. No greater blessing has been conferred upon the people in the United States of America than that conferred by the Rural Delivery Service, and I feel happy in the fact that I at least secured this service for my people and secured for them every single, solitary route that is now in my district. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, all this is legislation for the farmer, which has been enacted during this Congress and Congresses that have preceded it, but it has all been enacted under the régime and by the votes and through the instrumentalities of the Democratic Party, of course to some extent with the help of our friends on the other side. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I have no hesitation in saying to-day that there has been more constructive legislation enacted during this Democratic administration in the interest of the farmers and for their benefit than was enacted during the whole 16 years of the Republican administration, when they had absolute and complete control of all of the departments of the Government of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Therefore it is easy to determine who are the friends and the real friends of the great producers of the United States.

THE UNDERWOOD TARIFF LAW.

Not only that, but I voted for and helped to pass in this House the Underwood tariff law, which reduced the taxes of the people 50 per cent and put upon the free list for the farmers of the country agricultural implements and bagging and ties and many necessities of life. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They had been asking for that, but it had been denied them and that act gave it to them; and a few days ago I voted on the floor of this House for a bill that repealed all the stamp taxes on mortgages and notes and deeds and everything of that character that have been of great inconvenience and annoyance to the people.

THE CURRENCY LAW.

Not only that, but I voted for and helped to pass upon the floor of this House the great currency law, which during these troublesome and trying times has kept us out of panic, and during all the days to come by the exercise of the powers therein conferred it will continue to keep the power from Wall Street and prevent panics and we will have them no more forever, and their blighting influences will no longer oppress and hold up and rob the people. [Applause.] Instead of panic, prosperity and happiness will be the lot of the people.

THE SHIP-PURCHASE BILL.

I voted for the shipping bill when it passed this House in a former session of Congress and I voted for it when it passed the House in this session of Congress, because I believe, as I said, that this country being one great farm, producing ten billions of dollars of agricultural products and twenty billions of manufactured products annually, ought to be no longer dependent upon the Shipping Trust, and our farmers and our manufacturers ought to be able to get their products to the markets of the world without being at the mercy of that heartless trust. The Shipping Trust absolutely controls the transportation facilities, and the Government of the United States, with its power, should step in and correct this evil and give the people transportation to the markets of the world at the lowest possible rates that can be obtained. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

INSURANCE BUREAU.

It has been demonstrated that the Government can do business of this kind, because the insurance bureau which we brought into effect to give Government insurance in these war times, has proved to be a paying investment. It has taken care of itself and left a profit of \$2,000,000 in the Treasury of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, these are the reasons why I have been staying here upon the job every day in the Congress of the United States, looking after the interests of the farmers and all my constituents, answering promptly their letters, and honestly at-

tending to their business. [Applause.] I wanted them to have these benefits, and it has been my purpose and desire to do in every way possible all I could to secure them. These have been trying times, and many very important matters have been and are still pending. I have stayed here regardless of my personal interest, although I had opposition at home in my district.

At the beginning of the campaign there were three who were contesting with me. One of them, Hon. Guy W. Mitchell, withdrew early in the campaign and did not participate very much in it, and therefore did not engage in much speech making. Hon. J. A. Cunningham participated strenuously in the campaign for two months, but on the 30th day of July he withdrew from the race and retired from the field. From the information I have he made an honest and faithful and courageous campaign, and he did me the justice and kindness to say when I was a thousand miles away, that if he had been in Congress the same length of time that I had he would have voted just exactly as I did vote on all of these great questions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky). The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from South Carolina to yield me a little more time in order to finish this speech.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I have only eight minutes remaining of my hour, and there will be very likely some questions asked of me, and I shall have to consume that time.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I desire only five minutes additional.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman desires only five minutes, I will assure the gentleman from South Carolina that on this side we will not object to an extension of his time beyond the hour.

Mr. LEVER. Very well, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Mississippi. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, this is but another evidence of the great kindness and friendship to me of all the Members on the floor of the House, on both sides of it. It gives me much pleasure to say that I have never yet asked for an extension of time upon the floor of the House since I have been a Member or asked for unanimous consent to speak that it was not cheerfully granted to me. [Applause.] I thank you all.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I will.

Mr. GALLAGHER. What kind of opposition is this of which the gentleman speaks?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It is opposition for the Democratic nomination. This leaves me with only one opponent, Hon. John E. Rankin, who is still contesting with me for the nomination.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman will do him up, will he not?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. That is what my friends say in the first district of Mississippi. [Applause.] He is contesting with me for the Democratic nomination. So far as I am informed he has not criticized a vote I have cast, although I have cast thousands of them since I have been in Congress, and I believe I can say thousands that are record votes in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and so far as I am advised he has not criticized a speech I have made. [Applause.] Therefore, if I have thus served the people during all these years, voting in their interest and speaking in their interest, I do not believe the people in the first congressional district of Mississippi are going to turn me out in the primary election to take place on Tuesday, August 15, 1916. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. They will not; you are too good a friend of the farmer, and the people need you here.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I thank my friend. I know this, that a farmer never swaps off a safe horse in the middle of crop time. [Applause.] And the banker and the merchant and the business man do not discharge faithful employees simply because they have been in their service for many years, and the farmer himself does not discharge the faithful, honest, and conscientious field hand, who day by day labors to produce the very best crops possible on his farm. [Applause.] For that reason I do not believe my people are going to turn away from me when I have been doing all I could for them up here and faithfully laboring for their welfare and for their prosperity. [Applause.] I have stayed here, though, in the face of some criticism, of some misrepresentation, and even in the face of some falsification. There are a few unscrupulous people in my district—thank the Lord, there are not many of them, they are very few—who are so reckless with the truth that I am informed that they have been assiduously and secretly circulating, of course, with the intention, I presume, of making it more public on the day of the primary election, some things which

are false. I know my people and they know me, and I am willing to trust them fully. I do not believe a man, woman, or child in the first congressional district of Mississippi will believe campaign falsehoods circulated at or before the election, when I am a thousand miles away and here at my post of duty serving my constituents. I would have been very glad to have gone home and engaged in the canvass, but I could not leave here, and I will trust the people to take care of my interest and see that I have fair play, and I feel confident they will not let me suffer when I have honestly, faithfully, and promptly attended to their business here and in order to do so been kept away from Mississippi and deprived of the privilege and pleasure of meeting them face to face. Of course it would not be proper to discuss in detail here these false reports and I will not do so.

Now, I have stayed here not only to discharge my duty because it was my duty but I have had the further reason to remain here because our great Democratic Speaker, the Hon. CHAMP CLARK, and our distinguished Democratic leader, the Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, and our great and good President, Hon. Woodrow Wilson, have asked us to remain here in order to maintain a quorum that we may transact the public business and carry into effect Democratic doctrines and carry out Democratic policies and finish the Democratic constructive program of our great party. [Applause.]

I have remained here also to help President Wilson in every way I could to carry out his policies and maintain peace and keep us out of war, because I love peace and abhor war.

He is our Democratic President, and he is now the nominee of the Democratic Party for reelection to the high office of President of the United States; and if we have a Democrat in that office four years from next March, it will be Woodrow Wilson, and hence I prefer to do what I can to uphold his hands and help him in the great effort he is making to maintain peace and continue the prosperity which we are now enjoying. I am a Democrat, and I do not want to tear down the Democratic Party or destroy the confidence of the people in the Democratic President. [Applause.] We owe him a great debt of gratitude for the great service he has rendered our party and the country, and it is the duty of every Democrat to stand by him and support him in the discharge of his duties as President and to help in every way possible to secure his reelection for another term.

To demonstrate the great debt of gratitude we owe him, in conclusion let me call your attention to the victories of peace for which he stands as compared with the victories of war. Look across to the other shore across the seas, and you will see nothing but desolation, destruction, and death, the men being slaughtered in war and sorrow in every home, the tears flowing down the cheeks of widows, and the cry of the orphan heard throughout the length and breadth of those unhappy lands. These are the victories of war.

Look now on the other picture in our beautiful country and you will see prosperity and happiness everywhere, our men buoyant and happy as they cheerfully follow their peaceful pursuits to support their loved ones, joy and happiness in the hearts of the mothers and laughter and song in the souls of the children as they see father and brother at home, the birds singing, the flowers blooming, and everybody contented. These are the victories of peace for which we are indebted to our great President. [Applause.] Therefore, in the realization of his marvelous services we will gather around him, uphold and sustain him during the rest of this term, and march with him onward and upward to grander achievements and more glorious developments, if possible, and on to his victorious reelection for another term. I feel sure that my friends in the first district will see to it on Tuesday, August 15, 1916, that I am retained in Congress to help him in his great work, and that I will be with you here, gentlemen, during next Congress to continue our united efforts for the glory of our great country and the good of all the people. [Great applause.] I thank all the Members of the House for your attention and your kindness.

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

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the general state of the Union.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW].

Mr. **POU**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the general state of affairs in the United States.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted [After a pause.] No objection is heard, and it is so ordered.

Mr. **LEVER**. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentlemen from Iowa [Mr. **HULL**].

Mr. **HULL** of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the farmers and stockmen of this country that this Agricultural bill that we are now about to pass contains in the clause on eradication of foot-and-mouth disease a provision that in the future will protect them against the unjust rules and regulations that were enforced during the recent outbreak of the foot-and-mouth disease. I refer to that clause which provides that "all quarantine regulations" must be "lawful." The inclusion of this word "lawful" is a great satisfaction to us not only because it covers the very point for which we fought when the bill was before the House, but because it will protect the various States against any attempts that might be made by the Bureau of Animal Industry to override State laws by their own rules and regulations.

The insertion of the word "lawful" means that hereafter the Federal Bureau of Animal Industry must conform with the State laws in its regulation of these diseases; or, at least, it means that the farmers can not be deprived of their money simply because they do not obey some fanatic order of any administrative body down here in Washington. It is a vastly different proposition to say that in order to be paid for stock killed a farmer must obey "all quarantine regulations," as was provided in the amendment submitted to this House—the clause to which I objected—and to say that he must obey "all lawful quarantine regulations," as it now is written in the bill. I feel very confident that no one in Iowa will object to this part of the law as it is now written; but practically every one in my district, where we had had the experience we did in this matter, objected to obeying quarantine rules that were not legal.

It was to have this very thing accomplished that we waged such a hard contest months ago, and have been misrepresented thereby since. At that time I insisted that the Bureau of Animal Industry had acted without authority in enforcing quarantines of its own not in accord with State laws. There were some at the time who questioned this statement, but so far I have been unable to find any authority to prove that the National Government has any quarantine rights intrastate, and no one questions their right interstate. To substantiate my statement I quote from Mr. William E. Waltz, dean of the School of Law, University of Maine:

It is universally conceded that quarantine law—that is, laws preventing intercourse for a certain space of time on the part of persons infected, or under suspicion of infection, with others in order to prevent the spread of some contagious or infectious disease—come under that part of the police power which concerns the preservation of the public health. It has been established by a long series of decisions that the police power belongs to the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, and is hence reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

In determining whether a given governmental power rests with the Federal Government or with the States we must start with the presumption that it rests with the States unless such power has been surrendered by the Constitution to the United States, either expressly or by implication, and that the States possess and exercise, except as so restrained, the authority of independent and sovereign States, having exclusive jurisdiction over persons and things within their territory.

It is admitted that the police power is not expressly surrendered by the States, and an examination of the authorities goes to show that there is no adjudicated case holding that this power is delegated to the Federal Government by implication.

In so far as quarantine laws are the legitimate exercise of the police power of the different States as applied to local conditions, legislation along this line rests exclusively with the States, and the Federal Government, in the absence of any power delegated to it expressly or by implication, can not in any way make laws directly dealing with these conditions or superseding to any degree this power originally vested in the States by reason of their independent sovereignty.

It must be admitted that in the absence of an amendment to the Constitution Congress has no power to deal directly with what is properly intrastate and strictly local quarantine, and for many reasons it is well that such is the case.

This proves conclusively that the Bureau of Animal Industry was clearly without authority when it promulgated and enforced those quarantine rules in several States which proved so costly to the farmers. I have been criticized and charged with attempting to deprive the farmers of pay for any stock that might be killed in future outbreaks by raising a point of order against the clause that I did. As a matter of fact, the greater part of that clause which I have been accused of eliminating I did not object to at all. The clause to which I objected was that which simply refers to quarantine regulations, and this was thoroughly understood. This is shown by the RECORD of April 29, page 7099,

when in discussing the arrangement of time the following debate took place:

Mr. **LEVER**. Let me ask the gentleman a question. Is the gentleman going to move to strike it out or make any substantial amendment to it? The question of talk is one thing, and I am willing to give a liberal time. If there is a general proposition to strike out or increase, that is one thing.

Mr. **KING**. I have three amendments that I want to offer in good faith, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. **HULL**] can speak for himself.

Mr. **MADDEX**. I also have an amendment.

Mr. **HULL** of Iowa. I have a point of order and three amendments to make.

Mr. **LEVER**. It will not take long on the point of order, for I know what it is. How would one hour on a side do on the paragraph relating to foot-and-mouth disease?

Now, what took place on May 2, when this bill was under consideration again and I raised the point of order, was that the chairman of this committee, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, insisted that the paragraph go out, and he thereby mutilated his own bill to that extent. In making the point of order my object was not to defeat the proposition to reimburse farmers for stock slaughtered, but to perfect the amendment by eliminating the limitation entirely or amending it by placing the word "lawful" before "all quarantine regulations," as it is now written. This is shown in the RECORD of May 2, on page 7251. I offered the following amendment:

At the end of the Lever amendment 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."

This is the language of the bill without the clause to which I objected, and this amendment was stricken out on a point of order by Mr. **LEVER** himself.

By inserting the word "lawful" we compel no man to obey any rules and regulations unless they are in compliance with the laws of the State in which he lives. It is the object we who fought so long in the House had in view, and we welcome legislation whereby the farmers will be protected from the autocratic methods of a bureau here in Washington.

I want to say that now is the time for this Bureau to prepare to stamp out the next outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease. It is a poor excuse for a department such as this Bureau of Animal Industry to say that in an outbreak of an epidemic like foot-and-mouth disease they are not prepared to fight the disease. This is just exactly what we are paying them for, and they should prepare at all times for an outbreak of all those diseases as well known as foot-and-mouth.

Mr. **MCKENZIE**. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. **HULL** of Iowa. For a question; yes.

Mr. **MCKENZIE**. What would the gentleman do in a State, for example, where they did not have any State quarantine law? How would you take care of the situation in that State?

Mr. **HULL** of Iowa. The legislature ought to pass one.

Mr. **MCKENZIE**. But suppose they did not?

Mr. **HULL** of Iowa. I did not know there was any State that did not have such a law, but that does not make any difference. It does not justify Congress in trying to do something they can not do.

Mr. **MCKENZIE**. The point I am trying to make is, How would the gentleman take care of the situation, in order to protect the general public, where the State has no law?

Mr. **HULL** of Iowa. What State is there that has no quarantine law? I assume, and think I am correct, that every State has such a law. If not, it is time they had one.

Mr. **MCKENZIE**. I am just submitting the proposition.

Mr. **HULL** of Iowa. But what State? I examined a number of State laws, and did not find a State without a law of some kind on the matter. I found a number of States that did not permit the kind of quarantine that this bureau was enforcing in that particular State.

Mr. **MCKENZIE**. I do not know of any State, but I am simply submitting the proposition to find out what the gentleman from Iowa would suggest the Government should do in a case of that kind.

Mr. **HULL** of Iowa. Just what I am suggesting now, that their attention should be called to the fact that they have not that law and that they ought to have one. They have a legislature, and that is the duty of the legislature.

Mr. **MCKENZIE**. But the gentleman's contention, as I understand it, is that the State law should be supreme and that the Federal law should be subject to the State regulation?

Mr. **HULL** of Iowa. I am not contending what should be; I am simply stating what the Constitution permits. You can not change the Constitution and the laws of this country to suit your particular ideas of how best to suppress disease or crime. Those who enforce law must first themselves be law-abiding.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion there?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does not the gentleman think it could be taken care of under police regulation and for the good of the public health in any State?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. By the State; yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. In any State.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Already under their fundamental law.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

It may be true that running a quarantine according to the laws of the several States will not make it as easy as if they were run by one central authority, but nevertheless it is the one way you can run a quarantine in the State and run it legally. If the laws of the several States are not as they should be it is time to find it out, and they should do so at once. They will find that the State of Iowa will gladly meet them more than half way; that they are more anxious than anyone to stamp out contagious disease among the live stock. All they insist upon is that the rules be made practical to the conditions that prevail in the State. The Legislature of the State of Iowa, made up, as it is, largely of practical, level-headed farmers, is certainly good authority on all these matters. In other words, the State of Iowa is very willing to cooperate with the Bureau of Animal Industry, and they expect them to aid and advise them, but they do not expect to turn over the lawmaking power on so drastic a matter as a quarantine to any bureau in Washington and allow them to dictate the law. The Legislature of Iowa will unquestionably protect the farmer so that he can sell stock not diseased or exposed to disease. To deny this right will compel the farmer to quit the live-stock business. They will protect the farmer against quarantine laws not drawn in the capitol of the State and against laws that were drawn in Chicago that robbed the farmer by rigging the market to pay dividends on watered stock and which made possible an insurance graft of huge proportions. They will not permit an embargo being placed on business when there is no evidence of disease. They will not pass laws permitting a bureau here in Washington to issue a law preventing the farmer from driving cattle into sheds and barns located on his own farm when a blizzard is raging outside. In fact, their laws will be sane laws and not insane laws. I believe the results we have obtained in this respect on this bill have justified the efforts we have made.

I have had no personal feeling in this matter. The fight has been a long, hard one, but if I have called attention to the great outrage perpetrated by the Government when it ran the foot-and-mouth quarantine, and have made a repetition of it impossible, I shall feel satisfied and consider the time and effort well spent.

Congress has no power to pass quarantine laws, and it therefore has no power to delegate to anyone that authority, and it is therefore illegal and unconstitutional for any bureau here in Washington to assume that it has this authority. For any bureau here in Washington acting with a bureau in a State to presume to trade or pass this authority from the State to the national bureau is just as wrong. The people of the State, acting through their legislature, are the only ones who are qualified to pass a quarantine law under the Constitution as it is now written, and the people themselves are the only ones that can surrender that power constitutionally.

I have the utmost respect for these bureaus of the Government and the great work they are doing, but when they try to become the dictators of legislatures they are treading on very dangerous ground, and it is time that Congress should let them know that they are only advisers of the Government, and not makers of law. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a matter was brought to my attention on yesterday which, if true, is certainly of great interest to the membership of this House. I recite the story only as it was told to me. I was informed that our distinguished opponents on the other side of the aisle in preparing for the coming campaign are having a series of moving pictures taken; that somewhere not known to the ordinary Republican mortal there is a room fitted up somewhat similar to the Speaker's room; and that the Democratic candidate rushes into that room with a roll of papers under his arm, a look of statesmanship upon his face, and after a consultation with the Speaker receives his blessing and departs.

The next place that he appears is in some room somewhere where the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] receives him, and he sits down and consults with him about matters of important legislation, bills are examined,

and apparently conclusions of great weight are reached. All this scene of the candidate's familiarity with Democratic greatness is placed upon the reel and is to be exhibited to the admiring constituency of the Democratic candidate and his friends.

This picture is labeled "A candidate is not without honor save in his own district."

Now, I do not know that I have any particular criticism to make of this performance. I think I ought to voice one objection, however. I understand that Charlie Chaplin and Mary Pickford get enormous figures for acting in moving pictures. I do not think it is fair to have the honored Speaker and the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina play the leading part in this greatest of picture performances for an ordinary salary. They are hurting the profession.

Then, there is another thing I would suggest to my Democratic friends. I think somewhere along the line they ought to have a scene with the distinguished leader on this side of the House [Mr. MANN], because then they could satisfy their constituents that they at least have been in a position where they might possibly get inoculated with real information and really know what was going on.

But I understand that there are some group pictures also being made and to be used in this campaign by this same outfit. One of those group pictures consists of our distinguished Speaker, Mr. KITCHIN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. FITZGERALD, showing their attitude, their demeanor, and their humor when they received word that the President had changed his position upon the Panama Canal. [Laughter.] It is said that no one who understands lip reading is permitted to look upon this picture. [Laughter.] It is, I am told, labeled "The Outcasts."

Then the next picture shows a group of distinguished southern Senators. First, it shows them when they received the news that the President had indorsed the legislative program for this session with the child-labor bill left out. The next part of the same reel shows them after they had received the news that the President, after consulting his campaign manager, had come over to the Senate and directed that it be passed during this session. And in this second group, standing well in the foreground, is the distinguished Senator from Georgia, Mr. HARDWICK, reading that noted sentence that was written across the Democratic campaign textbook in 1914, "Thank God for Woodrow Wilson."

This pathetic exhibition is labeled, "We favor one term for President."

Now, the next one, according to the information I have, shows a scene at the White House. It shows one of the Democratic candidates going up there to see the President and receiving his orders as to how he should vote, and then the look of satisfaction and of calm content upon his face as he goes back and notifies his constituents as to how he is going to proceed and what measures he is going to support and how he will vote all in the interest of the people. And the next scene shows him after the President has changed his attitude and he has been notified that he has to vote the other way. [Laughter and applause.] That, I think, is labeled "Innocents abroad in Washington." [Laughter.]

Now, the next picture in the series, as I am informed, represents the President situated at a typewriter, working with tremendous energy in his correspondence with the belligerent nations. It is labeled "We are bound to win if the trust does not corner the paper supply."

Then the sixth on the program consists of four reels. It shows the President in 82 distinct and different attitudes upon 41 important questions—upon each side of all of them. [Laughter and applause.] It is said, even with all the power of machinery and with all the rapidity with which a moving picture can be shown, even then justice can not be done to the original. This is the greatest exhibition of the skill of the lightning-change artist ever exhibited to the American people. [Laughter.] This performance is said to be especially adapted for the movies. It is labeled "Stand by the President."

The last of this series, as I am told, represents the President full armored, with sword drawn, his foot upon the neck of Huerta and waiting for the rabble to indicate whether it is thumbs up or thumbs down.

Then we see our great Navy on its way to Mexican waters; we see it drive out the magnificent navy of Mexico that consists of one old dilapidated gunboat. We see the bombardment of Vera Cruz. We see the crumbling buildings, the maimed and killed Mexicans. We see the seizure of the customhouse and the taking of \$1,000,000. We see the flag lowered, the return to our own country, leaving American citizens to be cared for by foreigners. Then we see the funeral at New York of our own killed. We read the magnificent sentences of the President in his funeral oration at that time.

And then we turn to the border. We see the murderous Villa and his victims slain at Columbus. We see the ammunition that has been sent from this country to Villa and to Carranza. We see it used against our own people. We see the massacre at Carrizal. We see the American soldiers marching through the burning sands of the desert and pursuing the bandits that have slaughtered Americans, marching between two parallel lines of railway they were not permitted to use. We see the thousands of soldiers scattered along the Mexican border. We see a procession of American citizens that have been driven from Mexico, of the men that have been murdered in Mexico, and of the American women that have been outraged in Mexico.

We turn and we see at Arlington the new-made graves of our slain. This heroic picture is labeled, "Too proud to fight; or, he has kept us out of war." [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, it looks to me as if the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] has searched around and found it very hard to find something to talk about, if he has to go around all the splendid, magnificent, constructive legislation that this Congress and this administration have enacted, representing the people, and instead undertakes to criticize this great work and the President of this great Republic.

I want to say to the gentleman from the State of Washington that he ought to be happy on this great occasion when the conference report of the great Committee on Agriculture of this House has brought out and agreed upon a bill that carries the greatest blessings ever brought out for 38,000,000 of people in the United States, the great farming class of people, who constitute the backbone and the sinew of this Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Will you vote for this conference report? Can not you see, sir, in this great bill \$30,000,000 for agriculture that is worth more than any other \$400,000,000 which Congress has appropriated in the last 50 years? Can you not see, sir, the great benefit that is going into the agricultural-extension work, the great benefit that is going into the special field seeds and garden seeds which the conferees put back into this bill after those provisions had been stricken out by the Senate? Can you not see the great benefit to the cattle raisers, the truck farmers, the grain farmers, and the cotton farmers?

You, sir, are criticizing the President and the Democratic Party. You are talking about back numbers and dead issues in the past. You, sir, are unable to see in our constructive work the great benefits that are coming to the humble homes of millions of poor people and the firesides of the farmers of this country.

I think you ought to rise up with the great mass of the American people and thank God that we have in this country peace, happiness, and prosperity, when all Europe is engaged in war. There, sir, across the deep Atlantic you have the picture of the widow and orphan, with the briny tears running down their cheeks, standing before a grave containing the body of a brave man, killed in battle—for what? Because some crowned king or royal potentate said there must be war, and the great masses, the common people of Europe, are dying daily, sir, in consequence.

You want to see the United States engaged in that sort of business. You have in this country the workingman, the farmer, the business man, and the professional man, all happy in prosperity. Their wives are happy, their children are happy, they have smiles and laughter in their hearts, but the gentleman from Washington can not appreciate that. He can not appreciate what this great party of construction and this great patriotic President has done in keeping this country at peace, in keeping it in strict neutrality, in making prosperity, happiness, and joy instead of devastation, destruction, and despair, according to the ludicrous gentleman from the State of Washington. Thanks be to Almighty God that the majority of men who compose this great body do not have in their hearts the spirit that seems to animate the gentleman from Washington when he delivered that 10-minute utterance just preceding me. Thank God we have a President and a Democratic Congress that stand for peace instead of for war, destruction, sorrow, and devastation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

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

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman intend to make any statement whatever as to the conference report?

Mr. LEVER. I would be very glad to answer any questions that may be asked in regard to it.

Mr. ANDERSON. The House conferees appear to have receded from the House disagreements in practically all of the amendments adopted by the Senate to the grain-grading section. I was somewhat curious to learn what arguments induced the conferees to recede, in view of the fact that I had endeavored to secure the adoption of some of these amendments on the floor and in the committee without avail.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will point out some specific amendments concerning which he desires information, I can probably give him the information he desires. I will say this, however, that the House conferees have felt, with reference to the grain-grading bill, that they have receded from the mere nonessential, and have won out on the essential, propositions in conference between the two bodies.

A great many of the recessions as to that bill are with reference to the insertion of the words "interstate or foreign commerce" or "consigned for sale," and things of that kind—simple changes of language. In my judgment they do not amount to a very great deal. We feel that on the essential propositions the House conferees have won substantially all along the line.

Mr. ANDERSON. The amendments that I had particularly in my mind were those beginning with No. 191 to No. 196, inclusive. The proviso as now amended requires the Secretary of Agriculture to issue licenses to inspectors who are authorized to inspect grain under State laws in the States in which they have State grain-inspection systems. I am in favor of that amendment. I tried to have it adopted on the floor and in the committee.

I was wondering what arguments were advanced by the Senate conferees that induced the conferees on the part of the House to accept the amendments, in view of the fact that the bill as originally reported to the House was declared to be so good that it was impossible to amend it in any respect on the floor when it was here.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEN], who was on the floor at the time and who was also a member of the conference committee.

Mr. RUBEN. I will say to the gentleman in regard to these amendments that the bill as it left the House provided that the Secretary of Agriculture should, in issuing these licenses, give preference to the men who inspect the grain in the States where they have grain-inspection systems provided by law.

In effect the Department of Agriculture would do that anyway. So we simply agreed to the Senate amendment, and put into the bill what would have been done by the Agricultural Department anyway.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman's view about that proposition appears to have changed since the bill passed the House.

Mr. RUBEN. Oh, no; the gentleman's view has not changed. The gentleman's view is now just as it was before.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have a very distinct recollection of an attempt to secure the adoption of this amendment in the committee and on the floor without success.

Mr. RUBEN. The gentleman's view and the committee's view may not be the same, but my view has always been that these inspectors ought to be licensed by the Secretary of Agriculture. That is my personal view. The committee thought otherwise, and on the floor of the House I stood with the committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. Now, I should like to direct the attention of the gentleman to amendment 174. The House conferees appear to have succeeded in getting the consent of the Senate conferees to recede from that amendment. That amendment, as adopted by the Senate, is very important from the standpoint of States like Minnesota, that have State grain inspection established by law. It provides that the appeal shall be from the final decision in the State; and if stricken out, the appeal will be from the original inspection in the State, and will have the effect of wiping out the various grain boards of appeal in the States.

Mr. RUBEN. The view of the House conferees was that if you had an appeal first to the State authorities and then to the Secretary of Agriculture, you would simply complicate matters. We thought the best thing was to have the appeal directly to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture establishes these grades, and enforces the grain grading throughout the country, and we thought it would be much better to have the appeal made directly to him; and the House conferees held to that view, and the Senate conferees receded.

Mr. ANDERSON. It seems to me the view of the House conferees on that proposition is somewhat inconsistent with their

view with respect to the rest of the bill. As to the rest of the bill the House conferees apparently have been willing to retain the various State inspection systems as they exist in the States now, but with respect to appeals they appear to have taken an entirely different view.

Mr. RUBEY. I will say to the gentleman that this appeal clause, section 6 of this bill, is the only provision in the bill which throws around the inspection system of the country the safeguards necessary to see that the grand standards are enforced, and that the grades are adopted by the various States and throughout the country, and the appeal is made directly to the Secretary of Agriculture in order that we may have uniformity in applying the standards and have a uniform system of grading; in other words, to see that standards are applied uniformly throughout the country.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think you are going to get uniformity in that way, for this reason, that in the case of intrastate shipments the appeal will necessarily be to the State board of appeals, and their decision in that case, I suppose, will be final, while, if it is an interstate shipment, the appeal will be to the Secretary of Agriculture. The result will be that you will have two final decisions, one determination final in the case of intrastate shipments and the other determination final in the case of interstate shipments. Consequently, instead of having uniformity you will have a complete lack of uniformity and a complete disagreement.

Mr. RUBEY. The gentleman realizes, of course, that a large per cent of the grain—90 per cent of it—goes into interstate and foreign commerce, and the intrastate grain trade is a very small part of the entire amount.

Mr. ANDERSON. However small it may be, it is nevertheless entitled to the consideration of the committee and of the conferees.

Mr. RUBEY. This bill is for the purpose of taking care of interstate and foreign commerce. We have nothing whatever to do with the intrastate grain shipments.

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course, I have no disposition whatever to criticize the House conferees. I do want to say, however, that in my judgment this bill in its operation will give rise to very serious complaint and objection, and that before it has been in operation very long it will be found necessary to amend it in very many and very material particulars.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture a question.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that the hour allotted to me may be extended 10 minutes. There are several gentlemen who desire to get in.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that his time may be extended 10 minutes, so that he may yield to other gentlemen. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LEVER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. COX. How much do the Senate appropriations in this bill amount to compared to those carried in the bill when it left the House, exclusive of Senate amendment 50, which relates to the purchase of land in the Appalachian forest?

Mr. LEVER. The bill as it passed the Senate, leaving out the Appalachian and White Mountain appropriation of \$3,000,000, is about \$670,000 less than the bill as it left the House.

Mr. COX. I think the Senate should be congratulated, for once in its long history, on having reduced the amount of an appropriation bill instead of increasing it.

Mr. LEVER. Before the gentleman extends his congratulation, let me say that \$1,250,000 of that is a reduction in the \$2,500,000 insurance fund for the foot-and-mouth disease, which, from present indications, will not be needed.

Mr. COX. I do not care very much where the reduction comes, so long as it is a reduction. What disposition was finally made of amendment 59, the investigation of experiments for the purpose of determining colors? Did the House or Senate recede?

Mr. LEVER. The Senate committee and the Senate itself restored to the bill the language which was reported by the House committee.

Mr. COX. Then the \$50,000 originally carried in the House bill is available for that purpose?

Mr. LEVER. Exactly.

Mr. COX. I think that is a wise provision. Now I want to get information in relation to one more amendment, amendment 65. What was done with that, finally? Was that money turned over to the Agricultural Department, to let them use it as an indeterminate fund, or was it covered into the Treasury?

Mr. LEVER. The House agreed to that proposition with an amendment providing that whatever money might be received should be turned into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. COX. And I believe the Senate receded from its artesian-well proposition?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] three minutes.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, I quite concur with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] that in order to have a workable bill there will have to be amendments to the grain-grading proposition, but I trust that when those amendments are made they will not be made along the line suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota. The real contest in the grain-grading bill has been between two or three States which have already grain-grading laws, and which provide for their own inspectors, and those who desire grain grading as it ought to be by the General Government for interstate and foreign shipment. It has been their contest and fight all along the line. So that when we started out to have governmental grading of grain the grain producers of the country did not want the Government to yield the control of this grading to these three or four States that have great grain markets such as Minnesota, Illinois, and Missouri.

When the first grain-grading bill was put through the House it was made permissive upon the part of the Secretary of Agriculture to license the men who were in the service of the States. Later on the bill which passed the House this term gave them the preference. Now, the final move has been taken by the Senate and agreed to by the conferees of the House which practically gives these States which have the special grain-grading laws absolute control. Because they have the power under the conferees' report to say in effect what men, and only what men, shall ever become inspectors for the purpose of grading grain which goes into interstate and foreign commerce.

Mr. RUBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. RUBEY. The gentleman will recollect that another section gives the Secretary of Agriculture the right to revoke these licenses.

Mr. SLOAN. That is true, of course.

Mr. RUBEY. It gives him not only the right but it directs him to appoint them, and it gives him the absolute right to revoke the licenses, and in addition to that in another section it imposes a heavy penalty and a fine upon licensed inspectors for any malfeasance in office.

Mr. SLOAN. I desired to make myself plain in this. As it is now under this bill, no man can become an inspector in these States until he has become a licensee from the State. It is true that the Secretary of Agriculture—

Mr. RUBEY. The gentleman is mistaken in that. The men who are now employed in the State department will be licensed, but this does not prohibit the department from licensing others in addition.

Mr. SLOAN. There must be a great increase in the amount of grain in interstate and foreign commerce before he will have an opportunity to appoint others. Unless the amount is materially increased the inspectors have nothing to do beyond what they now have. So in the initial selection the men who are to grade the interstate grain under this bill will be those who now grade the grain in the markets and have graded the grain under these State commissions, or whatever they may be called.

Mr. RUBEY. We have thrown around it every possible safeguard that we could, and if these men do not show themselves to be competent, the Secretary of Agriculture can remove them and appoint others.

Mr. SLOAN. That is true; but not every safeguard is thrown around it; the greatest safeguard from a national standpoint would be to place in the Secretary of Agriculture the power to select these men himself. If we are to have a national grain-grading law it ought to be national and not at the dictation of the several States—a grading system which constituted the real demand for the national legislation. If the people of the United States were satisfied with State control of grading, as it has been conducted for the last 10 or 20 years, there would have been no occasion whatever for grain-grading legislation. This report is to a large extent a surrender to the control of grain-grading organizations, dissatisfaction with which prompted this grading legislation.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEY. If I have the time.

Mr. STEENERSON. I think the question has been answered, but I want to be sure. I want to ask the gentleman whether, on page 117, amendments 190, 191, 192, and 193 limit the inspectors to those appointed by the States, or whether, under this bill, the Secretary of Agriculture can appoint those who are not inspectors?

Mr. RUBEY. He must appoint those now employed by States, but he can appoint in addition others that may be needed.

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not see that in the bill.

Mr. RUBEY. The gentleman will find in the last section of the bill, that the Secretary of Agriculture is given the right to appoint as many as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

Mr. STEENERSON. There is created under section 5 the board of appeals.

Mr. RUBEY. No; the board of appeals amendment introduced in the Senate was receded from by the Senate conferees.

Mr. STEENERSON. So there is no board of appeals?

Mr. RUBEY. No board of appeals.

Mr. STEENERSON. The appeal is simply to the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. RUBEY. To the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. STEENERSON. Is it supposed that the Secretary will attend and decide these appeals in person?

Mr. RUBEY. No. I will say in explanation of that that there are in this country 30 or 40 great grain markets, and in each of these markets the Secretary will have his representatives, one or more, as the business of that particular center may require. These men will be experts in grain, and they will pass upon each and every appeal immediately after it is made, so as to avoid any delay, absolutely.

Mr. STEENERSON. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. RUBEY. We want the appeals to be decided at once, so as to avoid delay.

Mr. STEENERSON. It does not contemplate that an appeal shall lie from the Secretary of Agriculture or his representative to Washington?

Mr. RUBEY. No, indeed.

Mr. STEENERSON. That would make unnecessary delay.

Mr. RUBEY. Unnecessary delay, demurrage, and so forth.

Mr. STEENERSON. There is no further appeal?

Mr. RUBEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. STEENERSON. The other point I had in mind has been covered by my colleague.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Rubey] for two minutes.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Members of the House in connection with the grain-standards act that this legislation or similar legislation has been pending in Congress for many years. There are two schools of thought. One that which seeks to have Government inspection and the other that which seeks to have Government supervision. The bill which we have passed, and which we are agreeing to here to-day, is a bill providing for Government supervision over grain grading throughout the country. The bill as it passed the House, and as it has been agreed to in conference, is, in my opinion, a most excellent measure, will meet the conditions of the country, and will prove satisfactory to everyone who has to do with grain, from the man who produces it on the farm to the miller who converts it into flour, or to the grain dealer who ships it into foreign lands. I believe that the passage of this act marks a great advance step along the line of the establishment of Government standards for agricultural products. I am satisfied that it will be acceptable to the people of the country.

Mr. STEENERSON. Why does the gentleman say that this gives merely supervision of inspection? It seems to me that it provides for inspection.

Mr. RUBEY. It provides, in the first place, for the establishment of grain standards. Then the Secretary of Agriculture licenses men throughout the country to grade the grain. In States which have State grain inspection established by law the inspectors are employed by the States and paid by the State; in other States the inspectors are employed, but paid by boards of trade and chambers of commerce, as at present. The Government itself comes in as a supervisor of the grading in each one of the great grain markets, so that in reality instead of the Government appointing thousands of men and paying them salaries to go out and grade grain in every part of the country this bill simply provides for supervision of the grading of grain by men appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and these men will see that the standards are applied correctly and justly and that the grain is given the grade that rightly belongs to it.

Mr. STEENERSON. It seems to me that when the Secretary decides the appeal he actually grades the grain.

Mr. RUBEY. No; when he decides the appeal he simply passes upon the work done by these grain graders or inspectors.

Mr. STEENERSON. And they are his own subordinates.

Mr. RUBEY. And exercise supervision over the grading. Not only that, but when this law gets into full operation, and as these men are employed in first one market and then another

and are being transferred from one market to another, supervising the grading in one place and then supervising it in another, they will naturally unify the system and bring about a uniform application of the grain standards throughout the country.

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

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The conference report was agreed to.

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

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 50, by Mr. LEVER:
"I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 50, and agree to the same."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 50, and agree to the same.

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

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. There are four amendments that were not agreed to. They are all dependent upon this amendment. Could we not have, by unanimous consent, a motion covering all four of the amendments?

Mr. LEVER. I thought if my motion should prevail, then it would be necessary to make further motions with reference to these other amendments; but if my motion should be voted down, then another motion would not be necessary with respect to these other amendments.

Mr. MANN. I understand; but why should we not have an agreement that the motion should cover all four of the amendments? They are all the same thing.

Mr. LEVER. No; they are not the same. The other motions that I should make would be to concur in the different Senate amendments with an amendment, so as to correct the totals.

Mr. MANN. Very well.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 50.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I also offer the following motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 54, by Mr. LEVER:
"I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate No. 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:
"In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert \$8,549,735."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 54 and concur in the same with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. Also the following motion:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 112, by Mr. LEVER:
"I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 112, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:
"In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment, insert \$25,125,852."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 112 and concur in the same with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. I also offer the following motion, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 223, by Mr. LEVER:
"I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 223, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:
"In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment, insert \$26,948,852."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 223 and concur in the same with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the Agricultural bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on Senate amendment No. 50.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLARK of Florida). Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KONOP] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KONOP. Mr. Speaker, when the present session of Congress comes to an end legislation of great importance to the country will have been enacted into law. Since the opening of the Sixty-second Congress in 1911, the first Democratic Congress since 1895, more reform and progressive legislation, more legislation for the benefit of the great masses, have been placed on the statute books than in any period of our history. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Because of a Democratic administration at Washington we now elect United States Senators by popular vote, and we have a publicity law which insures the honest election of Senators and Representatives.

We have the income tax, which places the burden of taxation on those best able to pay, and nets to the Treasury nearly \$140,000,000 a year. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We have the Underwood tariff law, the first honest downward revision of the tariff in a quarter of a century, and we will have a nonpartisan tariff commission which will prevent the tariff from being used as a football of politics in the future. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We have a new banking and currency system which has emancipated the American people from the money changers of Wall Street.

We have the Federal Trade Commission and the Clayton anti-trust law for the protection of honest business men and the encouragement of honest business.

We have passed a law for the physical valuation of railroad properties in order to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix just passenger and freight rates.

We have enacted liberal pension laws to take care of the old soldier and his widow in their old age.

And what about the 25,000,000 men in this country who labor by the sweat of their brows? For years they have been petitioning Congress for legislation, but not until after the election of a Democratic majority in the Sixty-second Congress were these petitions heard.

We have a Secretary of Labor, and labor now occupies a prominent position at the President's Cabinet table.

We have an eight-hour law on works done for the Government as well as work done by the Government.

We have the children's bureau for the protection and welfare of the youth of the country, and we will have a child-labor law.

We now have laws for the safety and protection of workmen in hazardous occupations, such as the phosphorous match act, the Bureau of Mines act, and Bureau of Safety Appliances.

We now have a seaman's law which has liberated the seamen, and we have exempted labor unions from the operation of the antitrust law, thereby liberating the laboring man and elevating him above property and the almighty dollar.

We created a Commission on Industrial Relations, whose recent report is opening the eyes of the country to our industrial problem; and we have passed a law providing for a Board of Mediation and Conciliation which has successfully adjusted differences between employers and employees.

We have given to labor a trial by jury in contempt cases and limited the use of the injunction in labor disputes.

We have elevated the post-office employees to the plane of free American citizens by removing gag rules that were promulgated by President Roosevelt and President Taft.

The House has passed a workman's compensation bill, and a bill providing for the retirement of superannuated postal employees has been favorably reported from a House committee and is now on the calendar of the House.

And for the farmers of the country—besides all the progressive and reform legislation, we have extended the Rural Free Delivery System and established a Parcel Post System.

We have given the farmer a rural-credit system for which he has been begging for so these many years.

We have passed a bill for agricultural extension work, a warehouse bill, and a bill to stop gambling in farm products.

We have enacted a good-roads law which extends Federal aid to road building.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KONOP. Yes, sir.

Mr. DENISON. I noticed in enumerating the various laws I did not understand my colleague to mention the immigration bill. Was that omitted intentionally or by oversight?

Mr. KONOP. It has not become a law yet.

Mr. DENISON. I know, but the gentleman has mentioned several others that have not become laws.

Mr. KONOP. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. The child-labor bill has not become a law; the corrupt-practices bill has not become a law.

Mr. KONOP. We have now a publicity law, but the new law has passed the House of Representatives.

Mr. DENISON. But I am just wondering if my colleague omitted that by oversight or intended to mention that.

Mr. KONOP. I can mention that if the gentleman wants me to do so.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. KONOP. Certainly.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Did the Republican Party during its tenure of 16 years pass an immigration bill or any of the other bills to which the gentleman has referred?

Mr. KONOP. I do not think so.

Mr. STEENERSON. If the gentleman will permit, the gentleman referred to the parcel-post law. The gentleman is aware of the fact that was passed during the Taft administration and took effect the 1st of January before this Democratic administration—

Mr. KONOP. But it did not pass until we got a Democratic Congress here. The gentleman's party were here for 16 years and did not enact it into law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman is exaggerating. The Senate was the body that was—

Mr. KONOP. Yes; but none of this legislation which might have been considered and passed was passed and became a law until you had a Democratic Congress here. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. STEENERSON. I desire to say to the gentleman—

Mr. KONOP. I do not yield further, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, such is the record of achievement in legislation of the Democratic Party. In the past you have charged that party with obstruction. You have charged us with being a party of negation. You have unjustly charged us with causing business calamity and depression. You have bragged about a prosperity that was trust made and subservient to big business. You have talked about the full dinner pail.

And what about to-day? Under a Democratic administration we are enjoying the greatest prosperity in the history of our country, not a temporary trust-made prosperity, but a lasting prosperity; a prosperity for all; a prosperity for both big and small; a prosperity of freedom and equality among our business men and people. I challenge a comparison of the record of the Democratic Party for constructive legislation with that of any party at any time. I challenge a comparison of the prosperous condition of the country to-day with that of any period of our history. For 16 years you have been in power. You have had control of every department of Government. Why did not you pass this legislation? What do you offer now? What constructive legislation do you promise to enact if you are returned to power? Your platform that you have adopted at Chicago can be condensed into one resolve: "Whereas you are in and we are out, therefore be it resolved that you get out and let us in." You are looking for the jobs and offer no service to the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But, Mr. Speaker, this is not all. When this session ends we will have provided for the protection, security, and lasting peace of a hundred million people. We will have provided an Army and a Navy sufficient and able to protect the interests and honor of our Republic and of its citizens everywhere. We do not want war. These preparations are not for war. These are preparations against war. We love peace. God grant that there will never be another war. But why are we unprepared? Who is responsible for this condition? Who has been in power for 16 years before the Wilson administration? At no time in the history of our country has any administration equaled the present in the matter of providing adequate national defense. In spite of the boisterous noise and bluster of his predecessors about our Army and Navy, it was President Wilson who, by his patriotism and great leadership, has called the attention of the country to our unprepared condition and created a demand for adequate national defense. President Wilson stands as an incomparable giant among the leaders of the movement for national defense, national unity and security.

Mr. Speaker, while making adequate preparations against war, the greatest achievement of the administration is that our great leader has kept us at peace with the world. While civilized Europe has been involved in the greatest slaughter of humanity during the past two years, President Wilson has kept us at peace. Time and time again during the past three years arose occasions that "tried men's souls." Calm, patient, and patriotic, the President has never wavered. He has triumphantly piloted the ship of state through a most angry sea. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On the eve of a great election misrepresentations are and will be made. Facts are distorted; nationality will be arrayed against nationality; creed against creed. Charges of bad faith, lack of wisdom, lack of courage and patriotism, and want of neutrality are and will be heard from the platform and appear in the hostile press. All for one purpose. All for the purpose of befogging the issue and defeating for reelection a man who has kept us at peace and insured prosperity. But, Mr. Speaker, the American people know where Woodrow Wilson has stood and where he stands to-day. He stands for America "first, last, and all the time," and for peace and prosperity to her people.

In the handling of the Mexican question you charge him with weakness. I deny the charge. It takes strength to do right when it is popular to do wrong. You say he has been too patient. Thank God that he has been patient and prudent and has kept us out of war with that unfortunate country. Do you think it would have been any honor to our flag for a country of 100,000,000 to fight 15,000,000 half-civilized Indians? You say that the President has been wrong. In what particulars has he been wrong? What would you have done in that delicate situation? What will you do should you—God forbid—be placed into power? Will you go to war? You can not win on a general charge like that. The American people demand particulars. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In the handling of the foreign relations with belligerents in Europe, the pro-English have been charging the President with weakness for not going to war with Germany, and the pro-Germans have been charging him with partiality and unneutrality. Has the President been right in these controversies? All belligerents admit it. Germany admits it. The allies admit it. All belligerents know that Woodrow Wilson has stood for international law and international rights. You say he has been wrong. In what particular has he been wrong? What would you have done? Would you have gone to war? The American people will demand that you make your charges more definite and certain. No, Mr. Speaker; the people know that President Wilson's handling of international affairs has kept us at peace and has redounded to the honor and glory of our country.

In the present campaign every effort is being made to line up the German-American vote against the President. Everything is done to misconstrue the President's attitude and his utterances. There is much idle talk about the hyphen. Charges are made that the President has accused German-Americans of disloyalty. I deny that charge. No act nor utterance that the President has made can be so construed. Let me quote to you the President's words on different occasions that are being misconstrued for political purposes.

At the unveiling of the Barry Monument at Washington on May 16, 1914, two and a half months before the outbreak of the European war, in the course of his address, President Wilson said:

John Barry was an Irishman, but his heart crossed the Atlantic with him. He did not leave it in Ireland. And the test for all of us, for all of us had our origins on the other side of the sea, is whether we will assist in enabling America to live her separate and independent life, retaining our ancient affections, indeed, but determining everything that we do by the interests that exist on this side of the sea. Some Americans need hyphens in their names because only part of them has come over; but when the whole man has come over, heart and thought and all, the hyphen drops of its own weight out of his name. This man was not an Irish-American. He was an Irishman who became an American. I venture to say he voted with regard to the questions as they looked on this side of the water and not as they looked on the other side; and that is my infallible test of a genuine American, that when he votes, or when he acts, or when he fights his heart and his thought are centered nowhere but in the emotions and purposes and policies of the United States.

Can any American citizen, of whatever race or nationality, take offense at such a plea for national unity and undivided loyalty? Now, let me quote to you from the President's message in December, 1915:

There are citizens of the United States, I blush to admit, born under other flags but welcomed under our generous naturalization laws to the full freedom and opportunity of America, who have poured the poison of disloyalty into the very arteries of our national life; who have sought to bring the authority and good name of our Government into contempt, to destroy our industries wherever they thought it effective for their vindictive purposes to strike at them, and to

debase our politics to the uses of foreign intrigue. Their number is not great as compared with the whole number of those sturdy hosts by which our Nation has been enriched in recent generations out of virile foreign stocks, but it is great enough to have brought deep disgrace upon us.

And further, he said:

There are some men among us and many resident abroad who, though born and bred in the United States and calling themselves Americans, have so forgotten themselves and their honor as citizens as to put their passionate sympathy with one or the other side in the great European conflict above their regard for the peace and dignity of the United States. They also preach and practice disloyalty.

On February 23, 1916, he said this to a committee of Hungarians who called at the White House:

I have never doubted for a moment the feeling that gentlemen such as yourselves have for America. I recognize you as just as much Americans as anybody born in this country. I have deplored, and I am sure you have united with me in deploring, the spirit which has been manifested by some who have misrepresented those for whom they professed to speak, and my public protests have been against what they said and against their misrepresentations of what I felt sure was the sentiment of the rank and file of those Americans born on the other side of the water who have come and enriched America by giving her their talent and their work and their allegiance.

On May 2, 1916, the President spoke as follows:

You have heard a great deal about the hyphen. I, for one, have never been deceived. The number of persons of really divided allegiance in this country is very small, and if I had been born in some other country I would, for one, resent the representations which have been made by those who were not the spokesmen of those for whom they pretended to speak in suggesting a divided allegiance.

On Memorial Day, 1916, at Arlington, he said this:

We have no criticism for men who love the place of their birth and the source of their origin. All that we do criticize is that in some instances—they are not very numerous—but in some instances men have allowed this old ardor of another nationality to overthrow their ardor for the nationality to which they have given their new and voluntary allegiance.

On Flag Day the President used these words:

There is disloyalty in America. It proceeds from a minority, a very small minority, but a very active and subtle minority. It works underground, but it also shows its ugly head where we can see it, and there are those at this moment who are trying to levy a species of political blackmail, saying, "Do what we wish in the interest of foreign sentiment or we will wreak our vengeance at the polls." That is the sort of thing against which the American Nation will turn with a might and triumph of sentiment that will teach these gentlemen once for all that loyalty to the flag is the first test of tolerance in the United States.

And, again, June, 1913, he said:

Certain men—I have never believed a great number—born in other lands have in recent months thought more of these lands than they have of the honor and interest of the Government under which they are now living. They have even gone so far as to draw apart in spirit and in organization from the rest of us to accomplish some special object of their own. I am not here going to enter any criticism of these people, but I do want to say this, that such a thing as that is absolutely incompatible with the fundamental idea of loyalty, and that loyalty is not a self-pleasing virtue. I am not bound to be loyal to the United States to please myself. I am bound to be loyal to the United States because I live under its laws and am its citizen, and, whether it hurts me or whether it benefits me, I am obliged to be loyal.

Mr. Speaker, these are the utterances of a typical American President. These utterances plead for unity in America and loyalty to America. The President has not attacked German-Americans. He has not attacked British-Americans, French-Americans, nor any other Americans. The President has attacked a few American citizens for disloyalty to America. His words apply to all citizens who are disloyal. A British-American, a French-American, a German-American, an Italian-American, or any other American who is disloyal to the American Republic by placing the interests of some foreign country against those of America is the one singled by the President. The President clearly differentiates between the loyal citizens of every blood and race and those who are disloyal. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Political enemies may twist and distort these statements and try to prejudice the German-American voters of this country against the President. A few leaders in the German-American Alliance may frame up resolutions against him; but the great mass of men of German blood, men whose patriotism and loyalty to this country have been demonstrated and never questioned—these men will not falter; they will not let their loyalty to their country be made a footstool of politics. Typical of these patriotic citizens of German blood and the finest example of American citizenship is Gen. Frederick C. Winkler, of Milwaukee. A representative German-American, a soldier who fought for the Union, a lifelong Republican, Gen. Winkler sent the following telegram to President Wilson:

Have read your New York Press Club address with great satisfaction. A Republican voter since 1860, I hold that in the present crisis the party has no place. True Americanism must stand by the man who manfully stands at the helm. I support your reelection.

JULY 4, 1916.

F. C. WINKLER.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let me quote what the Waldbote, a German weekly of Medford, Wis., says about the misrepresentation of President Wilson's remarks for political purposes:

Party politics are the sole motive of misinterpreting the reference of President Wilson to disloyal citizens. But there are writers and public speakers who are demagogues enough to do such a monstrous injustice to the President of the United States as a means to their political ends.

President Wilson declared on two different occasions and said practically the same thing in the Democratic national platform, "that there exists in the United States a small number of such, who conspire for the purpose of advancing the interests of foreign countries and to the prejudice of our own country." The President said explicitly that the number was only small and designated no nationality.

But, orally and in writing, it is preached to the German-Americans of the whole country for party political ends that President Wilson means exclusively German-Americans and all German-Americans.

The purpose back of such demagogic substitution of a false interpretation to the words of the President is clear. It is a monstrous injustice.

Let us be just.

On the efforts to deliver the German-American vote against the President, the same German paper says:

German-Americans are not poll cattle. They will vote independently, and the Waldbote believes that the Democratic Party will lose fewer German-American votes than the Republican Party. Many German Republicans will vote for Wilson, because he kept the country out of war, while they know that under any Republican administration it would have been involved long ago.

Mr. Speaker, we have a great country. We are a great cosmopolitan people. Our country is made up of all the peoples of Europe. We have the English and the Scotch; we have the sturdy, stalwart Scandinavian, the romantic Italian; we have the industrious German, the versatile Irishman; we have the polished Frenchman, the progressive Belgian and Hollander; we have the hard-working Poles and Bohemians, the despised Greeks, and the persecuted Jew. They all came to our shores. They make up a new people, a new race, a new nation. Under a free Government they have builded a grand Nation, the brightest star in the galaxy of nations. They love their home, their country, their flag. Should they divide now into a confederation of nationalities? When there is danger to our national unity; when for political purposes, men here and there, through organized effort, try to ally nationality against nationality; when men put alien interests above those of this Republic, should not the President, the spokesman of all these people, plead in behalf of undivided allegiance to but one country and one flag?

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party enters upon a campaign for true Americanism. It presents a record of achievement unequalled in any period of our history. It presents a candidate that has championed the cause of true Americanism and peace, preparedness, and prosperity. It presents a statesman who has kept faith and made good. All it asks is justice at the hands of patriotic American citizens. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, now I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks concerning some tabulations of wage increases in the past few years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks as indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to my colleague be extended for one-half an hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG] be extended for one-half an hour. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I follow the gentleman from Illinois, and I asked for only 30 minutes the other day. I think I will need about 20 minutes, and I ask for 30 minutes additional.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that his time be extended for 30 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. Would the gentleman from Alabama prefer to continue this afternoon or to proceed the first thing to-morrow?

Mr. HEFLIN. Do we meet to-morrow?

Mr. MANN. We will have a meeting to-morrow. There are several gentlemen allotted time this afternoon, and we will meet to-morrow and they will have an opportunity to proceed. It will be pretty late this afternoon, but the gentleman can determine later. He has his hour anyhow.

Mr. HEFLIN. All right, I will determine later, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RODENBERG. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House [applause], four years ago, owing to a most unfortunate division in the ranks of the Republican Party, Woodrow Wilson was elected President of the United States by a minority

vote of the people and with him there came into power a Congress Democratic in both branches. For 16 years prior to 1912 the Republican Party had been in complete control of the destinies of the Nation, and during that time it made a record of patriotic achievement unparalleled in all the annals of political history. [Applause on the Republican side.] Prosperity was at high tide in every branch of human endeavor. Labor was steadily employed at the highest wages ever paid. The farmer received good prices for his products, the merchant was happy and contented, the manufacturer had an abundance of orders, the banks had plenty of money which they were prepared to loan at reasonable rates of interest, the hum of legitimate industry was heard throughout the length and breadth of the land, and the American flag commanded profound respect wherever it was unfurled to the breeze. [Applause on the Republican side.] At no time in the history of this Republic were the American people more prosperous than during those 16 years of uninterrupted Republican control. Our population rose from 70,000,000 to approximately 95,000,000. The savings of the people, the real test of material prosperity, increased from two billion to four and a half billion dollars and our national wealth from seventy-seven billion to a hundred and eighty billion dollars. No nation on earth and no political party that has ever existed since governments were instituted among men can present a record that begins to compare with the marvelous achievements of the Republican Party from the inauguration of William McKinley in 1897 to the close of the administration of William Howard Taft in 1913. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But, strange and anomalous as it may seem, it was this very unprecedented and unparalleled prosperity that was responsible for the overthrow of Republican supremacy and for the installation of a Democratic administration. The American people are in some respects a peculiar people. They are always restless and they are never entirely satisfied. They are constantly looking for something new, and when they have found it they are willing to experiment with it simply because it is new; and especially is this true when everything is moving along smoothly and there are no signs of impending disaster in the skies. It is then that the demagogue appears upon the scene. It is then that the agitator flourishes. It is then that successful appeal is made to passion and to prejudice and seeds of discontent are sown in fertile and productive ground. It is then that the finger of suspicion is pointed at everybody and everything and men for the first time in their lives question the honesty and integrity of their friends and neighbors. It is then that honor is assailed, that motives are impugned, that confidence is destroyed. It is then, too, that we are in a receptive mood and lend willing ear to the man who talks glibly of "pitiless publicity" and the "new freedom."

Yes, my friends, when times are good, when work is plentiful, when the job is looking for the man, when we are surrounded on all sides by abounding prosperity, it is then that the average American feels his independence and welcomes an opportunity to manifest that feeling by voting to upset the established order of things. We had become so accustomed to prosperity under Republican rule that we accepted that prosperity as a mere matter of course and forgot to give credit to whom credit was due. We simply grew indifferent to our own welfare and permitted ourselves to be lured upon the rocks of disaster by the siren song of the impractical theorist who feeds us on fancy instead of fact, on promise instead of performance, and who would have us believe that a flight of rhetoric is more sustaining than a slice of roast beef. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But suddenly we awake with a start. The dream is over. We rub our eyes and look about us. We take an inventory of our melancholy surroundings, amid the wreck and ruin of our national hopes and aspirations, and then we ask ourselves why we were ever so foolish as to let go of those principles and policies which have stood the test of time and experience in order to follow a political will-o'-the-wisp. That is a question that the thinking people of this country who permitted themselves to take a political joy ride four years ago are asking themselves to-day, and that is the question that our Democratic friends are called upon to answer.

The Democratic Party is now in full control of the Government. They are in full charge of both the executive and legislative branches, and at this very time, in utter defiance of every consideration of elementary decency, they are even trying to get control of the judicial branch by advocating the passage of a bill now pending in the Senate which would empower a partisan President to remove from office some thirty-two Federal judges of admitted probity and recognized ability in order to make room for "deserving Democrats." Having full control of the Govern-

ment, the Democratic Party is properly chargeable with full responsibility for everything that has been done or left undone, and they can not escape that responsibility. The day of reckoning is at hand. For the first time in many years they are called upon to give an account of their stewardship and to satisfy the American people that they are entitled to a continuation of public confidence. Can they do so? Let us see.

Four years ago our Democratic friends made certain direct and specific promises to the wage earners of this country. They promised the men who work in the mills, in the mines, in the factories, and on the farms—the men who earn their bread in the sweat of their brows—that if they were successful in wresting control of the Government from the Republican Party they would place upon the statute books certain economic laws which would bring increased prosperity to every American home and every American fireside. Has that promise been kept? Has the Underwood Democratic tariff law proven a benefit or an injury to the wage earner? Has it increased or decreased his opportunities for employment? Has it directly or indirectly been the means of establishing a single new industry in any State in this Union? Has it created a market anywhere within the confines of the Republic for the only commodity that the workingman has to sell, namely, his labor? No; no—a thousand times, no! From the day that the Underwood tariff law went into effect, on October 19, 1913, until the spring of 1915, when we first began to feel the stimulating effect of the tremendous orders for European war supplies, complete industrial paralysis rested like a blight upon every part of our common country. Starvation and stagnation confronted us on all sides. The mines quit working, the mills and factories closed their doors, and across their silent and smokeless chimneys was written the epitaph, "Died of an overdose of the Underwood bill." [Applause on the Republican side.]

A half million men in New York alone were compelled to patronize the bread line, and 200,000 in the city of Chicago paid daily visits to that one institution that always springs into existence under a Democratic administration, the free soup house.

Every railroad sidetrack in this country was filled with long strings of empty freight cars, and the rabbits built their nests and bred their young in the weeds that covered the roadbeds.

Our imports from abroad increased by leaps and bounds, and there was as much joy and rejoicing among the manufacturers of Europe as there was gloom and despair among the manufacturers of America. Our custom revenues fell off, wages were cut, dividends were passed, bank clearings decreased, credit was destroyed, and failure became the order of the day. Compared with the last year of a Republican administration the gross earnings of the railroads alone fell off more than 4½ per cent in the first year of the Wilson administration, and iron productions decreased more than 25 per cent. The steel mills of this country were reduced to 40 per cent of their normal capacity, two-fifths of all the looms in our woolen mills were idle, and \$40,000,000 of capital invested in cotton mills became unproductive, while the importation of cotton cloth from abroad almost doubled in quantity.

But just as the sun of our prosperity was about to pass into complete eclipse, just as hope was about to give way to blank despair, our drooping spirits were revived and our saddened hearts were cheered by the comforting assurance of our amiable ex-Princeton professor that all our depression was purely psychological, a state of mind. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Well, that helped some. [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.] Of course it did not pay the rent, or buy schoolbooks or clothing for the little ones at home. It did not pay doctor's bills or grocer's bills, or satisfy the cravings of an empty stomach. It did not put any flour or sugar or bacon in the larder, but it did serve to make us think of our happy, care-free college days, when all the world was bright and rosy and there was nothing to indicate the possibility of Democratic success. [Applause on the Republican side.] Great, indeed, is psychology, and Woodrow Wilson is its prophet!

You have not forgotten the promise that was held out to us by our Democratic friends when the Underwood tariff law went into effect. You remember they told us at that time that on the 1st of January there would be a general resumption of activity in all of our industries. Well, we waited until January, but there was no resumption. Then we were told that if we would wait until the 1st of March every wheel and every spindle in every mill and factory throughout the country would begin to turn. We waited until March, but the wheels and spindles refused to turn. Then they said that if we would wait until the 1st of May, when the flowers begin to bloom, tra la la la [laughter], the very sun in the heavens would be obscured by the clouds of smoke arising from every chimney in this broad land of ours.

Well, we waited until May and the flowers bloomed, but there was no smoke. Then we were told if we would be patient until the 1st day of July we would be overtaken by the greatest prosperity in all our history. Well, we waited until July, and instead of being overtaken by prosperity you will recall that we were overtaken by a drought; and then our Democratic friends quit prophesying an early return of prosperity and they began to pray for rain; but inasmuch as the prayers of the righteous only avail their appeal remained unanswered until August, and in August the war broke out in Europe, and then we were told that as soon as peace was declared we would experience the greatest boom in all history. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Well, when that prophecy was made our friends were only concerned about the approaching November elections. They thought that the war in Europe would be of short duration. But as that titanic conflict continues there has been an ever-increasing demand for American products to supply the needs and necessities of the warring nations of Europe. As the result of that demand American business has been given a temporary stimulus.

But every sensible human being knows that trade in war munitions can not form a lasting basis for American prosperity. [Applause on the Republican side.] We are exporting to-day to the warring nations in Europe approximately \$300,000,000 of products a month, and this tremendous trade in war supplies has given us a fictitious and artificial prosperity that will crumble and fade away on the day that peace is declared. [Applause on the Republican side.] I for one hope that God will speed that day. I do not want to see my country prosper at the expense of the grief-stricken and heartbroken widows and orphans of the Old World. [Applause on the Republican side.] I do not welcome a prosperity that is based upon the sorrows and the misfortunes of our kindred across the seas. [Applause on the Republican side.]

To me the very thought of coining money out of the blood and the tears and the sufferings of humanity is abhorrent. My sympathy goes out to the mothers of Europe, and I would to God that it lay in our power to lift from them this burden of sorrow and weight of woe. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Ah, my Democratic friends, when you boast of the kind of prosperity that is now with us, above your notes of exultation I can hear the moans and the groans of the wounded and the dying. When you point to the munitions factory and gloat over its unwonted activities, across the waters I can see the bleak white walls of the dreary hospitals of pain, with their never-ending procession of maimed and mutilated men. When you rejoice over the extra tax that you are now collecting from the opulent manufacturer of war munitions, I can see the pinched and pallid face of the soldier boy, and I can hear him murmur the blessed name of "mother" as his young soul wings its flight to God.

Oh, talk not to me of a prosperity that is eating out the very heart of our boasted Christian civilization, a prosperity that makes a mockery of all the nobler sentiments of the race, a prosperity that is based upon human hate, and that bids defiance to the heaven-sent message of old, "Peace on earth, good will toward men." [Applause on the Republican side.] I prefer a normal to an abnormal prosperity. I believe in "ringing out the false" and "ringing in the true." I prefer the kind of prosperity that we enjoyed for 16 years under a Republican protective tariff. I favor the kind of prosperity that is the direct and logical result of wise legislation, discriminating in favor of the American farmer, the American mechanic, and the American manufacturer, as against his Canadian and European competitor. [Applause on the Republican side.] The Underwood tariff law, and in fact no Democratic tariff law that has ever been enacted, has ever made that discrimination.

On the contrary, every Democratic tariff law discriminates in favor of the foreigner and against the American, and the Underwood law is not an exception to the rule. It deliberately invites imports from abroad, thereby reducing production at home. Why, Mr. UNDERWOOD, the author of the bill, declared, when he introduced his measure into this House, that it was the purpose of his bill to invite foreign competition in our industrial life, and Mr. Wilson said that it would shapen the wits of the American manufacturer and enable him to compete with the European manufacturer. But neither Mr. Wilson nor Mr. UNDERWOOD ever told us just how the American manufacturer is going to meet that competition from abroad and at the same time maintain the American standard of wages. Oh, no doubt it sharpened the wits of the American manufacturer, to the point where the edge was taken off entirely, but while the sharpening process was going on it completely dulled the earning capacity of every American wage earner. [Applause on the Republican side.] I represent in this body a great industrial district. In my district is the important manufacturing city of Granite City. In that city there stands to-day, as a monument

to the genius and the wisdom of that great Republican constructive statesman, William McKinley [applause], a magnificent tin-plate plant which, under the beneficent policy of protection, gave employment to thousands of men. The Underwood tariff law had been in operation exactly three days when the Standard Oil Co. placed an order for \$1,500,000 worth of tin plate in Wales. They found that because of the reduction made in the tariff on tin plate by the Underwood bill, the rate having been cut from 45 per cent to 15 per cent, they could buy their tin plate in Wales, bring it across the ocean, pay the freight, and manufacture it into cans and make money by the operation. When that order went across the water it took employment away from the tin-plate workers of Granite City. It took employment away from the miners who dig the coal that fires the furnaces. It took employment away from the railroad men who transport the coal to the mills and the finished plate to the market.

It took customers away from the farmer who has produce to sell, from the grocer, the druggist, the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker. Does any Democrat believe for a moment that these wage earners can see any virtue in a Democratic tariff law? They are prosperous now; yes. They are prosperous in spite of adverse Democratic tariff legislation. [Applause.] They are prosperous because to-day 30,000,000 men, strong-armed and clean-limbed, in the very prime of vigorous manhood, have left the mills and the factories of Europe for the forts and the trenches. They are prosperous to-day because the mills and factories over there are no longer producing the things that they once produced, but, in the main, they have been transformed into plants for the manufacture of war supplies. They are prosperous to-day because for the time being all industrial competition from Europe has been removed; but they know, and you and I know, that as soon as peace is declared this competition will return, stronger, more vigorous, and more relentless than ever before. [Applause.] The most serious question to engage the attention of the statesmen of the Old World when peace is declared will be the question of rehabilitating their destroyed industries. In order to bring about that rehabilitation they will have to get a supply of money. In order to get money they will have to sell their manufactured products to some country that has the money to pay for them. The United States has the money, and, operating as we now are, under a low tariff, this country will be made the dumping ground for all of Europe; and when these importations begin to flow in upon us every industry in this country will be crippled, and some of them will be completely destroyed. When that time comes there will be a universal demand from Maine to California for a protective tariff that will protect us against ruinous and disastrous competition. [Applause on the Republican side.] And then our Democratic friends will vie with each other in disavowing any responsibility for the iniquitous Underwood tariff law. My friends, I believe with all my heart and soul that a protective tariff is absolutely essential to our national welfare. I believe that the great basic principle underlying that policy—the equalization of the cost of production here and abroad—is fundamentally sound and correct as an economic proposition. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Every sensible man, no matter what his politics may be, will admit that the wage rate in this country is from two to five times as high as it is in the countries of Europe and from ten to twenty-five times as high as it is in the countries of the Orient. If the cost of the labor required to produce a given article in this country is \$2, and the cost of the labor required to produce a similar article in Europe is only \$1, it stands to reason that unless this Government steps forward and says to the foreign manufacturer, "Before you can sell your product on this side of the Atlantic, before you can dispose of your article in the United States, you must pay first into our Treasury a tariff equal in amount to the difference in cost of producing that article in your country and in our country." Unless that is done, the European article will crowd the American article out of the market, and the American manufacturer will be compelled either to close his factory or to reduce the wages of his employees to the European level in order to meet that competition. He has no other alternative.

My friends, the protective policy of the Republican Party needs no defense. It has stood the test of experience. It has brought untold blessings to every American home, and it finds its vindication to-day in the genuine prosperity that it brought to all the people in days now gone, but which will return when the Republican Party is restored to power on the 4th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1917. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Our Democratic friends made another direct and specific promise in the campaign of four years ago, a promise that they would like to have us forget, but which, like Banquo's

ghost, will not down. They said in that campaign that the protective system of the Republican Party was responsible for the high cost of living. They wept crocodile tears as they expressed hypocritical sympathy for the downtrodden workingmen. They said that they would reduce the tariff and thereby bring about a corresponding reduction in the cost of the necessities of life. Well, they reduced the tariff, but just to what extent did they reduce the cost of living? They forced the farmer's wheat and corn into competition with Canada and the Argentine Republic, and they compelled him in 1914, before the war created the abnormal demand for our food supplies, to accept the lowest price for his products that he had received since the days of Grover Cleveland.

And yet the price of flour and breakfast cereals continued to advance. They put cattle on the free list and reduced the tariff on woolens and cottons, and yet the price of beef and clothing is higher to-day than at any time in our history.

They put sugar on the free list and almost destroyed the industry from the scare they gave the manufacturers, and then, under the guise of a revenue necessity, they restored the duty in part, and yet the price of sugar to the consumer continued to advance until now only a multimillionaire feels justified in sweetening his breakfast coffee or tea. No wonder that the Democratic Congressman who recalls that promise of four years ago shudders every time his eye rests on the market quotations of the produce exchange. No wonder that he has a congestive chill every time he sees a constituent in the act of buying a dress or fitting on a pair of shoes. No wonder that he has formed the habit of patronizing the back alleys and side streets of his home city whenever he hears that a bridal couple is at the store buying furniture for their little cottage. [Laughter.] But I would bid the consumer to be of good cheer and not to be discouraged. You know you have the comforting assurance from Mr. Wilson that you are now living under the "new freedom"; you are free to buy wherever you can buy the dearest, and to pay for what you buy, if you have the price. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Four years ago our Democratic friends made another direct and specific promise to the people. They said that they would practice the most rigid economy in the management of all governmental affairs. They denounced the Republican Party as the party of profligacy and extravagance. They said that they would apply the pruning knife to all appropriations and give the world an exhibition of what was meant by real old-fashioned Democratic economy. And yet, in the face of that promise, in the very teeth of that declaration, we find that the Sixty-third Congress, the first Democratic Congress under Mr. Wilson, spent \$177,000,000 more than was spent by the first Republican Congress under Mr. Taft. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And God only knows the extent of the expenditures of the present Congress. When the figures are finally compiled and given to the world there will not be a Democrat in the United States who will admit that there is such a word as "economy" in the English language.

Appropriations have been simply running riot. Thousands upon thousands of new and needless positions have been created; the civil-service laws and regulations have been set aside; boards and commissions have multiplied with such amazing rapidity that it is only by the exercise of the most extraordinary care that a taxpayer can avoid a collision with a Democratic officeholder when he is taking a stroll on any highway or byway. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Having secured an accidental and temporary lease of power, our Democratic friends seem to have adopted as their rule of action the old motto, "Eat, drink, and be merry, for on the 4th day of next March we die, and we will be a long time dead." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

In the campaign of 1912 the Democratic Party proclaimed itself as the champion of genuine nationalism. They promised that they would take a broad and comprehensive view of the Nation's needs; that they would not destroy a single legitimate industry; that they would legislate for all the people, free of favoritism and devoid of discrimination. But in all our history Democratic performance has never squared with Democratic promise. The Democratic Party is not now and has never been a national party in the true meaning of that word. [Applause on the Republican side.] It is distinctly and essentially sectional in character. Its political vision has never extended north of the old Mason and Dixon line. It is controlled in its principles and purposes by the men of the South, many of whom still cling to the traditions of a dead and buried past. Every important committee in the House and Senate, with one or two exceptions, is to-day in the control of men representing southern constituencies. The chairman of a committee, if made of the right kind of material, is always able to shape the legisla-

tion that is recommended to Congress by the committee over which he presides.

I have nothing whatever to say against these gentlemen of the South, because I am proud to be able to say that among them I number some of my warmest personal friends. Individually they are agreeable, affable, and courteous gentlemen, but collectively, as a political aggregation, they are an abomination in the sight of the Lord. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Having control of all the committees the South to-day exercises a dominating influence in national legislation wholly out of all proportion to its importance as a contributing factor to the general welfare, either in an agricultural, commercial, or economic sense.

My friends, mortal man is so constituted that he is seldom able to rise above his environment. These Southern gentlemen, in the main, represent districts that are purely agricultural in character and that produce a single crop, and that crop is cotton. The good Lord gave the South a climate and a soil that enables it to produce cotton in competition with all the world. Supplementing these superb natural conditions, the South has an abundance of cheap negro labor with which to harvest its cotton crop. These negro laborers receive 50, 75 cents and \$1 a day, and, as a rule, they are kept in debt by being compelled to buy all of their supplies of the plantation or company store, a system of brutal and barbarous servitude that has long since been abolished by law in every Northern State.

The South is not engaged in manufacturing to any considerable extent, and, as a result, the men who represent that section of our country in Congress have absolutely no conception of the industrial needs and necessities of the great manufacturing centers of the North. Having but few white and no negro labor organizations, they have no knowledge of the wage scale that the northern manufacturer pays, and they are not interested in legislation that tends to benefit and improve the condition of the wage earner. They are interested only in securing a market for their cotton, and they are quite willing to buy their plantation machinery and supplies wherever they can be bought the cheapest. It is a matter of indifference to them if those supplies are manufactured in Europe or in the Orient. They are not in the least concerned about the welfare of the employee in the northern mill or factory. It is wholly immaterial to them whether the economic policies which they have placed on the statute books spell ruin and desolation to the laborers of the North so long as they can rest secure in voluntary sectional isolation.

The Republican Party, and the Republican Party alone, has always been the one true and genuine national party. It has always stood for a policy big enough and broad enough and grand enough to protect every legitimate industry in the land, no matter whether that industry is located in the North, in the South, in the East, or in the West. It stands for that policy to-day, and will so continue to stand until time shall be no more.

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

Mr. RODENBERG. No; I do not care to yield. My friends, I intend now to leave the discussion of subjects that I know are unpleasant to my Democratic friends, and to pass on to the discussion of a subject which must be positively painful to every red-blooded American. I turn from Democracy's dismal and destructive domestic policies to the consideration of the miserable makeshift, the tragic and truculent travesty which, under President Wilson, masquerades as America's foreign policy. First, I shall consider poor, bleeding, distracted Mexico. From the day that Maximilian was dethroned as Emperor by Benito Juarez and Porfirio Diaz, the controlling factor in Mexican politics has always been the moral influence of the Government of the United States. But for the vigorous and determined action of Secretary Seward at the close of the Civil War the revolt against Maximilian would not have succeeded, and Diaz would not have become President. For 34 years Diaz enjoyed our good will and friendship, and during that time he was able to maintain peace within the borders of his country, but when it became known that the Diaz government had entered into a secret agreement with Japan under the terms of which the Japanese were to be given a naval base on the west coast of Mexico, he forfeited our friendship and good will, and paved the way for the success of the revolution under Francisco Madero. When Madero became President it was not long until he, too, lost our friendship because of his refusal to pay any attention to the demands of the American ambassador, Mr. Henry Lane Wilson, for the payment of indemnity for the loss of American life and property during his revolution.

When Madero was forced out, Huerta became President, and when President Wilson announced his determination not to accord official recognition to Huerta, his doom was sealed then and there. The history of the last 50 years teaches us that

stable government in Mexico is absolutely impossible without the moral support and sympathetic cooperation of the Government of the United States. In the early days of this Republic we promulgated the Monroe doctrine, and we have insisted ever since upon its recognition as a vital principle of American policy, if not of international law. For 90 years we have maintained a protectorate over all Latin America, and we have said to all the world that we would not permit any European monarchy to gain a foothold on the Western Continent. When we voluntarily assumed that position we, by implication at least, guaranteed the ability and the capacity of the Latin American peoples for self-government. Having deliberately assumed that position, what, then, is the plain duty of the United States in the event that any of the Latin American Governments now under our protectorate should collapse? Power always carries with it responsibility. If we intend in the future to insist upon the recognition of the Monroe doctrine as a principle of international law, it follows that we must be prepared to meet fairly and squarely all of the responsibilities incident thereto, or we must forever abandon that doctrine. There is no other alternative. What are the conditions to-day in Mexico? The experiment of democratic government in that country has failed. The whole social fabric has collapsed. Organized society has broken down. A reign of terror exists. Law and order have been set aside. Anarchy is triumphant. There is no security; no protection; no government. All is chaos and confusion. Mexico is no longer able to enforce her treaty obligations or to give protection either to her own citizens or to foreigners who may be domiciled there.

What part has our country played in this dreary drama of destruction, and who, I ask, is primarily responsible for the carnival of crime that is now at its height in Mexico? I make the statement, and I measure my words in doing so, that the impartial historian of the future will lay the responsibility at the feet of Woodrow Wilson and his wobbling policy of "watchful waiting." [Applause on the Republican side.]

Victoriano Huerta was President of Mexico when Woodrow Wilson was inaugurated President of the United States. The de facto government of Huerta had been recognized by all the leading countries of Europe, but President Wilson, although besought and importuned to do so by practically every substantial and intelligent resident of Mexico, both foreign and native, declined to accord official recognition to Huerta, the only man of sufficient force of character to restore law and order in the distracted Republic, and allowed himself to be controlled in his action as President by the sentimental idealism of the late departed, but not lamented, Mr. Bryan. In announcing his refusal to recognize the de facto government of Huerta, Mr. Wilson proclaimed his intention of not interfering in the affairs of Mexico and of not permitting anyone else to interfere. The very act of refusing recognition to Huerta was in itself an interference in the domestic affairs of our neighboring Republic and a deliberate attempt on Mr. Wilson's part to destroy the only government that Mexico had. But Mr. Wilson did not stop there. He even had the temerity to inform the people of Mexico that they might hold an election, but if Huerta were the choice of the electorate he would not be recognized by the United States. From that day to this he has followed such a policy of officious and irritating meddling, tinctured with indecision and vacillation, that to-day all Latin America believes that the diplomacy of the United States is based on duplicity and double dealing.

When we sent that great and experienced diplomat (?) and "deserving Democrat," John Lind, to Mexico to try moral suasion in an effort to dislodge Huerta, and which was later followed by an offer of financial aid to the Mexican Government if Huerta would only do the disappearing act, he gave Gamboa, the Mexican minister of foreign affairs, an opportunity to create a laugh at our expense, the echoes of which are still ringing in our ears.

Not a scintilla of evidence that would be admitted in any American court of record has as yet been produced connecting Huerta with the assassination of Madero. No official statement has ever been issued by this Government or by the Government of Carranza implicating Huerta as an accessory before or after the act. All has been mere hearsay. There is nothing upon which to base a charge against Huerta but innuendo and veiled insinuation. I believe now, and have always believed, that every consideration of common sense, every consideration of ordinary justice and fair dealing, required the President to follow the example of the leading countries of Europe in according recognition to Huerta. [Applause.] But, of course, a diplomacy which finds its inspiration in grape juice can not be expected to scintillate any very great amount of common sense. [Laughter.]

But if Mr. Wilson felt that he could not recognize Huerta without doing violence to his supersensitive conscience, then, why in heaven's name did not he accord recognition at once to

the Carranza Government, and by that act give notice to Mexico and the world that the United States was determined to establish a government down there and put an end to brigandage and murder and rapine? Why did he wait until October 19, 1915—two years and seven months after he assumed the Presidency—before recognizing Carranza? If he felt that he had sufficient knowledge of Mexican conditions to warrant him in deposing Huerta, then we have a right to assume that he should have been ready to take the next step necessary to reestablish orderly government in Mexico.

Even Mr. Wilson or any other idealist must know that any country without a government quickly lapses into a state of anarchy and especially so when 80 per cent of the people of that country are illiterate and semibarbarous. If Mr. Wilson really felt the deep sympathy that he has always professed to feel for the starving Mexican people then, after deliberately destroying the only government that existed in Mexico, I insist that every dictate of humanity, every impulse of justice, demanded that he do all in his power to establish forthwith and without delay a government capable of enforcing the fundamental guaranties of a civilized government, the protection of life, liberty, and property. The adoption of any other policy under the circumstances is stamped not only with indecision but with insincerity as well. [Applause on Republican side.]

The administration's entire course with regard to Mexico has been a succession of stupid and brutal blunders. There is not a single creditable incident in the whole miserable affair. Huerta was proclaimed President on February 19, 1913, or 13 days before the inauguration of Mr. Wilson, and despite the frantic efforts of our bewildered and befuddled administration he was not forced out of the Presidency until July 15, 1914. The attempt to force that resignation could well be utilized by a humorist as a plot in comic opera but for the humiliating effect on our national pride. You will recall that on April 9, 1914, several of our soldiers were arrested at Tampico by some petty Mexican officer, and that after their release Rear Admiral Mayo demand an apology and punishment of the officers making the arrest and a public salute of 21 guns to our flag within 24 hours.

The apology was promptly made and punishment was meted out to the offending officers, but the salute was not fired. Thereupon President Wilson, through O'Shaunnessy, demanded an immediate compliance with Mayo's request that a salute be fired by a government which he refused to recognize and which he himself said did not exist. [Applause on the Republican side.] Huerta replied that powder in Mexico was rather expensive, but that he would fire a salute if Mayo would fire one in return. Then our marines and sailors were ordered down to Vera Cruz and they took possession of the customhouse, and in doing so 17 of our boys were killed. Then Funston and the Fifth Brigade were sent down, and they remained in Vera Cruz until November 23, when they were suddenly withdrawn upon the threatening and imperative demand of Carranza. This whole senseless and ridiculous performance cost the United States the lives of 17 of our brave boys and \$10,000,000 in money, but the salute has never been fired. [Applause on the Republican side.]

When Huerta was finally overthrown and Carranza entered Mexico City the President again hesitated and shrank from a plain responsibility. It was apparent to everybody that Villa was on the point of revolting against Carranza, and if President Wilson had met the situation by promptly recognizing Carranza and had given Villa and his followers to understand that no revolt on their part would be tolerated by our Government, I feel morally certain that many of the succeeding bloody chapters of Mexico's history would never have been written. The recognition did not come and Villa revolted, and the President then showed his deep sympathy for the Mexican people by permitting the State Department, under Mr. Bryan, to covertly aid and abet Villa, the most villainous and bloodthirsty bandit of them all.

Finally conditions became so unbearable that the administration reluctantly concluded that some action was necessary. Accordingly the so-called A. B. C. powers, Argentine, Brazil, and Chile, were asked to call representatives of the warring factions of Mexico into a conference for the purpose of composing their differences and forming a government. In this call it was clearly and unmistakably intimated by our Government that failure on the part of any Mexican faction to respond to the call and participate in the conference would result in a refusal by us to deal with such faction in the future. Villa, Zapata, and other bandit chiefs accepted the invitation with alacrity and enthusiasm, and the world then witnessed the humiliating and disgraceful spectacle of the great and powerful Government of the United States counseling and con-

ferring with murderers and cutthroats as to our future policy in Mexico. Even Carranza, steeped in treachery as he since has shown himself to be, seems to have had too much self-respect left to take part in a conference with Villa and Zapata. He peremptorily refused to attend, but within six weeks thereafter he was recognized by Woodrow Wilson as the de facto head of the Government of Mexico. Great God, what a record of infamy and shame! What a travesty on diplomacy and statesmanship! Is it any wonder that the world stands aghast and the people of America hang their heads in deep humiliation whenever they think of Wilson's Mexican policy? [Great applause on the Republican side.]

Oh, it will not avail Mr. Wilson or his apologists to try to make it appear that all Americans residing in Mexico are freebooters and adventurers. Many an honest man of moderate means has gone there on legitimate business and in the hope of winning a competence for himself and family. He was proud of his American citizenship when he went to Mexico. He regarded it as a badge of honor and he felt that he was fully protected by our treaty with that country. But he was soon disillusioned. When trouble came and he appealed to his Government for protection, the administration at Washington bluntly and brutally informed him to leave his earthly possessions behind and to get out of the country, as no protection would be extended to him. The action of the American Government in sending that notice to American residents in Mexico was at the same time notice to the bandits of Mexico that they were at liberty to plunder and rob and kill Americans with impunity and without let or hindrance. Already 250 Americans have been wantonly and brutally murdered, scores of American women have been ravished, little children have been horribly mistreated, the American flag has become an object of contempt and derision in every part of Mexico, and when an appeal for relief is made to Washington the victims of Mexican outrage are met by the insulting query, "What are you doing in Mexico; why don't you get out and come home?"

It took the administration two years and seven months to make up its mind to recognize Carranza, and because of this tardy recognition, because of the many humiliating intervening events, because of the spineless, vacillating policy that has been pursued, because of the universal contempt in Mexico for everything American, even Carranza seems to have lost all respect for us, and there is every indication that it will not be long until we will have serious trouble with the de facto government of which he is the head. If the recital of Mexican outrages as set forth in Secretary Lansing's note to Carranza is based on fact, then that recital constitutes a stronger indictment of the inefficiency and incompetency of the Wilson administration than any partisan Republican could possibly frame. [Applause on the Republican side.] In that note Secretary Lansing specifically charges Carranza adherents with responsibility for the attacks on Brownsville, Red House Ferry, Progreso Post Office, and Las Peladas, all of which occurred during last September. And yet, notwithstanding the treachery of Carranza and his followers the administration, of which Mr. Lansing is the chief official, has complacently permitted Carranza to import arms and munitions from the United States into Mexico. The trouble at Parral occurred as late as April 10 of this year. The attack on our soldiers at that place was made by the soldiers of Carranza. Four days after the attack and after the administration had full knowledge of Carranza's treachery, Secretary Lansing issued an order permitting Carranza to import 1,000,000 rounds of small-arms ammunition. The day before the order was issued Mr. Cleveland H. Dodge, vice president of the Phelps-Dodge Co., was in the city of Washington and, according to the newspapers, visited the Secretary of State.

The Phelps-Dodge Co. is engaged in the manufacture and sale of munitions of war and is the same company that was indicted in the Federal courts for violating the embargo on the shipment of munitions to Mexico in the last year of the Taft administration and escaped conviction on the technicality that the munitions had not actually reached the Republic of Mexico but had been stopped at Bisbee, Ariz. Mr. Cleveland H. Dodge, vice president of the Phelps-Dodge Co., is a most interesting gentleman. The records show that he was the heaviest individual contributor to the Democratic national campaign fund in 1912, his first contribution being \$30,000. [Applause on the Republican side.] I am not making any charge against the integrity of the Secretary of State, nor do I know positively that the Phelps-Dodge Co. sold Carranza this 1,000,000 rounds of ammunition, but I can not help wondering if there is any connection between the call of Mr. Dodge on Mr. Lansing and the issuance of the order. The ammunition which was imported by Carranza under that order was used in the attack on our soldiers at Carrizal, in which 19 of the Nation's defenders,

including two officers, lost their lives. If there should be any connection between the visit of Mr. Dodge and the issuance of the order, and if the ammunition that was shipped to Mexico was shipped by the Phelps-Dodge Co., then may God have mercy on an administration that permits a campaign contributor to recoup himself at the expense of the lives of our gallant soldier boys. [Great applause on the Republican side.]

But, say our Democratic friends, President Wilson has kept us out of war, and that is reason enough why he is entitled to reelection. Two years ago they adopted as their slogan: "War in Europe, peace in America, God bless Wilson." Well, I want the good Lord to bless the President of the United States. I want Him to bless every American citizen, the highest and the humblest, the richest and the poorest. But I can conceive of no good or valid reason why a special blessing should be invoked upon the President because we are not at war with Mexico. Why, the very act of sending our troops to Vera Cruz because of an imaginary insult was in itself, under the usages of international law, a *casus belli* or act of war, and would have been so construed by Huerta but for the fact that he had his hands full trying to suppress the revolution of Villa and Carranza. The people of the United States owe absolutely nothing to Mr. Wilson because we are still at peace with Mexico. His persistent and pernicious meddling in the internal affairs of that unhappy country would long since have provoked an open rupture and actual war but for Mexico's inability to unite her own people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But, say our Democratic friends, Wilson has kept us out of the European war. Why of course he has. Why should he not? Who wants war with any of the European powers? What American citizen in the full possession of his senses is demanding that our country should become involved in that terrific conflict? Where is there any sentiment for war anywhere within the confines of this Republic? Is the President entitled to wear a halo of imperishable glory for simply doing that which all of his fellow-Americans not engaged in the sale of munitions want to have done? Is he entitled to any special praise for performing a plain duty? No; no. On the contrary, the President would lay himself open to the severest censure and condemnation if he failed to exhaust every honorable means, every resource of diplomacy, to prevent our country from being drawn into this awful vortex which has engulfed all Europe. The attempt to capitalize in a political way the performance of a solemn duty that a Chief Executive owes to his country will fail, and so, too, will the attempt to create a false and un-American issue of so-called Americanism. [Applause on the Republican side.] The descendants of no one nationality that enters into our composite American life can claim a monopoly of loyalty to the Stars and Stripes. Every civilized nation under God's shining sun has contributed its share to the glory and the greatness and the grandeur of American civilization. [Applause on the Republican side.] These men came from across the seas because of their love for liberty. Here they have established their homes and reared their families and here in free, sun-kissed and heaven-blessed America lie all their future hopes and aspirations. [Applause on the Republican side.]

To-day all Europe is drenched in blood. The flower of the young manhood of the Old World is being sacrificed to the god of war. Already 5,000,000 men, created in the image of their Maker and endowed with immortal souls have paid the last full measure of devotion to their country and their country's cause. And as that gigantic struggle drags its bloody length along, we on this side of the Atlantic are overcome by conflicting emotions. Related as we are by ties of blood and consanguinity to the people of the Old World, it is but natural that our sympathies should be divided. I have nothing but profound pity for any man, no matter what his nationality may be, who does not sympathize with the land of his ancestors' birth in this great struggle for national existence, and I insist that an expression of that sympathy is in no sense a reflection on anyone's Americanism. [Applause on the Republican side.] On the contrary, I regard it as in every way commendable and as an evidence of deep and genuine humanity. God help the man who would attempt to make political capital for himself or his party by stifling the noblest emotions of the human heart. My father and mother were born near where flows the classic Rhine, but I thank God that when my father came to this country at the close of the Revolution of 1848 and took the oath of allegiance to the laws and the Constitution of this Government, that he meant exactly what he said. [Applause.] I thank God that he became an American citizen not only in word but in spirit as well, and that he instilled in the hearts of his children a sincere love of reverence for the Old Flag and for the institutions of his adopted country. [Great applause on the Republican side.]

The sentiments that animated my father animated yours, and when their devotion to American ideals is questioned because of a lingering affection for the land of their nativity we can point with pride to a hundred battle fields upon which many of them sealed their loyalty with their blood. [Applause on the Republican side.] No, no; it will not do. It is un-American; it is un-Christian; it is inhuman. You and I and all of us, and our fathers before us, believe in genuine Americanism. We believe in an Americanism that observes the spirit of true neutrality and that is free of all official partiality. We believe in an Americanism that shows no favoritism and that insists upon the recognition and enforcement of American rights on land or sea by every European belligerent, an Americanism that challenges and compels respect for the American flag by every nation on earth. [Applause on the Republican side.] You may talk in glittering generalities about "intrigues" and "hyphenates," but the inherent spirit of fair play that characterizes every true American will demand that you present a bill of particulars or stand convicted of criminal hypocrisy at the bar of enlightened public opinion. [Great applause on the Republican side.]

Time will not permit me to discuss at length the contradictory and chameleonlike record of this administration. Suffice it to say that President Wilson has completely reversed himself on practically every important question. At one time he was in favor of a single presidential term, of free canal tolls, of intervention in Mexico, of theoretical free trade, of Garrison's continental army plan, and of "knocking Bryan into a cocked hat," and now he is opposed to all of them. [Laughter and applause.] At another time he was opposed to military training, to increasing the Army and Navy, to a tariff commission, to labor unions, and to adequate preparedness, and now he is in favor of all of them. But perhaps, after all, there is an explanation.

The President once admitted in a burst of confidence that he had a "single-track mind." You know that at the end of every single-track railroad there is always a turntable, and if presidential peregrinations count for anything it must be apparent to every observer that the President landed on the turntable at the end of the track early in his term and has been traveling in a circle ever since. [Applause and laughter on Republican side.]

These are the counts in our indictment of Woodrow Wilson and his inefficient administration. The issues are joined, the record is made up, and the Republican Party is ready to submit the case to the verdict of the people. With an abiding faith in the intelligence, the manhood, and the patriotism of the American voter, we look forward with hope and confidence to the 4th day of March, 1917, when, under the courageous, capable, and patriotic leadership of Charles Evans Hughes [loud applause on Republican side] our national prestige will be fully restored and the Republic will once again assume her proud position in the sisterhood of nations. [Prolonged applause on Republican side.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is recognized for an hour.

Mr. HEFLIN rose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the other gentlemen who already have orders permitting them to speak to-night, following the gentleman from Alabama, shall have permission to address the House to-morrow.

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, there is no special order for to-morrow, then.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] makes the request that the gentlemen who also have permission to speak to-day may speak to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] may have leave to address the House to-morrow for 40 minutes, following the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, ours is the first Government in all the world to have a written Constitution as its organic law, and here for the first time in all history a Supreme Court was established to construe the Constitution. This system is the product of the collective wisdom of our fathers, and it is a great

improvement over all other systems. The Constitution of the United States is the chart and compass of American liberty, and the Supreme Court is the chief guardian of its sacred principles. In that body more than in any other branch of the Government is lodged the saving strength of the Republic. It was suggested in the Constitutional Convention that the President and a certain number of the Supreme Court Judges be given a qualified veto power over all measures passed by Congress, but, as Judge Simeon E. Baldwin, of Connecticut, has well said, "That would not do, for it would have thrown the Supreme Court judges into active participation in politics, and that would have impaired popular confidence in the Supreme Court."

Mr. Speaker, the fathers realized the importance and necessity of placing the supreme authority beyond the reach of political influences and partisan ambition, and they established the Supreme Court upon a constitutional elevation above the legislative and executive branches of the Government. In the early days there were those who questioned the wisdom of allowing the Supreme Court to have and exercise a power that could declare null and void the acts of the legislative and executive branches of the Government, but the wise and far-seeing patriots of that day said that the legislative and executive branches of the Government are political in their nature and are susceptible to political influences and dependent upon political success at the polls. But they said the Supreme Court, with its members consecrated to the work and serving for life, free from party strife and bitterness, purely judicial and nonpartisan in its character, will exercise its power without the fear of political punishment or the hope of political reward. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, in order to make sure that those chosen for service in the court of last resort would never seek or accept political office or have occasion to worry about provision for old age, our fathers provided for the life tenure of its members, with permission to retire at the age of 70 years, continuing to draw the salary until death. They made no such provision for Members of Congress, and they did not thus provide for even the President of the United States.

What more could our fathers have done to show that they deemed it wise and necessary to keep the Supreme Court entirely out of politics, and that they regarded it as a sacred institution, especially set apart and dedicated to the highest and most important service in our Government?

It is clear, then, that the fathers intended that the Supreme Court should be and forever remain out of politics. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

WASHINGTON'S OPINION.

When President Washington appointed for life the first judges of the Supreme Court, men of judicial skill and rectitude, the personal representatives of the dignity and majesty of the law, he declared that the Supreme Court is the chief pillar upon which our National Government must rest. The Father of our Country helped to create this independent and nonpartisan tribunal of the Nation. He saw that it was good, pronounced his blessing upon it, christened it in the name of liberty, and dedicated it to the cause of justice. [Applause.] He then committed it to the care and keeping of the generations that were to come after him; and they, thank God, have protected and preserved it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

CHIEF JUSTICE MARSHALL.

Mr. Speaker, the great Chief Justice Marshall, who believed in the life tenure of the Supreme Court judges, and who frequently praised the plan which kept the Supreme Court out of politics, declared that the judge must be rendered perfectly and completely independent, with nothing to influence or control him but God and his conscience. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Hon. Charles E. Shepherd, a distinguished lawyer from the State of Washington, speaking on Marshall day, 1901, of the nonpartisan character of our Supreme Court, said that Chief Justice Marshall was unmoved by the rise and fall of parties and administrations. The vision of a coming election never passed athwart that clear, penetrating, judicial eye. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Again, Judge Baldwin has said that—

The Supreme Court was the rock against which the wave of political reaction which swept John Adams into retirement and made Jefferson President dashed in vain.

CHARLES CARROLL, OF CARROLLTON.

Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, whose honored name graces the Declaration of Independence, said in 1827:

I consider the Supreme Court of the United States as the strongest guardian of the powers of Congress and the rights of the people.

In 1835 Hon. Horace Binney, of Philadelphia, one of the greatest lawyers that ever lived, in speaking of Chief Justice Marshall and the Supreme Court, said:

The Supreme Court judge in administering the law is the representative of the abstract justice of the people.

And in 1884 Chief Justice Waite, in unveiling the monument erected here in honor of Chief Justice Marshall, said:

The judicial power of the United States has been carefully preserved and wisely administered.

CHIEF JUSTICE FULLER.

In 1901, 100 years from the time that John Marshall was made Chief Justice, Chief Justice Fuller, of this same nonpartisan tribunal, declared that—

The Supreme Court judge must walk the straight and narrow path marked out by law regardless of political expediency or party politics.

Speaking in honor of Chief Justice Marshall in 1901, Senator William Lindsay, an able statesman of Kentucky, said:

No other court compares with our Supreme Court in jurisdiction, power, or independence. The peace, the prosperity, and the very existence of the Union are vested in the hands of our Supreme Court judges. It is, indeed, fortunate that we have a tribunal commanding public respect and public confidence, the mandates of which the people accept without regard to political affiliations or preconceived opinions.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, patriots East and West, North and South, Democrats and Republicans alike, bear testimony to the potential power and beneficent influence of our independent and nonpartisan Supreme Court. [Applause on the Democratic side.] What a source of strength it has been to the Republic in all the years that are gone!

FREE FROM IMPROPER INFLUENCE.

Hon. George M. Williams, an able lawyer of Oregon, said on Marshall day in 1901:

The Supreme Court of the United States is as far removed from the influence of passion and prejudice as it is possible for a human tribunal to be.

And this fact, Mr. Speaker, more than any other, has made that court revered and respected by all classes and conditions of our people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Again, Judge Simeon E. Baldwin says:

In England the British ministry is directly represented in the court of last resort before which causes of international importance may be brought; but here the situation is different. The Supreme Court does not act upon notions of State policy. It is a body purely judicial, and its office is purely to declare the law.

And, continuing, he says:

In no other government, as in ours, is the foreign office so powerless to control judicial proceedings by which foreign relations are affected.

So, Mr. Speaker, this situation accounts for the fact that no high court in all the world enjoys the reputation abroad that this court does among the nations of the earth. [Applause.] A few years ago a dispute arose between Canada and the United States, and Canada suggested that she was willing for the Supreme Court of the United States to determine the question. Mr. Speaker, what a beautiful acknowledgment of our Supreme Court's reputation for fairness and impartiality; what a splendid tribute to the integrity of this purely judicial and nonpartisan court of ours. [Applause.] Judge U. M. Rose, of Little Rock, a brilliant lawyer of Arkansas [applause], on Marshall day in 1901, in his splendid tribute to the nonpartisan character of our Supreme Court, said:

With us the Government is one of limited powers, and the humblest citizen may at any time challenge the authority of Congress or President or both combined. The Supreme Court, composed of learned men, quite excluded from the pale of actual or practical politics, having control of neither the sword nor the purse, presents to the world the fairest and best judicial tribunal ever devised by the wisdom of man.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

SUPREME COURT CONTROLLING INFLUENCE.

Hon. Frank Springer, of the Territory of New Mexico, said, in 1901:

If this Republic endures longer than those of antiquity, it will be chiefly by reason of the controlling influence of that great court which maintains the equilibrium of the Nation—

[Applause.]

which holds together the Union like some great sun of a planetary system, sending its light to the remotest parts, allowing each member to move unrestrained in its appointed path, but binding all by its mighty force, so that they can neither collide with each other nor depart from the system.

[Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, where is the patriot who is willing to tamper with the power which maintains the equilibrium of the Nation? Where is the citizen who is willing to destroy the light of our civic sun, which by its majesty and power holds in place and blesses every righteous force in the Government? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Hon. George R. Peck, in his article on

the March of the Constitution, speaking of how the Supreme Court has guarded that sacred instrument, says:

It has been so administered as to combine more of liberty to the citizen with more of power in the Nation than any other constitutional government.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, we are called upon to break a custom that has greatly blessed and benefited the American people. We are urged to establish a precedent that would radically change the status of our Supreme Court and plunge it into partisan politics. [Applause.]

PARTISAN INFLUENCE.

If our fathers in the early days were so careful to guard the Supreme Court against partisan influence and political ambition, with what scrupulous care should we guard it now, when sinister interests appeal more to the power of the purse than to the principle of the patriot. [Applause.] When they seek to coerce the voter, make barter of the ballot, and undertake to buy the highest office within the gift of the people. [Applause.] Sinister interests with political influence in too many instances have been able to work their will in local courts at the expense of justice and to the detriment and great injury of the citizen involved. Now, if any citizen, however humble and obscure, feels that the Constitution has been violated and political influence and partisan prejudice have operated to deny him justice, he can go to this nonpartisan tribunal, beyond the reach and taint of partisan consideration, and there receive justice. [Applause.]

THE PEOPLE'S STRONGHOLD.

Mr. Speaker, that court is the rich man's rock against improper judgments, the poor man's shelter against judicial tyranny, the city of refuge for both capital and labor, and the people's mighty stronghold of justice against injustice. [Applause.] The feeling of respect and appreciation on the part of the people for our Supreme Court and their abiding faith in its integrity and in its love of justice have done more to inspire patriotism and strengthen the Republic than any other influence in the country. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker I have heard of a State in this Union where it is said that one of the supreme court judges was ambitious to be governor. One day a case of considerable importance came up for consideration. The parties on one side of the suit were men of great political influence, and it is said that this judge expressed friendship for their side, took charge of the case, wrote the opinion, and later announced his candidacy for the office of governor. Mr. Speaker, if this precedent, which drags the Supreme Court into politics, is established, and we say to our Supreme Court judges, hereafter you are at liberty to court political influence and seek political office, I fear that some time some judge may play politics at the expense of justice, and sacrifice human rights upon the altar of political ambition. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

LORD JEFFREYS.

Lord Jeffreys, of infamous memory, chief justice of the High Court of England, dragged the judicial ermine into the mire of corrupt politics and used his office to influence elections. On one occasion he went to a city where an election was being held and entered the court room where Mayor Peckham was holding court. On seeing him there, the mayor became indignant and rebuked him, saying:

You, who ought to be the guardian of our laws and sacred constitution, shall not thus audaciously violate them.

[Applause.]

Our fathers saw what political ambition and partisan activity did for the High Court of England, and they resolved to avoid the mistakes of the mother country. Those who framed the Constitution were determined to place safeguards around our Supreme Court so as to keep it forever out of politics, and I repeat they wisely provided that its members should serve for life [applause], and retire, if they desired to do so, at the age of 70 years, continuing to draw the salary until death.

FROM WASHINGTON TO WILSON.

From Washington to Jackson and from Jackson to Lincoln, from Lincoln to Cleveland and from Cleveland to McKinley, and from McKinley to Wilson the people of all parties have protected the Supreme Court against political invasion, and millions yet unborn will guard and protect it in the years that are to come. [Applause.]

JUSTICE HUGHES.

In 1912 Mr. Justice Hughes said:

A Supreme Court judge should not be available for political office. The Supreme Court must not be dragged into politics.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Why, Mr. Speaker? "Because above the need of any man's service in political office in this country rises the importance of

the unstained integrity and nonpartisan character of our Supreme Court." [Applause.]

That was the position of Mr. Justice Hughes in 1912. Then he regarded the keeping of the Supreme Court out of politics as a matter of grave concern to the country. Then he felt that his country's best interest demanded that he refuse to allow the use of his name—a Supreme Court judge—as a candidate for the office of President in order to relieve his party of an embarrassing situation. Mr. Speaker, in the light of his position in 1912 and in view of what he has done in 1916, I ask what it is that causes him to be willing now to drag down and sacrifice this nonpartisan court upon the altar of partisan expediency. [Applause on the Democratic side.] With what degree of grace and good conscience can he invite the voter now to do that which he declared four years ago was a dangerous step to be taken in this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He has told us in strong language how important it is to keep the Supreme Court out of politics. What reason will he offer now for his effort to change it from an independent, nonpartisan court to a recruiting station of candidates for President? [Applause on the Democratic side.] What argument has he to make now as to why it should be changed from a temple of justice to a political hotbed of partisan ambition? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, Hon. WARREN G. HARDING, a Republican United States Senator from Ohio, was permanent chairman of a convention dominated by Republican bosses at Chicago. In notifying ex-Supreme Court Justice Hughes of a nomination that he had received by that convention Senator HARDING reminded him that his nomination "was extraordinary and without a parallel in the history of the Republican Party." That is true, Mr. Speaker. It was indeed a most extraordinary nomination. It did not only violate a long-standing precedent and tradition of the Republican Party, but it struck a dangerous blow at civil liberty in America. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That boss-ridden and degenerate old party of PENROSE and SMOOR having stifled virtue and destroyed moral vigor in itself, now turned in its greed and desperation and laid its cruel hands upon the Supreme Court, the very citadel of human rights in America. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And, Mr. Speaker, upon that unprecedented performance and that most extraordinary nomination they invite patriotic Progressives not only to repudiate the principles that they stood for four years ago, when they fought bossism, ring rule, and corruption, but they invite them to use their ballots in support of a movement which will, if successful, work injury to their children and their children's children long after we are dead. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

TEMPLE OF JUSTICE.

Mr. Speaker, for more than a hundred years the American people have regarded our Supreme Court as a temple of justice far above the plane of partisan politics, and never until now has any political party desired or dared to invade its sacred precincts in search of a candidate for President [applause on the Democratic side]; but with due appreciation of the wisdom and necessity of keeping that court out of politics and placing their country's welfare above the desire for party success, all parties have guarded against breaking the custom which has kept our Supreme Court free from political influence and partisan ambitions. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But, Mr. Speaker, it remained for the power-hungry bosses of the Republican Party to invade that holy of holies in our judicial system and undertake to establish a precedent that would destroy the independence and nonpartisan character of our Supreme Court. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Yes, Mr. Speaker, in order to get control of the Government these desperate bosses of the Republican Party are willing to weaken public confidence in this court of last resort and destroy its usefulness as the chief guardian of constitutional rights and liberties. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The bosses of the Republican Party who invaded our temple of justice and undertook to violate its sanctity and rob it of its nonpartisan character by dragging it into politics are not the friends but they are the enemies of the Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

DESPERATE BOSSES.

We are told that when Napoleon made known to Josephine his intention to divorce her, she pointed to a star in the sky and said to him: "That is your star, bright and resplendent now, but the day that you divorce me your star is set." I want to say to the reckless bosses of the Republican Party who have gone to the Supreme Court for a candidate for President, you are taking a step fraught with grave danger to the country. You are seeking to violate a principle dear to the American people, and you

are striving to break a custom as old as the Government, and if your un-American plan succeeds you will have dimmed the luster and destroyed the brilliancy of the brightest star in the firmament of American liberty. [Applause on Democratic side.]

SINISTER INTERESTS.

Mr. Speaker, if this plan of the Republican bosses succeeds, and ex-Supreme Court Justice Hughes is elected President, the Supreme Court will be in politics, and then sinister interests will have succeeded in storming the once impregnable citadel of the Nation's strength and in striking down the mightiest bulwark of American liberty. [Applause on Democratic side.] They will then be able to do what they were powerless to accomplish before the Supreme Court was invaded by boss politicians and its members imbued with the desire for political office and fired with the spirit of partisan ambition. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Then it will not be long until we will be confronted with the awful spectacle of Supreme Court judges either openly or secretly striving to secure the Democratic and Republican nominations for the office of President. Mr. Speaker, upon our ability to defeat the establishment of this wicked precedent which would drag our Supreme Court into politics depends the preservation of rights and liberties dear to the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The wise custom which has kept our Supreme Court out of politics, purely judicial and nonpartisan in character, was in existence when every citizen now living was born, and the blessed right to keep it inviolate is the birthright of the American citizen. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Who, then, is ready to barter this birthright for a mess of political potage? Where is the father who will deliberately follow a course that he knows will bring evil to his children and injury to his country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Speaker, we must not weaken and impair this great judicial institution whose nonpartisan character has become a part of the vital life of the Nation, but we owe it to ourselves and to our children to contribute to its strength and preservation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Our fathers established this wise and valuable custom, and it is our duty to protect and preserve it.

SENATOR LODGE OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Senator LODGE of Massachusetts, a Republican, took the position in 1901 that—

When a judge ascends to the Supreme Court bench the door of political preferment closes behind him.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

So, Mr. Speaker, if a Supreme Court judge puts off the judicial ermine, turns his back upon the Constitution, and quits the temple of justice to engage in partisan warfare, we must see to it that the precedent is not established, for in this way alone can we prevent this public calamity and this crime against the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Grover Cleveland, in his article on "Good citizenship," said:

The abandonment of our country's watchtowers by those who should be on guard and the slumber of the sentinels who should never sleep directly invite the stealthy approach, the pillage, and the loot of selfishness and greed.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

If the Republic itself could speak, animated by the patriotic spirits of Washington, Madison, Marshall, and Lincoln, it would say to the Republican bosses who have violated confidence and abused power in the legislative and executive branches of the Government:

Spare the Supreme Court,
Place no stain upon its brow,
For a hundred years it has guided me,
And you shall not harm it now.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, of the long list of distinguished jurists who have ministered in the temple of justice only two or three have tried to drag it into politics and pervert it from the ends of its institution, but be it said to the everlasting praise of the patriots of the country, they refused to sanction this attempted violation of a time-honored custom. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The people of the United States are devoted to the principles and established in the faith that this court must and shall be forever free from partisan politics and political ambition. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

THE NATION'S HIGHEST COURT.

Mr. Speaker, our Supreme Court is the loftiest tribunal in all the world [applause], and a place on that bench is the climax and crowning glory of attainment in the legal profession. [Applause on the Democratic side.] When an American citizen is elevated to that high station and crosses its sacred threshold and puts on the honored ermine of the Nation's highest court,

he ought to dedicate his talents and consecrate his all to whole-hearted service in the temple of justice. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let it be known in all the hereafter that there is one high and sacred place in our system of Government that shall never be invaded by political influence and partisan ambition, and that everyone who enters that sacred tribunal closes the door of political ambition behind him, casts anchor with the Constitution to live and die as one of its faithful guardians. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

THE POWER OF LIFE AND DEATH.

Mr. Speaker, our Supreme Court holds the scales of justice between the man of moderate means and the man of large fortune. It determines cases in which the welfare of society is involved and the life of the citizen is at stake. It has the power to revise and destroy all other court decisions. It wields the power of life and death over State and Federal statute, and it has the power to declare null and void the acts of the Chief Executive of the Nation, and I submit to this House and to the country that this great court, on account of its supreme power and importance, should forever remain free from partisan ambition and political activity. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This court must never be perverted from the ends of its institution. It must forever remain true to the purpose of its creation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The power to make law is important and the power to execute law is essential, but the power to destroy law, the power to withhold or to administer justice, is the most important power of all. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

THE ARK OF THE COVENANT.

Here, then, in the Supreme Court, our fathers lodged the ark of our civic covenant, and they wisely provided that those chosen to guard and protect it should enlist for life and be consecrated to the service. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That ark was placed there by the founders of the Republic, and for more than a hundred years it has remained in the temple of justice high above the din and noise of partisan contests. There, in its exalted grandeur, it guards the Constitution, holds the scales of justice and contributes as no other power can to the strength and perpetuity of the Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, the man who votes to break this custom, to change the status of our Supreme Court from a nonpartisan to a political body, votes against his own best interest and against the best interest of his children and his children's children. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In the name of the sainted dead whose sacred hands separated that court from politics and dedicated it to the cause of justice, I call upon every patriot guard in the country to vote to retain this valuable custom. In the name of millions yet unborn, whose rights and liberties will be injuriously affected if this court is to be dragged into politics, I summon every sentinel in the Republic to protest and preserve this mighty bulwark of American liberty. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

THE VESTAL VIRGINS.

The historian tells us that in Rome, the preservation of fire was given a sacred office and that the vestal virgins were consecrated to the service. Winter and summer, year in and year out, they guarded the sacred flame. The Roman legions might be encamped upon the river Rhine or forming battle line along the distant Euphrates, back in the temple at Rome burned the eternal fire. Mr. Speaker, so long as the vestals kept vigil in the temple, all was well with the Roman Empire. From their sacred office, there radiated a power and an influence that kept citizen and soldier with heads erect and light upon their faces, and spreading contentment everywhere. But in an evil hour the tempter came. The vestals left the temple and the sacred flame went out. Faith in the Government and the spirit and lofty ideals that once characterized the people of Rome were gone, and with them went the spirit and moral stamina of citizen and soldier, and Rome fell down among her beautiful hills and died.

SUPREME COURT JUDGES IN THE TEMPLE.

Mr. Speaker, in building this Republic, our fathers gave to the Supreme Court a sacred office. They dedicated it to the cause of liberty and kindled upon its sacred altar the white fires of eternal justice. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They consecrated our Supreme Court Judges to service in the temple. And winter and summer, year in and year out they have guarded the sacred flame. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The waves of party strife and bitterness have beat against the legislative and executive branches of the Government, but beyond the sound of the breakers, and beyond the reach of the waves has stood in solemn grandeur this

American temple of justice. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

So long as it was free from politics and our justices kept vigil in the temple all was well with the Republic. The humblest citizen, the high and the low, the rich and the poor looked with implicit faith upon this temple as the very seat and home of justice. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This fidelity to duty on the part of the judge, and this abiding faith on the part of the citizen has been the inspiring power that has kept the light of justice forever burning in the temple and held the respect and confidence of the American people through all the years that are gone. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

SENATOR WORKS, OF CALIFORNIA.

Senator WORKS, a Republican, of California, a great lawyer, and one who cherishes in his heart the tradition which has kept our Supreme Court out of politics, said in the Senate of the United States, April 12, 1916:

To my mind, it is of the gravest importance that that great tribunal should be separated absolutely and forever from politics. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This attempt to bring the highest tribunal of the country or any member of it into politics should be resented, not only by the member to whom the tempting offer is made, but by the whole country.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

And, Mr. Speaker, it will be resented. Patriotic judges, lawyers, and laymen will stand in solid phalanx to prevent the establishment of this dangerous precedent. [Applause.] All men, regardless of party affiliations, know in their hearts that the independent and nonpartisan character of our Supreme Court has made it the mightiest force for good in this Government. [Applause.] Every man who hears me to-day knows that if ever a Supreme Court judge is elected President that the precedent for opening that court to partisan politics has been established and that that precedent would violate the sanctity and impair the usefulness of the highest court in the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That court of last resort, from whose decision there is no appeal, has been and in the future ought to be purely and wholly a tribunal of justice unhampered and unimpaired by political influences from without or partisan ambition from within. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

CLASHING CREEDS AND WARRING INTERESTS.

Mr. Speaker, above clashing creeds and warring interests, beyond the fret and the fever, the strife and the bitterness of partisan conflicts, sits this court with singleness of purpose, unswerving eye and steady hand holding aloft the eternal principles of justice. [Applause on the Democratic side.] As the crusaders fought to recover the holy sepulcher from the hands of infidels, I call upon the American crusader of to-day to fight with the same zeal and determination to protect our temple of justice against those who would debauch and defile it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] God of our fathers forbid that we shall ever prove recreant in our obligations to protect and preserve it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

ITS EXALTED MISSION.

This sacred custom has become a fixed principle with our people. It is as old as the 13 stripes in our flag, and its splendor is reflected in every star that beams in the blue of Old Glory. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It has blessed and benefited our people everywhere. It is vital to the happiness and well-being of a hundred millions of people, and it is necessary to the perpetuity of the Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let every patriot in the country declare once and for all that this temple of justice shall never become a political incubator to hatch out candidates for the office of President [Applause on the Democratic side], but that it shall remain now and forever true to the purpose of its creation and consecrated to its exalted mission. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

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. 5427. An act referring certain claims against the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, August 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 Secretary of the Treasury, submitting tentative draft of legislation making appropriation for sewer, auditor's building, old Bureau of Engraving and Printing, (H. Doc. No. 1317); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, inviting attention to a letter addressed to Congress under date of March 9, 1916, and which was printed as House Document No. 898, in regard to the laboratories, Bureau of Mines, Pittsburgh, Pa. (H. Doc. No. 1318); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the reclamation service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 1319); 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 were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. TAGGART, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14973) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the liability of common carriers by railroad to their employees in certain cases," approved April 22, 1908, and amended April 5, 1910, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1084), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13718) to authorize the maintenance and operation of dams across the St. Croix River at Baileyville and Grand Falls, Me., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1088), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 6372) to authorize the counties of Baldwin and Mobile, Ala., their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Spanish River at or near the junction of Raft and Spanish Rivers, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1089), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. HULL of Iowa, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14927) for the relief of William H. Boyer, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1078), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16590) for the relief of George Le Clear, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1079), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14245) for the relief of Edward Looby, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1080), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10697) for the relief of S. Spencer Carr, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1081), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8945) for the relief of John P. Chesley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1082), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5182) requiring the Secretary of War to issue an honorable discharge to Benjamin R. Buffington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1083), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13352) granting a pension to Charles C. Cooper; and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 17288) providing that Indian schools may be maintained without limitation as to annual rate of expenditure per pupil; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17289) providing for the continuance of the Osage Indian School, Oklahoma, for a period of 10 years from January 1, 1917; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 17290) providing for the registration of designs; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HAMILL: A bill (H. R. 17291) to regulate the shipment and storage of explosives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 17292) for the regulation of salaries in the custodian service of the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 17293) authorizing the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon for a post office in the city of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17294) relating to copyrights; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. TAGUE: A bill (H. R. 17295) to require fishing vessels to carry certain equipment for all small boats and dories; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 51) to create a committee to investigate the Government's treatment of the National Guard and what defects in the guard organization have been evidenced by the present mobilization; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 52) directing the Secretary of State to require consular agents to gather information regarding trade conditions in belligerent countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BELL: Resolution (H. Res. 335) to pay for folding speeches; to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 337) providing for the consideration of S. 509; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EAGAN: Resolution (H. Res. 338) to investigate the explosions at Jersey City, N. J., which occurred on the 30th of July, 1916; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRATT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 290) granting permission to the National Sculpture Society to hold an exhibition in the National Museum of a collection of American sculpture, and authorizing an appropriation in aid thereof; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 17296) removing the disabilities of Richard W. Hocker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 17297) granting an increase of pension to George W. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRITT: A bill (H. R. 17298) for the relief of Thomas Monteth; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17299) for the relief of M. A. Searcey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17300) for the relief of W. H. McFarland; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 17301) to correct the military record of Matthew C. Butler, jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 17302) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Bagley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 17303) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 17304) for the relief of W. L. Rose; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 17305) for the relief of William I. Wood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 17306) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Salton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 17307) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Bissell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: A bill (H. R. 17308) granting an increase of pension to Daniel E. Warner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 17309) granting a pension to Sarah K. Arnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17310) granting a pension to Robert Campbell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17311) granting a pension to Sarah M. J. Bertram; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17312) granting a pension to Joseph E. Blackwell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17313) granting a pension to Mary C. Bartlebaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17314) granting a pension to Harry Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17315) granting a pension to John R. Crayton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17316) granting an increase of pension to Lloyd Criswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17317) granting an increase of pension to William G. Camp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17318) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Barnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17319) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17320) granting an increase of pension to William H. Fulkineer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17321) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Atherton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17322) granting an increase of pension to William L. Alley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 17323) for the relief of William G. Gaylor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 17324) for the relief of the heirs of Charles F. McLean, of Union Church, Jefferson County, Miss.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 17325) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Glenn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 17326) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Sugg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 17327) granting a pension to Christiana Fortner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 17328) granting a pension to James M. Bush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 17329) granting a pension to Mary J. Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 17330) to pay to the trustees of the German Evangelical Church, of Humboldt, Kans., the sum of \$540, being the value of the use and occupation of the church building for a period of three years, from October, 1861, to October, 1864, by the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 17331) to permit Seth Shepard, Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, to retire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 17332) granting an increase of pension to Robert Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of union meeting of the four railroad transportation brotherhoods, approving stand taken by Hon. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, of Alabama, relative to Hay conscription bill, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASWELL: Memorial of Southern Forestry Congress, favoring amendment to the Agricultural appropriation bill for purchase of forest areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAILEY: Memorial of Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, Altoona Lodge, No. 287, favoring House bill 16142, relative to limiting the length of trains, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BEALES: Evidence in support of House bill 13352, granting a pension to Charles C. Cooper; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of Dr. Robert P. Knapp, of New York City, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of members of the Custodian Mutual & Benevolent Welfare League, favoring the Nolan minimum-wage bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Paramount Knitting Co., of New York, favoring passage of the Army bill with Senate amendments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Westbrook Farm, Oakdale, Long Island, N. Y., against House bill 16307, for registration of pure-bred live stock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Oakcrest Association, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring investigation relative to high price of anthracite coal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of sundry citizens of the United States, relative to program of constructive peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petitions of Seggerman Bros. and Rockwood & Co., of New York, against amendment to the general revenue bill ceasing drawbacks during the war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Technology Sales Co., of New York, favoring the Senate Navy bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of New York Produce Exchange, favoring adequate American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of market committee, American National Live Stock Association, favoring Borland resolution, relative to marketing live stock, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of New York Produce Exchange, relative to adequate merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of executive committee, National Association Union Volunteer Officers, relative to Volunteer officers' retired-list bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Association to Resist British Domination of American Commerce, relative to restrictions on American citizens, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Order of Railway Conductors, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, etc., relative to wage controversy between railroads and employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of New York Produce Exchange, favoring adequate American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of Wisconsin Retail Clothiers' Association, favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of New York Produce Exchange, favoring adequate American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of R. D. Cobb and 32 other citizens of Riverdale, Gratiot County, Mich., regarding Senate bill 5677; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial of directors of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, favoring the Shields water-power bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of members of Freight Agents' Association of South Chicago, Ill., urging legislation to empower the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate the threatened railroad strike; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the Philadelphia Bourse, favoring reference of railroad difficulties to Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: Petition of sundry citizens of Gleas Falls, N. Y., favoring passage of a bill for a Federal motion-picture commission; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Redlands, Cal., relative to arbitration between railroads and their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Narragansett Lodge, No. 478, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, favoring passage of House bills 1668 and 15950; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Providence, R. I., favoring Federal censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Resolution adopted at union meeting of Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Order of Railroad Conductors, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, and Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, at Grand Forks, N. Dak., on July 2, 1916, protesting against legislation to establish compulsory arbitration, and protesting against the reference of labor disputes to the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, August 5, 1916.

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we call upon Thy name and invoke Thy blessing upon us as we address ourselves to the tasks of this day. We come to Thee lest we should lose the least opportunity to serve our fellow men. We come to Thee lest we should neglect to use the greatest power that Thou hast committed to us in this same service. This day may we be directed by Thy grace in the performance of the duties that are before us, and at its close may we have the comfortable satisfaction of having done our best to aid the world to higher and richer and nobler things. For Christ's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

On request of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN and by unanimous consent the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, August 1, 1916, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16699) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, 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 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 15; and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Add at the end of said amendment the following: "Provided further, That the present manager of the cadet store shall, on his own application, after 40 years' service as clerk, superintendent, and manager of said store, be entitled to be placed on the retired list of the Army with the pay of a retired pay clerk, Quartermaster Corps, of the same period of service"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided, That whenever a cadet shall fail to pass any required examination because deficient in any one subject of instruction he shall have the right to apply for a second examination regarding such subject by making written application therefor to the Academic Board within 10 days after being officially notified of such failure. The examination demanded shall be held within 60 days from the date of such application, and if the cadet being otherwise qualified shall pass the same by compliance with the requirements existing at the time of the first examination, he shall be readmitted to the academy: *Provided further*, That this proviso shall apply to those former cadets who failed in not more than two subjects during the current year who shall make application for such examination within 20 days after the approval of this act: *Provided further*, That any cadet who fails to pass any required examination shall have no more than one reexamination: *And provided further*, that nothing contained in section 1325 of the Revised Statutes shall render ineligible any former cadet honorably discharged from the Military Academy for deficiency in studies, if otherwise qualified, as a civilian candidate for appointment to any vacancy in the grade of second lieutenant under class 6 of the national defense act approved June 3, 1916"; and the Senate agree to the same.