

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We can not have a yea-and-nay vote to-night.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that we take a recess until to-morrow.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will vote on this amendment to-night.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, before the roll call begins, I move that when we take a recess to-day we recess until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock; that not later than 8 o'clock this evening we take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. OVERMAN. What is the motion?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The motion is that not later than 8 o'clock this evening we take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. What I desire is simply to get the recess in before we call the yeas and nays and disclose the lack of a quorum, after which we can do nothing but adjourn. That is the object I had in view.

Mr. OLIVER. I move to amend that motion by inserting "6" instead of "8."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I accept that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is that the Senate recess not later than 6 o'clock this evening until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. OWEN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] to the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). In the absence of my pair, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], I withhold my vote.

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement which I made on the last roll call, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BECKHAM. I am paired with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. I understand that Senator has not voted, and I withhold my vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I transfer the pair which I have heretofore announced to the junior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. POMERENE. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] on official business. He is paired with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT].

Mr. STONE. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK], who is absent. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. TAGGART] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN];

The Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE];

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES];

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]; and

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH].

The roll call resulted—yeas 22, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—22.

Brandegee	Kenyon	Pol Dexter	Wadsworth
Chamberlain	Kern	Pomerene	Walsh
Cummins	Lodge	Sheppard	Warren
Curtis	Oliver	Sherman	Williams
Harding	Page	Smith, Mich.	
Jones	Pittman	Sterling	

NAYS—23.

Bankhead	Martin, Va.	Ransdell	Thomas
Burleigh	Martine, N. J.	Robinson	Thompson
Hardwick	Myers	Shafroth	Underwood
Hughes	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	Vardaman
Johnson, Me.	Overman	Smith, Ga.	Works
Lane	Owen	Swanson	

NOT VOTING—51.

Ashurst	Dillingham	La Follette	Saulsbury
Beckham	du Pont	Lee, Tenn.	Shields
Borah	Fall	Lee, Md.	Simmons
Brady	Fletcher	Lewis	Smith, Md.
Broussard	Gallinger	Lippitt	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Goff	McCumber	Smoot
Catron	Gore	McLean	Stone
Chilton	Gronna	Newlands	Sutherland
Clapp	Hitchcock	Norris	Taggart
Clark, Wyo.	Hollis	O'Gorman	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Husting	Penrose	Townsend
Culberson	James	Phelan	Weeks
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Reed	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the amendment of the Senator from New York to the amendment of the committee, the result of the vote is yeas 22, nays 23. Senator BECKHAM and Senator STONE are present and not voting. The roll call discloses the lack of a quorum.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The Senate has already decided, has it not, that not later than 6 o'clock this evening it will stand in recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; the motion was that not later than 6 o'clock the Senate will take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. And that motion was agreed to before the roll was called?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That motion was agreed to before the roll call disclosed the lack of a quorum, so the Chair declares the Senate in recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock p. m.) under the order previously made, the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, April 15, 1916, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, April 14, 1916.

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

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

Infinite Spirit, God our Father, whose loving kindness and tender mercies are without end, we thank Thee for the gifts Thou hast bestowed upon us. Strengthen our will, quicken our conscience, and guide us in the use of our talents that we may be worthy recipients, faithful servants to Thee and our fellow men after the similitude of the Master. Amen.

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

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND LETTERS.

The SPEAKER. When the Senate bill incorporating the American Academy of Arts and Letters was passed there was a similar bill, H. R. 4678, on the House Calendar that should have been laid on the table. Without objection, it will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE ALLEGHENY RIVER, WARREN, PA.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there is on the Speaker's table a bill (S. 5229) providing for the construction of a bridge across the Allegheny River in the borough of Warren, Pa. A similar bill has been reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I ask to have the bill taken from the Speaker's table and laid before the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 5229) granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Warren County, Pa., to construct a bridge across the Allegheny River in the borough of Warren, county of Warren, in the State of Pennsylvania.

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the county commissioners of the county of Warren, in the State of Pennsylvania, and their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Allegheny River

at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in the borough of Warren, in the county of Warren, in the State of Pennsylvania, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

The bill H. R. 13475 was laid on the table.

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

THE TAX ON SUGAR.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 11471, an act to amend an act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to take the bill H. R. 11471 from the Speaker's table, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. KITCHIN, Mr. RAINEY, and Mr. FORDNEY.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12717, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and pending that I desire to ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who speak under the five-minute rule on the bill may have leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen who speak on the bill under the five-minute rule have leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The motion of Mr. LEVER was then agreed to; accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY].

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, it had been my intention to make some remarks on the California and Oregon land-grant problem. I had anticipated that the Committee on Public Lands would have reported the bill pending before it, but it has been unable to do so up to this time. I therefore ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 12717, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

H. SNOWDEN MARSHALL.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the select committee appointed by the Speaker of the House under House resolution 193, to inquire and report on the charges of contempt against H. Snowden Marshall for violation of the privileges of the House, I submit the following report.

Mr. Speaker, in order that Mr. Marshall may have full opportunity to examine this report and that the membership may become acquainted with it, I ask unanimous consent that the report lie on the Speaker's table until it is called up at a later day by the select committee, and that it be printed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee, chairman of the select committee, offers the report and asks unanimous consent that it lie on the Speaker's table and that the report be printed.

Mr. MANN. What is the object of laying it on the Speaker's table? It goes into the Clerk's hands if it is to be postponed and printed. How long is the report?

Mr. MOON. It is about 30 pages of typewritten matter, and then, of course, the evidence is attached as an appendix, and that is lengthy.

Mr. MANN. I thought if it was a short report it might be read, but I have no desire to have it read now.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee that the report be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MOON. I will ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the report be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman state when he will call up the report?

Mr. MOON. In view of the charges and the voluminous amount of testimony and the fact that Mr. Marshall is district attorney and engaged in the performance of his duties and is pressed for time, I think we ought to wait 10 days or two weeks.

Mr. MANN. It will not be called up this week and probably not next week, will it?

Mr. MOON. I will say that it will not be called up inside of two weeks. If it is desired, the House can fix a day now.

Mr. MANN. We can do that later.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the evidence be also printed in the RECORD with the report?

The SPEAKER. No; just the report will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. GARRETT. But the evidence will be printed in the document as a part of the report?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

The report is as follows:

[House Rept. No. 544, 64th Cong., 1st sess.]

H. SNOWDEN MARSHALL.

Mr. MOON, from the select committee appointed pursuant to H. Res. 193, submitted the following report:

The select committee of the House of Representatives was appointed under House resolution 193, which is as follows:

"[H. Res. 193, 64th Cong., 1st sess.]

"Resolved, That a select committee of five members be appointed forthwith by the Speaker to consider the report, in the nature of a statement, from the Judiciary Committee with reference to certain conduct of H. Snowden Marshall, and to report to the House of Representatives the facts in the case; the violations, if any, of the privileges of the House of Representatives or of the Committee on the Judiciary, or of the subcommittee thereof; the power of the House to punish for contempt; and the procedure in contempt proceedings, in case they find a contempt has been committed, to the end that the privileges of the House shall be maintained and the rights of Members protected in the performance of their official duties.

"The select committee shall have the power to send for persons and papers and shall submit its report to the House not later than April 14, 1916."

The report upon which this resolution was predicated and to which it refers is as follows:

"[House Rept. No. 494, 64th Cong., 1st sess.]

"ALLEGED OFFICIAL MISCONDUCT OF H. SNOWDEN MARSHALL.

"[Apr. 5, 1916.—Ordered to be printed.]

"Mr. WEBB, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report (to accompany H. Res. 193):

"By direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I beg leave to make the following report, in the nature of a statement, to the House of Representatives. On the 12th day of January, 1916, Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois, arose, in his responsible position, on the floor of the House and impeached H. Snowden Marshall, district attorney for the southern district of the State of New York, charging the said H. Snowden Marshall with numerous malfeasances and misfeasances and with corrupt and improper behavior and conduct in office. Immediately after the reading of said charges Representative BUCHANAN offered, for the immediate consideration of the House, resolution 90, which provided, among other things, 'that the Committee on the Judiciary be directed to inquire and report whether the action of this House is necessary concerning the alleged official misconduct of H. Snowden Marshall,' etc. After debate on the resolution the House, upon motion of Mr. FITZGERALD, of New York, referred the resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary for its consideration and action.

"The Committee on the Judiciary immediately began the consideration of said resolution and called Representative BUCHANAN before it to make such statement and furnish such information concerning the truth of his impeachment charges, as set out in House resolution 90, as he was able to make and furnish. Thereafter, on the 27th day of January, 1916, by direction of the Judiciary Committee, the chairman thereof offered in the House of Representatives the following resolution:

"[House resolution 110.]

"Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary in continuing their consideration of House resolution 90 be authorized and empowered to send for persons and papers, to subpoena witnesses, to administer oaths to such witnesses, and take their testimony.

"The said committee is also authorized to appoint a subcommittee to act for and on behalf of the whole committee wherever it may be deemed advisable to take testimony for said committee. In case such subcommittee is appointed, it shall have the same powers in respect to obtaining testimony as are herein given to the Committee on the Judiciary, with a sergeant at arms, by himself or deputy, who shall attend the sittings of such subcommittee and serve the process of same.

"In case the Committee on the Judiciary or a subcommittee thereof deems it necessary it may employ such clerks and stenographers as are required to carry out the authority given in this resolution, and

the expenses so incurred shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

"The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall have authority to sign, and the Clerk thereof to attest, subpoenas for witnesses, and the Sergeant at Arms or a deputy shall serve them."

"The said resolution was on said date unanimously agreed to.

"While further considering the said House resolution 90 and the said House resolution 110, on the 31st day of January, 1916, the Committee on the Judiciary authorized the chairman to appoint a subcommittee of three to execute the purposes of House resolution 110 to act for and on behalf of the full committee wherever it may be deemed advisable to take testimony for said committee, and on February 1, 1916, the chairman appointed Messrs. Charles C. Carlin, Warren Gard, and John M. Nelson as members of such subcommittee.

"Thereafter the said subcommittee organized and heard the testimony of certain witnesses in the Judiciary Committee rooms in the city of Washington. The subcommittee determined, for its further information and in carrying out the duties assigned it under the resolution of the House of Representatives, that it should hear the testimony of certain other witnesses in the city of New York, and on the 28th day of February, 1916, the said subcommittee, under subpoenas duly signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and attested by the Clerk thereof, caused certain witnesses to be brought before it, in the Federal post-office building in the city of New York, and continued the examination of witnesses upon said charges up to and including the 4th day of March, 1916.

"On the 3d day of March, 1916, there appeared in a New York newspaper an article containing, among other things, the following language:

"It is the belief in the district attorney's office that the real aim of the Congress investigation is to put a stop to the criminal investigation of the pro-German partisans.

"On the 3d of March, 1916, the subcommittee called before it one Leonard R. Holme, who testified to the subcommittee that he wrote the article containing the foregoing language, but when asked whether or not he conferred with anybody in the district attorney's office before the article was written replied that he declined to give the source of his information. The chairman of the subcommittee then propounded this question to the witness: 'Did you confer with Mr. Marshall before you wrote this article?' To which the witness replied, 'I respectfully decline to answer the question, sir.' The chairman of the subcommittee then propounded the following question to him: 'Did you confer with anybody in Mr. Marshall's office?' To which the witness replied, 'I respectfully decline to answer that question, sir.'

"Whereupon, the Sergeant at Arms was directed by the chairman of the subcommittee to take charge of the witness and keep him in custody until the further order of the committee. At 4.10 o'clock p. m. of the same day, the chairman of the subcommittee again propounded the foregoing questions to Witness Holme, and the following proceedings were had:

"Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Holme, the committee has directed me to order you to answer the question which was asked you. Mr. Stenographer, read the testimony of Mr. Holme.

"(The entire previous testimony of Mr. Holme was read to the committee by the stenographer in the hearing of the committee only.)

"Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Holme, I hand you this article in the sixth column of page 4 of the New York Times, dated Friday, March 3, 1916. The article is headed 'Marshall refuses BUCHANAN evidence.' I now call your attention to this paragraph of the article:

"It is the belief in the district attorney's office that the real aim of the Congress investigation is to put a stop to the criminal investigation of the pro-German partisans."

"I ask you from whom you got that information?

"Mr. HOLME. That information, sir, is a deduction. I have known at the time these proceedings were begun at Washington, it was before the indictment of Congressman BUCHANAN, that there had been a considerable amount of talk around this building as to their nature. I am down here practically every day of my life, and I meet with a great many men who are connected with the district attorney's office and who are in this building in various other regular capacities, and I based that paragraph entirely upon my knowledge of the general gossip around the building and the general feeling in the building.

"Mr. CARLIN. Why did you not state that, instead of saying it is the belief in the district attorney's office?

"Mr. HOLME. Well, sir, it comes to much the same thing, does it not? The district attorney's office is a large organization.

"Mr. CARLIN. Is that your answer?

"Mr. HOLME. Yes, sir.

"Mr. CARLIN. Did you base that part of the article upon a conference held with H. Snowden Marshall or any subordinate of his in the district attorney's office?

"Mr. HOLME. I based that article on my general knowledge of the conditions surrounding this proceeding and the general opinion floating around the building.

"Mr. CARLIN. You state that it is the general belief in the district attorney's office. Now, who in the district attorney's office expressed that belief?

"Mr. HOLME. I don't think I could give you any definite names, because I have discussed this matter with a large number of different people at various times.

"Mr. CARLIN. As a matter of fact, did anybody in the district attorney's office express that belief?

"Mr. HOLME. Yes, sir.

"Mr. CARLIN. Who?

"Mr. HOLME. I can only remember a very few, and I respectfully decline, as a newspaper man, to express their opinions, which are often given to me in general conversation.

"Mr. CARLIN. Was the belief expressed by Mr. Marshall or either of his assistants?

"Mr. HOLME. I respectfully decline to answer, sir.

"Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Stenographer, insert in the record this article which I hand you, and the date line of the paper.

"Mr. GARD. I understand you to say, Mr. Holme, that this extract which has been read to you was written by you?

"Mr. HOLME. Yes, sir.

"Mr. GARD. And the extract is this:

"It is the belief of the district attorney's office that the real aim of the congressional investigation is to put a stop to the criminal investigation of the pro-German partisans."

"You wrote that?

"Mr. HOLME. Yes, sir.

"Mr. GARD. And I understand also that you decline and refuse to answer questions as to whether you obtained that information from

anyone in the district attorney's office of the southern district of New York?

"Mr. HOLME. Yes, sir.

"Mr. GARD. You decline to answer that?

"Mr. HOLME. Yes, sir.

"Mr. CARLIN. Now, then, Mr. Holme, I am directed by the committee to order you to answer that. Do you still decline?

"Mr. HOLME. I do, respectfully, sir.

"Mr. CARLIN. Then, I am directed to say to you, for the record, that this committee determines you to be in contempt of the order of the committee and of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and that for the present you will be released from the custody of the marshal until the committee, if it sees proper, shall proceed in the manner prescribed by statute in such cases. We want to be kind to you. We have no desire to be harsh with you. We realize to some extent your embarrassment. We have a duty to discharge, and we think under the circumstances we will discharge it in this way and release you from the custody of the Sergeant at Arms of the House."

"On Saturday, the 4th day of March, 1916, the said H. Snowden Marshall, as district attorney for the southern district of New York, caused to be transmitted to C. C. CARLIN, chairman of said subcommittee, then in the performance of its duties, as required by the House of Representatives, the following letter:

"DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE,
New York, March 4, 1916.

"SIR: Yesterday afternoon, as I am informed, your honorable committee ordered the arrest of Mr. L. R. Holme, a representative of a newspaper which had published an article at which you took offense. The unfortunate gentleman of the press was placed in custody under your orders. He was taken to the United States marshal to be placed in confinement (I do not understand whether his sentence was to be one day or a dozen years). The marshal very properly declined to receive the prisoner. This left you at a loss, and I am advised that you tried to work your way out of the awkward situation by having Mr. Holme brought back and telling him that you were disposed to be 'kind' to him and then discharged him for the purpose of avoiding unpleasant consequences to yourselves.

"You are exploiting charges against me of oppressive conduct toward a member of your honorable body who is charged with a violation of law and of oppressive conduct on my part toward shysters in the blackmailing and bankruptcy business.

"I may be able to lighten your labors by offering to resign if you can indicate anything I ever did that remotely approximates the lawless tyranny of your order of arrest of Mr. Holme.

"The supposed justification of your order that Mr. Holme be placed in custody was his refusal to answer the question you asked as to where he got the information on which was based the article which displeased you.

"It is not necessary for you to place anyone under arrest in order to get the answers to the question which you asked Mr. Holme, because I can and will answer it. I gave Mr. Holme information, part of which he published and from which he made deductions, so that if your honorable committee has a grievance it is against me and not against him.

"What I told him was about as follows:

"I said that your expedition to this town was not an investigation conducted in good faith, but was a deliberate effort to intimidate any district attorney who had the temerity to present charges against one of your honorable body.

"I said that your whole proceeding here was irregular and extraordinary; that I had never heard of such conduct of an impeachment proceeding; that charges of this sort were not usually heard in public until the House of Representatives had considered them and were willing to stand back of them.

"I pointed out to him that you, contrary to usual practice, had come here and had held public hearings; that among your witnesses you had invited every rogue that you could lay your hands on to come before you and blackmail and slander me and my assistants under the full privilege of testifying before a congressional committee.

"I told him that you had called one of my junior assistants before you and had attempted to make it publicly appear that his refusal to answer your questions as to what occurred in the grand-jury room in the Buchanan case was due solely to my orders. I said that at the time you attempted to convey this public impression you knew that it was misleading, because I had been asked by you to produce the minutes of the grand jury and had been instructed by the Attorney General not to comply with your request, as you well knew. I showed him the telegram of the Attorney General to me and showed him a copy of my letter to you, dated February 29, 1916, in which I sent you a copy of the telegram of the Attorney General instructing me not to give you the grand-jury minutes.

"I told him that you were traveling around in your alleged investigation of me with BUCHANAN's counsel, Walsh and David Slade, in constant conference with you. I said that I believed that every word of the evidence, whether in so-called secret sessions or not, had been placed at the disposal of these worthies, and that I would be just as willing to give the grand-jury minutes to a defendant as to give them to your honorable subcommittee.

"I told him that I did not share the views which seemed to prevail in your subcommittee on this subject. I said that I regarded a Member of Congress who would take money for an unlawful purpose from any foreign agent as a traitor, and that it was a great pity that such a person could only be indicted under the Sherman law, which carries only one year in jail as punishment.

"I said that it was incomprehensible to me how your honorable subcommittee should rush to the assistance of an indicted defendant; how you had apparently resolved to prevent prosecution by causing the district attorney in charge to be publicly slandered.

"I told him that I would not permit the prosecution of the persons whose cause you had apparently espoused to be impeded by you; I said that if you wanted the minutes of the grand jury in any case, you would not get them as long as I remained in office. You will observe from the foregoing statement that what Mr. Holme published may have been based on what I said. If you have any quarrel, it is with me, and not with him.

"It is amazing to me to think that you supposed that I did not understand what you have been attempting to do during your visit here. I realized that your effort was to ruin me and my office by publishing with your full approval the complaints of various persons who have run afoul of the criminal law under my administration. Your subcommittee has endeavored by insulting questions to my assistants and others, by giving publicity and countenance to the charges of rascals

and by refusing to listen to the truth and refusing to examine public records to which your attention was directed, to publicly disgrace me and my office.

"I propose to make this letter public.

"Respectfully,

"H. SNOWDEN MARSHALL,
"United States Attorney.

"Hon. C. C. CARLIN,

"Chairman Subcommittee of the Judiciary,
"Committee of the House of Representatives,
"323 Federal Building, New York, N. Y."

"At the same time or before this letter was sent to the subcommittee it was given to the newspapers and published by them.

"On the 9th day of March, 1916, the subcommittee aforesaid, through its chairman, Hon. C. C. CARLIN, submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary the foregoing letter of H. Snowden Marshall.

"On or about the 11th day of March, 1916, the following letter was received by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and immediately laid before the full committee:

"DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
"UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE,
"New York, March 10, 1916.

"DEAR SIR: Referring to my letter of March 4, addressed to the chairman of the subcommittee which has recently taken testimony in New York concerning my administration of my office, I notice from the press that some persons appear to have construed my statements as directed toward your honorable committee as a whole. I beg to advise you that the criticisms in that letter were addressed to the methods pursued by the subcommittee. I do not retract nor modify any of those criticisms. But I did not intend (nor do I think my letter should be construed) to reflect in any way upon the Judiciary Committee, nor did I question the power of the House of Representatives to order such an investigation.

"If you and the other members of your committee, for whom I have high respect, have gained the impression that my letter carried any personal reflection upon your honorable committee, it gives me pleasure to assure you that I had no such purpose.

"Respectfully,

"H. SNOWDEN MARSHALL.

"Hon. EDWIN Y. WEBB,

"Chairman of the Judiciary Committee,
"House of Representatives, Washington, D. C."

"The Judiciary Committee has carefully considered said letters in the light of congressional and judicial precedents as touching the prerogatives of the House of Representatives and its Members, and the committee has come to the determination that said letters, their publication and attendant circumstances, are of such nature that they should be called to the attention of the House. For obvious reasons, the committee deems it advisable to take this step rather than to report directly upon the facts and the law in the case. I am, therefore, directed by the committee to report the whole matter to the House of Representatives with the recommendation that a select committee of five be appointed by the Speaker to report upon the facts in this case; the violations, if any, of the privileges of the House or the Committee on the Judiciary or the subcommittee thereof; the power of the House to punish for contempt; and the procedure in contempt proceedings, to the end that the privileges of the House shall be maintained and the rights of the Members protected in the performance of their official duties."

The select committee appointed under House resolution 193 met for the hearing on Friday, April 7, 1916, at 10 a. m., and took the testimony of Representatives Webb, Gard, Nelson, and Carlin and directed the chairman to send the following letter to Hon. H. Snowden Marshall, of New York, and then adjourned to 10 a. m., Monday, April 10, 1916:

"APRIL 7, 1916.

"Hon. H. SNOWDEN MARSHALL,

"United States District Attorney for the
"Southern District of New York, New York City.

"DEAR SIR: Inclosed is H. Res. 193 and Report No. 494, which explain themselves. The select committee appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives are now engaged in the investigation of the matters referred to herein. We will be glad to have you appear before us, if you so desire, at the rooms of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives, in the Capitol Building, Washington, D. C., on Monday, April 10, 1916, at 10 o'clock a. m., and make such statement as you may desire before the committee touching this matter. As the time of the committee is limited in which to report, you will oblige us by advising by wire whether you desire to be present or not. This communication is made to you by order of the select committee.

"Very truly, yours,

"JOHN A. MOON,
"Chairman Select Committee."

This letter was mailed to Mr. Marshall on the 7th of April, 1916. On April 8, 1916, the following reply was received by wire:

"NEW YORK, N. Y., April 8, 1916.

"Hon. JOHN A. MOON,

"Washington, D. C.:

"Your letter received. It will give me pleasure to appear before your committee at the time and place mentioned in your letter.

"H. SNOWDEN MARSHALL."

The committee met again at 10 a. m., April 10, 1916, pursuant to adjournment, when Mr. Marshall appeared and was given a stenographic copy of the statements of witnesses who had testified in the case, and was advised that he would be given an opportunity before making his statement to read the same and cross-examine the witnesses. Thereupon the committee adjourned to 1.30 p. m., April 10, 1916, this being deemed sufficient time by Mr. Marshall in which to examine the statements of the witnesses.

The select committee met again at 1.30 p. m., April 10, 1916. Mr. Marshall appeared and made a statement in writing and testified orally. He also subsequently submitted an additional statement on April 12, 1916, and some newspaper clippings. The statements and testimony of all the witnesses who appeared before the select committee are attached hereto as an appendix to this report. The newspaper clippings are not strictly relevant, but are filed. There was also filed as evidence for reference the hearings in the case of charges against H. Snowden Marshall, taken by a subcommittee of the Commit-

tee on the Judiciary in New York on February 28, 1916, and following. These hearings are material mainly in determining whether the subcommittee making the investigation was acting within the scope of its authority.

FINDING OF FACTS.

1. H. Snowden Marshall is and has been for several years past United States district attorney for the southern district of New York.

2. On the 28th day of December, 1915, the grand jury in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York found an indictment against a Member of the House, Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, and others, for the violation of a Federal statute. (We have not been furnished with a copy of this indictment and therefore can not incorporate it in this report.)

3. On December 14, 1915, preceding the finding of the indictment, Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois, impeached H. Snowden Marshall, the United States district attorney for the southern district of New York, of malfeasance and misfeasance in office. On January 12, 1916, said Representative BUCHANAN again presented to the House charges and impeached the said H. Snowden Marshall, United States district attorney for the southern district of New York, as follows:

"IMPEACHMENT OF H. SNOWDEN MARSHALL.

"The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Buchanan] is recognized.

"Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the highest privilege. By virtue of my office as a Member of the House of Representatives I impeach H. Snowden Marshall, United States district attorney for the southern district of New York, of high crimes and misdemeanors.

"I charge him with having conspired with persons, firms, and corporations, their agents and servants, to grant such persons, firms, and corporations the privilege of violating various criminal, neutrality, interstate commerce, or custom laws of the United States in the southern district of New York.

"I charge him with securing for persons or corporations great financial profit in consequence of the violation of the United States laws.

"I charge him with corruptly and collusively participating in such conspiracies.

"I charge him with corruptly neglecting and refusing to prosecute gross and notorious violations of various criminal, neutrality, custom revenue, and antitrust laws of the United States within said judicial district.

"I charge him with corruptly inducing and procuring grand juries to return into the district court for the southern district of New York of indictments charging crimes without there being evidence before said grand jury which would in any degree justify the finding and filing of such indictments.

"I charge him with being guilty of oppression in corruptly procuring indictments from the grand jury in said district charging reputable citizens with crime, although there was no evidence before the grand jury which would in the least warrant such charges.

"I charge him with corruptly conspiring with other persons to spread broadcast throughout the United States maliciously false newspaper publications and reports, emanating as official statements and purporting to describe results of investigations conducted by said United States attorney and his assistants, with the object of destroying friendly relations between the United States and one or more foreign governments.

"I charge him with unlawfully and feloniously abusing the legal process before the grand jury in said district of New York, the Secret Service, and the Bureau of Investigation and Inquiry of the Department of Justice in furtherance of such conspiracy aforesaid.

"I charge him with having knowledge, or the existence of circumstances from which knowledge is imputed to him, that large sums of money have been expended for or on behalf of foreign Governments and of various purveyors and manufacturers of war munitions for the purpose of influencing the actions of said United States attorney in furtherance of a conspiracy.

"I charge him with having corruptly neglected or refused to prosecute men who have made the port of New York, within said judicial district, a military or naval base for foreign belligerent powers.

"I charge him with corruptly neglecting and refusing to prosecute violations of Federal statutes prohibiting the loading and shipment of explosives on ships carrying passengers within said judicial district.

"I charge him with corruptly neglecting and refusing to prosecute violations of the foreign-enlistment act and laws of the United States within said district.

"I charge him with having corruptly used the powers of his office for the purpose of slandering and libeling peaceable and law-abiding people to their great injury.

"I charge him with having abetted, approved, acquiesced, and permitted unlawful and oppressive misuses of subpoenas and other process before grand juries in said southern district of New York.

"I charge him with having deprived law-abiding citizens of their legal rights, privileges, and immunities.

"I charge him with aiding, abetting, and approving unlawful expenditures of public moneys in violation of the laws of the United States.

"I charge him with being guilty of attempts by private solicitation of influencing the official actions and opinions of judges in the southern district of New York while in the performance of their judicial duties.

"I charge him with having used the powers of his office to cause and procure a discrimination in the assignment of judges to conduct trials in said district, so as to discriminate against one or more resident judges.

"I charge him with having used the powers of his office to procure or assist in the procurement of judges to be imported into the southern district of New York from other districts for the trial of cases in said district by falsely representing the condition of judicial business within said district.

"I charge him with being guilty of private solicitation with intent to influence the official acts and decisions of judges imported as aforesaid.

"I charge him with having attempted to corruptly control decisions and official actions of one or more of such imported judges.

"I charge him with having procured the assignment of one or more imported judges for the conduct of trials in the said district for the purpose of preventing defendants in such cases from receiving a fair and impartial trial at the hands of resident judges.

"I charge him with being a party to a conspiracy participated in by his assistant district attorneys and other officials connected with the administration of justice in the said southern district of New York for the purpose of unlawfully manipulating and controlling the selec-

tion of grand and petit jurors in connection with cases in the courts of said districts.

"I charge him with having been guilty of acts by which the rights of the United States and that of individuals have been unlawfully prejudiced and the orderly and fair administration of justice defeated or obstructed in one or more instances.

"I charge him with having employed the powers of his office for the purpose of shielding and to prevent the exposure of unlawful and improper conduct of one James W. Osborne in relation to facts involved in civil litigation which was pending in the State court in the State of New York.

"I charge him with unlawfully protecting the said Osborne and others from prosecution for the violation of United States laws.

"I charge him with willfully and corruptly refusing and neglecting to prosecute gross and notorious violations of the United States statutes committed by said James W. Osborne and others in the city and State of New York within said district.

"I charge him with having prostituted the office of United States district attorney for the southern district of New York.

"I charge him with having used the powers of his said office as United States district attorney to corruptly and willfully defame, slander, and injure the good name and professional standing of law-abiding citizens of the United States, to their great injury, for the purpose of protecting the private individual interests of James W. Osborne.

"I charge him with having corruptly failed, neglected, and refused to prosecute persons who, while acting as witnesses for the United States in the trial of causes, committed the crime of perjury, subornation of perjury, and conspiracy in connection with the cases of United States against Rae Tanzer, United States against Frank D. Safford, and United States against Albert J. McCullough et al.

"I charge him with having used and employed the United States grand jury in the southern district of New York for the purpose of attempting to establish records which might be used in defense of James W. Osborne, H. Snowden Marshall, Roger B. Wood, and Samuel H. Hershenstein (the last two being assistant United States district attorneys under said H. Snowden Marshall), and not for the purpose of investigation of violations of the United States laws.

"I charge him with corruptly and willfully failing to remove certain of his assistant district attorneys who destroyed documentary evidence material in the trial of a pending case in the United States district court for the southern district of New York.

"I charge him with corruptly and maliciously causing to be instituted criminal proceedings against Rae Tanzer and others for the purpose of protecting James W. Osborne, a special United States district attorney and a personal intimate friend of said H. Snowden Marshall.

"I charge him with corruptly and willfully failing and refusing to present to the court the trial of cases material and important evidence and in concealing or assisting and acquiescing in the concealment or destruction of material and important evidence relating to pending cases in the United States district court for the southern district of New York.

"I charge him with being corrupt, grossly negligent, and unfit to retain the office as United States district attorney for the southern district of New York.

"I charge him with having willfully and persistently violated the laws of the United States in connection with the performance by him of the duties of such United States district attorney for said southern district of New York.

"I charge him with having corruptly and willfully withheld and failed to present before the grand jury material and important evidence in connection with alleged investigations instituted before said grand jury by said H. Snowden Marshall in relation to the cases of United States against Rae Tanzer and United States against Albert J. McCullough et al., and others.

"I charge him with having corruptly and willfully refused and neglected to take cognizance of unlawful conduct of his assistant district attorneys in connection with the performance by them of official duties as such assistant district attorneys.

"I charge him with corruptly participating in or acquiescing to the presentation to the court in trial of cases in the southern district of New York of alleged evidence which he knew to be untrue and manufactured, or in the manufacture of and attempt to manufacture such alleged evidence.

"I charge him with producing willful injury and wrong to litigants in said district court and to citizens of the United States by his unlawful and improper conduct.

"Mr. Speaker, I send up the following resolution to the desk to be read by the Clerk.

"The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

"The Clerk read as follows:

"Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be directed to inquire and report whether the action of this House is necessary concerning the alleged official misconduct of H. Snowden Marshall; whether he has conspired with persons, firms, and corporations, their agents and servants, to grant such persons, firms, and corporations the privilege of violating various criminal, neutrality, interstate-commerce, or custom laws of the United States in the southern district of New York; whether he has secured for persons or corporations great financial profit in consequence of the violation of the United States laws; whether he has corruptly and collusively participated in such conspiracies; whether he has corruptly neglected and refused to prosecute gross and notorious violations of various criminal, neutrality, custom-revenue, and antitrust laws of the United States within said judicial district; whether he has corruptly induced and procured grand juries to return into the District Court for the Southern District of New York indictments charging crimes without there being evidence before said grand jury which would in any degree justify the finding and filing of such indictments; whether he has been guilty of oppression in corruptly procuring indictments from the grand jury in said district, charging reputable citizens with crime, although there was no evidence before the grand jury which would in the least warrant such charges; whether he has corruptly conspired with other persons to spread broadcast throughout the United States maliciously false newspaper publications and reports emanating as official statements and purporting to describe results of investigations conducted by said United States attorney and his assistants with the object of destroying friendly relations between the United States and one or more foreign governments; whether he has unlawfully and feloniously abused the legal process before the grand jury in said district of New York, the Secret Service, and the Bureau of Investigation and Inquiry of the Department of Justice in furtherance of such conspiracy aforesaid; whether he has knowledge or whether there are in existence circumstances from which knowledge is imputed to

him that large sums of money have been expended for or on behalf of foreign governments and of various purveyors and manufacturers of war munitions for the purpose of influencing the actions of said United States attorney in furtherance of a conspiracy; whether he has corruptly neglected and refused to prosecute men who have made the port of New York within said judicial district a military and naval base for foreign belligerent powers; whether he has corruptly neglected and refused to prosecute violations of the Federal statutes prohibiting the loading and shipment of explosives on ships carrying passengers within said judicial district; whether he has corruptly neglected and refused to prosecute violations of the foreign enlistment act and laws of the United States; whether he has corruptly used the powers of his office for the purpose of slandering and libeling peaceable and law-abiding people to their great injury; whether he has abetted, approved, acquiesced in, and permitted unlawful and oppressive misuse of subpoenas and other process before the grand juries in said southern district of New York; whether he has deprived law-abiding citizens of their legal rights, privileges, and immunities; whether he has aided, abetted, and approved unlawful expenditures of public moneys in violation of the laws of the United States; whether he has been guilty of attempts by private solicitation to influence the official actions and opinions of judges in the southern district of New York while in the performance of their judicial duties; whether he has used the powers of his office to cause and procure a discrimination in the assignment of judges to conduct trials in said district so as to discriminate against one or more resident judges; whether he has used the powers of his office to procure or assist in the procurement of judges to be imported into the southern district of New York from other districts for the trial of cases in said district by falsely representing the condition of judicial business within said district; whether he has been guilty of private solicitation with intent to influence the official acts and decisions of judges imported as aforesaid; whether he has corruptly attempted to control decisions and official actions of one or more of such imported judges; whether he has procured the assignment of one or more imported judges for the conduct of trials in the said district for the purpose of preventing defendants in such cases from receiving a fair and impartial trial at the hands of resident judges; whether he has been a party to a conspiracy participated in by his assistant district attorneys and other officials connected with the administration of justice in the said southern district of New York, for the purpose of unlawfully manipulating and controlling the selection of grand and petit jurors in connection with cases in the courts of said district; whether he has been guilty of acts by which the rights of the United States and that of individuals have been unlawfully prejudiced and the orderly and fair administration of justice defeated or obstructed in one or more instances; whether he has employed the powers of his office for the purpose of shielding and to prevent the exposure of unlawful and improper conduct of one James W. Osborne in relation to facts involved in civil litigation which was pending in the State court in the State of New York; whether he unlawfully protected the said Osborne and others from prosecution for the violation of United States laws; whether he has willfully and corruptly refused and neglected to prosecute gross and notorious violations of the United States statutes committed by said James W. Osborne and others in the city and State of New York within said district; whether he has prosecuted the office of the United States district attorney for the southern district of New York; whether he has used the powers of his said office as United States district attorney to corruptly and willfully defame, slander, and injure the good name and professional standing of law-abiding citizens of the United States to their great injury for the purpose of protecting the private individual interests of James W. Osborne; whether he has corruptly failed, neglected, and refused to prosecute persons who, while acting as witnesses for the United States in the trial of causes, committed the crime of perjury, subornation of perjury, and conspiracy in connection with the cases of United States v. Rae Tanzer, United States v. Frank D. Safford, and United States v. Albert J. McCullough et al.; whether he used and employed the United States grand jury in the southern district of New York for the purpose of attempting to establish records which might be used in defense of James W. Osborne, H. Snowden Marshall, Roger B. Wood, and Samuel H. Hershenstein (the last two being assistant United States district attorneys under said H. Snowden Marshall), and not for the purpose of investigation of violations of the United States laws; whether he has corruptly and willfully failed to remove certain of his assistant district attorneys who destroyed documentary evidence material in the trial of a pending case in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York; whether he corruptly and maliciously caused to be instituted criminal proceedings against Rae Tanzer and others for the purpose of protecting James W. Osborne, a special United States district attorney and a personal intimate friend of said H. Snowden Marshall; whether he has corruptly and willfully failed and refused to present to the court the trial of cases material and important evidence and in concealing or assisting and acquiescing in the concealment or destruction of material and important evidence relating to pending cases in the United States district court for the southern district of New York; whether he is corrupt, grossly negligent, and unfit to retain the office as United States district attorney for the southern district of New York; whether he has willfully and persistently violated the laws of the United States in connection with the performance by him of the duties of such United States district attorney for said southern district of New York; whether he has corruptly and willfully withheld and failed to present before the grand jury material and important evidence in connection with alleged investigations instituted before said grand jury by said H. Snowden Marshall in relation to the cases of United States v. Rae Tanzer and United States v. Albert J. McCulloch et al. and others; whether he has corruptly and willfully refused and neglected to take cognizance of unlawful conduct of his assistant district attorneys in connection with the performance by them of official duties as such assistant district attorneys; whether he has corruptly participated in or acquiesced to the presentation to the court in trial of cases in the southern district of New York of alleged evidence which he knew to be untrue and manufactured, or in the manufacture of and attempt to manufacture such alleged evidence; whether he has produced willful injury and wrong to litigants in said district court and to citizens of the United States by his unlawful and improper conduct; whether he has been guilty of any misbehavior for which he should be impeached.

"And in making this investigation the said committee is hereby authorized to send for persons and papers, administer oaths, take testimony, employ a clerk and stenographer, and is also authorized to appoint a subcommittee to act for and on behalf of the whole committee whenever and wherever it may be deemed advisable to take testimony for the use of said committee. The said subcommittee while so employed shall have the same powers in respect to obtaining testimony

as are herein given to said Committee on the Judiciary, with a sergeant at arms, by himself or deputy, who shall serve the process of said committee or subcommittee and shall attend the sittings of the same as ordered and directed thereby. The Speaker shall have authority to sign and the Clerk to attest subpoenas for any witness or witnesses."

This resolution (afterwards numbered 90) was on the same day referred by the House to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4. On the 27th day of January, 1916, the House passed H. Res. 110, which is as follows:

"[House resolution 110, 64th Cong., 1st sess.]

"Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary in continuing their consideration of H. Res. 90 be authorized and empowered to send for persons and papers, to subpoena witnesses, to administer oaths to such witnesses, and take their testimony.

"The said committee is also authorized to appoint a subcommittee to act for and on behalf of the whole committee wherever it may be deemed advisable to take testimony for said committee. In case such subcommittee is appointed it shall have the same powers in respect to obtaining testimony as are herein given to the Committee on the Judiciary, with a sergeant at arms, by himself or deputy, who shall attend the sittings of such subcommittee and serve the process of same.

"In case the Committee on the Judiciary or a subcommittee thereof deems it necessary it may employ such clerks and stenographers as are required to carry out the authority given in this resolution, and the expenses so incurred shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

"The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall have authority to sign, and the Clerk thereof to attest, subpoenas for witnesses, and the Sergeant at Arms or a deputy shall serve them."

5. That Representatives CARLIN, GARD, and NELSON were appointed by the Judiciary Committee of the House a subcommittee to hear and report under the House resolution the facts as to the impeachment charges heretofore mentioned against H. Snowden Marshall, United States district attorney for the southern district of New York.

6. That while said committee were hearing testimony in New York City as to the truth of said charges, in accordance with the resolution and pursuant to authority given to them, that H. Snowden Marshall, the person against whom said impeachment proceeding was pending, without just cause published in the New York Times, a daily paper issued in the city of New York, and thereafter delivered to said subcommittee aforementioned, the following letter:

"DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
"UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE,
"New York, March 4, 1916.

"SIR: Yesterday afternoon, as I am informed, your honorable committee ordered the arrest of Mr. L. R. Holme, a representative of a newspaper which had published an article at which you took offense. The unfortunate gentleman of the press was placed in custody under your orders. He was taken to the United States marshal to be placed in confinement (I do not understand whether his sentence was to be one day or a dozen years). The marshal very properly declined to receive the prisoner. This left you at a loss, and I am advised that you tried to work your way out of the awkward situation by having Mr. Holme brought back and telling him that you were disposed to be 'kind' to him and then discharged him for the purpose of avoiding unpleasant consequences to yourselves.

"You are exploiting charges against me of oppressive conduct toward a Member of your honorable body who is charged with a violation of law and of oppressive conduct on my part toward shysters in the blackmailing and bankruptcy business.

"I may be able to lighten your labors by offering to resign if you can indicate anything I ever did that remotely approximates the lawless tyranny of your order of arrest of Mr. Holme.

"The supposed justification of your order that Mr. Holme be placed in custody was his refusal to answer the question you asked as to where he got the information on which was based the article which displeased you.

"It is not necessary for you to place anyone under arrest in order to get the answers to the question which you asked Mr. Holme, because I can and will answer it. I gave Mr. Holme information, part of which he published and from which he made deductions, so that if your honorable committee has a grievance it is against me and not against him.

"What I told him was about as follows:

"I said that your expedition to this town was not an investigation conducted in good faith, but was a deliberate effort to intimidate any district attorney who had the temerity to present charges against one of your honorable body.

"I said that your whole proceeding here was irregular and extraordinary; that I had never heard of such conduct of an impeachment proceeding; that charges of this sort were not usually heard in public until the House of Representatives had considered them and were willing to stand back of them.

"I pointed out to him that you, contrary to usual practice, had come here and had held public hearings; that among your witnesses you had invited every rogue that you could lay your hands on to come before you and blackmail and slander me and my assistants under the full privilege of testifying before a congressional committee.

"I told him that you had called one of my junior assistants before you and had attempted to make it publicly appear that his refusal to answer your questions as to what occurred in the grand jury room in the Buchanan case was due solely to my orders. I said that at the time you attempted to convey this public impression you knew that it was misleading, because I had been asked by you to produce the minutes of the grand jury and had been instructed by the Attorney General not to comply with your request, as you well knew. I showed him the telegram of the Attorney General to me and showed him a copy of my letter to you, dated February 29, 1916, in which I sent you a copy of the telegram of the Attorney General instructing me not to give you the grand jury minutes.

"I told him that you were traveling around in your alleged investigation of me with Buchanan's counsel, Walsh and David Slade, in constant conference with you. I said that I believed that every word of the evidence, whether in so-called secret sessions or not, had been placed at the disposal of these worthies, and that I would be just as willing to give the grand jury minutes to a defendant as to give them to your honorable subcommittee.

"I told him that I did not share the views which seemed to prevail in your subcommittee on this subject. I said that I regarded a Member of Congress who would take money for an unlawful purpose from any foreign agent as a traitor, and that it was a great pity that such a

person could only be indicted under the Sherman law, which carries only one year in jail as punishment.

"I said that it was incomprehensible to me how your honorable subcommittee should rush to the assistance of an indicted defendant; how you had apparently resolved to prevent prosecution by causing the district attorney in charge to be publicly slandered.

"I told him that I would not permit the prosecution of the persons whose cause you had apparently espoused to be impeded by you; I said that if you wanted the minutes of the grand jury in any case, you would not get them as long as I remained in office.

"You will observe from the foregoing statement that what Mr. Holme published may have been based on what I said. If you have any quarrel, it is with me and not with him.

"It is amazing to me to think that you supposed that I did not understand what you have been attempting to do during your visit here. I realized that your effort was to ruin me and my office by publishing with your full approval the complaints of various persons who had run afoul of the criminal law under my administration. Your subcommittee has endeavored by insulting questions to my assistants and others, by giving publicity and countenance to the charges of rascals, and by refusing to listen to the truth and refusing to examine public records to which your attention was directed to publicly disgrace me and my office.

"I propose to make this letter public.

"Respectfully,

"H. SNOWDEN MARSHALL,
"United States Attorney.

"Hon. C. C. CARLIN,

"Chairman Subcommittee of the Judiciary
"Committee of the House of Representatives,
"323 Federal Building, New York, N. Y."

7. That on March 10, 1916, the said H. Snowden Marshall published, in reference to the said subcommittee heretofore named, the following letter:

"DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
"UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE,
"New York, March 10, 1916.

"DEAR SIR: Referring to my letter of March 4, addressed to the chairman of the subcommittee which has recently taken testimony in New York concerning my administration of my office, I notice from the press that some persons appear to have construed my statements as directed toward your honorable committee as a whole. I beg to advise you that the criticisms in that letter were addressed to the methods pursued by the subcommittee. I do not retract nor modify any of those criticisms. But I did not intend (nor do I think my letter should be so construed) to reflect in any way upon the Judiciary Committee, nor did I question the power of the House of Representatives to order such an investigation.

"If you and the other members of your committee, for whom I have high respect, have gained the impression that my letter carried any personal reflection upon your honorable committee, it gives me pleasure to assure you that I had no such purpose.

"Respectfully,

"H. SNOWDEN MARSHALL.

"Hon. EDWIN Y. WEBB,

"Chairman of the Judiciary Committee,
"House of Representatives, Washington, D. C."

These are the material facts in the case.

8. We conclude and find that the aforesaid letter written and published by said H. Snowden Marshall to Hon. C. C. CARLIN, chairman of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, on March 4, 1916 (and copied herein in finding of fact No. 6; also in Report No. 494 copied herein), is as a whole and in several of the separate sentences defamatory and insulting and tends to bring the House into public contempt and ridicule, and that the said H. Snowden Marshall, by writing and publishing the same, is guilty of contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States because of the violation of its privileges, its honor, and its dignity.

9. We find that Mr. Marshall's testimony is an aggravation of his contempt.

COMMENT ON LAW AND FACTS.

Mr. Marshall denies any intention to insult or stand in contempt of the Judiciary Committee or the House of Representatives, but he practically concedes in his testimony his contempt for the subcommittee and his desire by these publications to bring the subcommittee into ridicule and disrepute. If this is not wholly conceded by him in his testimony, it is certainly very fully proven. He reaffirms in his testimony the views heretofore expressed by him in the letters referred to against the subcommittee, and declines to offer any apology or retraction of the offensive matter in the letters contained, but rather reiterates and reaffirms it and thereby aggravates his contempt. In our opinion it is immaterial to the determination of this case whether the defendants Buchanan and others are guilty, as charged in the indictment in the district court of New York, or not, or whether the impeachment charges against H. Snowden Marshall are true or not. Both may be guilty or both may be innocent, or one guilty and the other innocent, with effect on the findings in this case. Therefore the select committee has made no investigation nor does it express any opinion as to the merits of either of said cases. We are considering under the resolution whether or not the facts herein set forth constitute a contempt by a violation of the privileges of the House of Representatives on the part of H. Snowden Marshall. No legislative body consisting of a large number of members can move from one place to another to take testimony in cases where its power and authority or dignity is called into question. Its power in this respect must, therefore, necessarily be delegated to one of its committees or a subcommittee by a proper resolution, as was done in this case. This delegation of power to a subcommittee is lawful, and carries with it all of the authority belonging to the House in the execution of the immediate purpose for which the committee was called into existence.

Any conduct that would be a violation of the privileges of the House if directed against the House in the first place, would be a contempt against the House and a breach of its privileges when directed against one of its committees or subcommittees appointed by authority of the House to do a specific thing and acting within its delegated power and in the scope of its authority. Any other view would leave the House powerless to protect its honor and dignity and its constitutional rights. It would set at defiance the sovereignty of the people represented by the House. That the House as a representative body has the inherent power to protect itself from defamation and all slanderous and lawless conduct that would bring it into reproach and popular contempt, whether uttered or committed in the presence of the House or else-

where, has not been disputed since the case of *Anderson v. Dunn* (6 Wheaton, 204). Offensive, abusive, and defamatory language against a committee of the House acting within its authority is offensive, abusive, and defamatory against the House, and is just as dangerous to the integrity of that body as if it had been committed in its presence.

Mr. Justice Johnson, in delivering the opinion in the case referred to, *Anderson v. Dunn*, among other things, said:

"It is certainly true that there is no power given by the Constitution to either House to punish for contempts, except when committed by their own Members. Nor does the judicial or criminal power given to the United States, in any part, expressly extend to the infliction of punishment for contempt of either House, or any one coordinate branch of the Government. Shall we, therefore, decide that no such power exists? * * * But if there is one maxim that necessarily rides over all others, it is that the public functionaries must be left at liberty to exercise the powers which the people have intrusted to them. The interests and dignity of those who created them require the exertion of the powers indispensable to the attainment of the ends of their creation. Nor is a casual conflict with the rights of particular individuals any reason to be urged against the exercise of such powers."

"That 'the safety of the people is the supreme law,' not only comports with but is indispensable to the exercise of those powers in their public functionaries, without which that safety can not be guarded. On this principle it is that courts of justice are universally acknowledged to be vested by their very creation with power to impose silence, respect, and decorum in their presence, and submission to their lawful mandates, and, as a corollary to this proposition, to preserve themselves and their officers from the approach and insults of pollution."

"It is true that the courts of justice of the United States are vested, by express statute provision, with power to fine and imprison for contempts; but it does not follow from this circumstance that they would not have exercised that power without the aid of the statute or not, in cases, if such should occur, to which such statute provision may not extend; on the contrary, it is a legislative assertion of this right, as incidental to a grant of judicial power, and can only be considered either as an instance of abundant caution or a legislative declaration that the power of punishing for contempt shall not extend beyond its known and acknowledged limits of fine and imprisonment."

"But it is contended that if this power in the House of Representatives is to be asserted on the plea of necessity, the ground is too broad and the result too indefinite; that the executive and every coordinate and even subordinate branch of the Government may resort to the same justification, and the whole assume to themselves, in the exercise of this power, the most tyrannical licentiousness."

"This is unquestionably an evil to be guarded against, and if the doctrine may be pushed to that extent it must be a bad doctrine, and is justly denounced."

"But what is the alternative? The argument obviously leads to the total annihilation of the power of the House of Representatives to guard itself from contempts, and leaves it exposed to every indignity and interruption that rudeness, caprice, or even conspiracy may meditate against it. This result is fraught with too much absurdity not to bring into doubt the soundness of any argument from which it is derived. That a deliberate assembly, clothed with the majesty of the people, and charged with the care of all that is dear to them; composed of the most distinguished citizens, selected and drawn together from every quarter of a great Nation; whose deliberations are required by public opinion to be conducted under the eye of the public, and whose decisions must be clothed with all that sanctity which unlimited confidence in their wisdom and purity can inspire; that such an assembly should not possess the power to suppress rudeness or repel insult is a supposition too wild to be suggested. And, accordingly, to avoid the pressure of these considerations, it has been argued that the right of the respective Houses to exclude from their presence, and their absolute control within their own walls, carry with them the right to punish contempts committed in their presence; while the absolute legislative power given to Congress within this District enables them to provide by law against all other insults against which there is any necessity for providing."

"It is to be observed that, so far as the issue of this cause is implicated, this argument yields all right of the plaintiff in error to a decision in his favor; for, nonconstat, from the pleadings, but that this warrant issued for an offense committed in the immediate presence of the House."

"Nor is it immaterial to notice what difficulties the negation of this right in the House of Representatives draws after it, when it is considered that the concession of the power, if exercised within their walls, relinquishes the great grounds of the argument, to wit, the want of an express grant, and the unrestricted and undefined nature of the power here set up. For why should the House be at liberty to exercise an ungranted, an unlimited, and undefined power within their walls, any more than without them? If the analogy with individual right and power be resorted to, it will reach no further than to exclusion, and it requires no exuberance of imagination to exhibit the ridiculous consequences which might result from such a restriction, imposed upon the conduct of a deliberative assembly."

In *Nugent v. Beale* (Smith's Digest of Decisions and Precedents, 601), the court says:

"The jurisdiction of the Senate in cases of contempt of its authority depends upon the same ground and reasons upon which the acknowledged jurisdiction of other judicial tribunals rests, to wit, the necessity of such jurisdiction to enable the Senate to exercise its high constitutional functions—a necessity at least equal to that which supports the like jurisdiction which has been exercised by all judicial tribunals and legislative assemblies in this country from its first settlement, and in England from time immemorial."

In *Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives*, volume 2, under the heading of Power to Punish for Contempt, pages 1046 to 1142, may be found the digest of the decisions sustaining the power of the House to determine what is contempt and to punish for the same. These decisions are made by the House and by the Senate and the Supreme Court of the United States. Reference is made also to Rawle on the Constitution, page 48, and Story on the Constitution, volume 1, section 847.

We find, therefore, that the House has full power to punish for contempt committed in its presence or not within its presence, by publication of matter that is defamatory against it or its committee lawfully constituted and acting within its authority. We find as stated that the privileges of the House in this case were breached by H. Snowden Marshall by the letter which he wrote to the subcommittee, heretofore referred to, and copied in Report No. 494 herein contained. This letter as a whole is insulting, defamatory, and a clear expression of contempt. The purpose for which it was written and printed was to defame—

to bring into ridicule and contempt—the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee having under investigation the impeachment charges against H. Snowden Marshall. It was as much a violation of the privileges of the House to have directed a scurrilous and offensive letter of this character against one of its committees as if it had been addressed directly to the House.

It is proper for us to say that Mr. Marshall was given every opportunity to retract or apologize or in some way modify his statements contained in the letter. Parts of the letter containing the most defamatory matter were read to him, and he was asked if he meant to still say that that was true. He reaffirmed and reasserted the same, only with the statement that it was intended to criticize the procedure of the subcommittee and was not intended as a contempt of the House. It is clear that if the House could tolerate such a construction of this letter and could tolerate such vile and defamatory language against one of its committees, it would be powerless to conduct impeachment trials or perform any other duty without living under the disgrace of the contempt that would necessarily come to a body so unmindful of its duties to the people as to permit such insult and injury.

SUMMARY.

Article II, section 4, of the Constitution says:

"The President, Vice President, and all civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for and conviction of treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors."

A United States district attorney is a civil officer within the meaning of this section of the Constitution. (See Rawle on Constitution, 213; 1 Story on Constitution, 790; Bouvier Dictionary, p. 319 of vol. 1.)

The impeachment of a civil officer must be by the House of Representatives. (United States Constitution, Art. I, sec. 2.) Impeachments are judicial in their nature.

The committee or subcommittee of the House appointed to investigate the facts under an impeachment proceeding pending in the House, and proceeding within the scope of their authority to perform this duty in taking testimony, is acting for and in place of the House.

A contempt by word, act, publication, or otherwise of a committee having jurisdiction in such cases and acting within the same is a contempt of the House which appointed it, and may be punished as such.

In this case Mr. Marshall was and is a United States district attorney. He was impeached in conformity to the Constitution.

The subcommittee was appointed and had jurisdiction in the matter to make the inquiry it was engaged in.

Mr. Marshall's letter of March 4, 1916, heretofore referred to is defamatory and tends to bring the committee and House into contempt and ridicule. By the printing and publication of the same, Mr. Marshall violated the privileges of the House, was guilty of contempt, and is guilty of contempt of the House of Representatives until he purges himself thereof or is purged by punishment.

The power of the House to punish for contempt is not confined to a reprimand. Punishment may be inflicted in the discretion of the House for a period not longer than the duration of the Congress acting.

As to the method of procedure that should be followed in the House in trial of the said H. Snowden Marshall for the contempt which the committee finds that he has committed, we recommend the passage of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Speaker do issue his warrant, directed to the Sergeant at Arms, commanding him to take in custody, wherever to be found, the body of H. Snowden Marshall, of the State of New York, and to proceed forthwith to bring the said H. Snowden Marshall to the bar of the House of Representatives, to answer the charge that he, on March 4, 1916, in the city of New York, did violate the privileges of the House of Representatives of the United States by writing and causing to be published the following letter:

"DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

"UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE,

"New York, March 4, 1916.

"SIR: Yesterday afternoon, as I am informed, your honorable committee ordered the arrest of Mr. L. R. Holme, a representative of a newspaper which had published an article at which you took offense. The unfortunate gentleman of the press was placed in custody under your orders. He was taken to the United States marshal to be placed in confinement (I do not understand whether his sentence was to be one day or a dozen years). The marshal very properly declined to receive the prisoner. This left you at a loss, and I am advised that you tried to work your way out of the awkward situation by having Mr. Holme brought back and telling him that you were disposed to be 'kind' to him, and then discharged him for the purpose of avoiding unpleasant consequences to yourselves."

"You are exploiting charges against me of oppressive conduct toward a Member of your honorable body who is charged with a violation of law and of oppressive conduct on my part toward shysters in the blackmailing and bankruptcy business."

"I may be able to lighten your labors by offering to resign if you can indicate anything I ever did that remotely approximates the lawless tyranny of your order of arrest of Mr. Holme."

"The supposed justification of your order that Mr. Holme be placed in custody was his refusal to answer the question you asked as to where he got the information on which was based the article which displeased you."

"It is not necessary for you to place anyone under arrest in order to get the answer to the question which you asked Mr. Holme, because I can and will answer it. I gave Mr. Holme information, part of which he published and from which he made deductions, so that if your honorable committee has a grievance it is against me and not against him."

"What I told him was about as follows:

"I said that your expedition to this town was not an investigation conducted in good faith, but was a deliberate effort to intimidate any district attorney who had the temerity to present charges against one of your honorable body."

"I said that your whole proceeding here was irregular and extraordinary; that I had never heard of such conduct of an impeachment proceeding; that charges of this sort were not usually heard in public until the House of Representatives had considered them and were willing to stand back of them."

"I pointed out to him that you, contrary to usual practice, had come here and had held public hearings; that among your witnesses you had invited every rogue that you could lay your hands on to come before you and blackmail and slander me and my assistants under the full privilege of testifying before a congressional committee."

"I told him that you had called one my junior assistant before you and had attempted to make it publicly appear that his refusal to answer your questions as to what occurred in the grand jury room in the

Buchanan case was due solely to my orders. I said that at the time you attempted to convey this public impression you knew that it was misleading because I had been asked by you to produce the minutes of the grand jury and had been instructed by the Attorney General not to comply with your request, as you well knew. I showed him the telegram of the Attorney General to me and showed him a copy of my letter to you, dated February 29, 1916, in which I sent you a copy of the telegram of the Attorney General instructing me not to give you the grand jury minutes.

"I told him that you were traveling around in your alleged investigation of me with BUCHANAN'S counsel, Walsh and David Slade, in constant conference with you. I said that I believed that every word of the evidence, whether in so-called secret sessions or not, had been placed at the disposal of these worthies, and that I would be just as willing to give the grand jury minutes to a defendant as to give them to your honorable subcommittee.

"I told him that I did not share the views which seemed to prevail in your subcommittee on this subject. I said that I regarded a Member of Congress who would take money for an unlawful purpose from any foreign agent as a traitor, and that it was a great pity that such a person could only be indicted under the Sherman law, which carries only one year in jail as punishment.

"I said that it was incomprehensible to me how your honorable subcommittee should rush to the assistance of an indicted defendant; how you had apparently resolved to prevent prosecution by causing the district attorney in charge to be publicly slandered.

"I told him that I would not permit the prosecution of the persons whose cause you had apparently espoused to be impeded by you; I said that if you wanted the minutes of the grand jury in any case you would not get them as long as I remained in office.

"You will observe from the foregoing statement that what Mr. Holme published may have been based on what I said. If you have any quarrel it is with me and not with him.

"It is amazing to me to think that you supposed that I did not understand what you have been attempting to do during your visit here. I realized that your effort was to ruin me and my office by publishing with your full approval the complaints of various persons who have run afoul of the criminal law under my administration. Your subcommittee has endeavored by insulting questions to my assistants and others, by giving publicity and countenance to the charges of rascals, and by refusing to listen to the truth and refusing to examine public records to which your attention was directed, to publicly disgrace me and my office.

"I propose to make this letter public.

"Respectfully,

"H. SNOWDEN MARSHALL,
"United States Attorney.

"Hon. C. C. CARLIN,

"Chairman Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee
"of the House of Representatives,
"323 Federal Building, New York, N. Y."

"That the said H. Snowden Marshall, in writing and publishing said letter, was guilty of a breach of the privileges and a contempt of the House of Representatives, and that the said H. Snowden Marshall be furnished with a copy of this resolution, and a copy of the report of the select committee of the House of Representatives, appointed to investigate the charges made against him in the House of Representatives.

"Resolved, That when H. Snowden Marshall shall be brought to the bar of the House, to answer the charge of having violated the privileges of the House of Representatives, as afore set out, the Speaker shall then cause to be read to said H. Snowden Marshall the findings of fact and findings of law by the special committee of the House, charged with the duty of investigating whether or not the said H. Snowden Marshall had violated the privileges of the House of Representatives, or was in contempt of same; the Speaker shall then inquire of said H. Snowden Marshall if he desires to be heard and to have counsel on the charge of being in contempt of the House of Representatives for having violated its privileges. If the said H. Snowden Marshall desires to avail himself of either of these privileges, the same shall be granted him. If not, the House shall thereupon proceed to take order in the matter."

JOHN A. MOON.
JOHN N. GARNER.
CHARLES R. CRISP.
JOHN A. STERLING.
I. L. LENROOT.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER].

[Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. JACOWAY].

Mr. JACOWAY. Mr. Chairman, when I went upon the Committee on Agriculture I was necessarily compelled to relinquish my other committee assignments. This was due to the fact that the Committee on Agriculture was designated as one of the few select committees of the House, and those composing the membership of one of these committees could not be a member of any other committee. I have never regretted my seeking membership upon this committee, which resulted in the loss of other committee assignments held by me.

THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.

When one comes to discuss the present Agricultural bill now before the House and realizes what it contains and takes into consideration that when these provisions are crystallized into statutes, and in the mind's eye views the beneficent results that will flow to every class of people, from the Golden Gate to the Atlantic, from the North to the South, he is impressed with the fact that any attempt in a limited period of time to intelligently discuss the bill as a whole could be likened unto an attempt to "grasp a huge ball upon which the human hand can gain no hold." For this reason, in the period allotted to me, at best I can only address myself to certain provisions of the bill that are transcending in importance. No bill is more important to the country than the Agricultural bill, which primarily has for its one great object the betterment of the millions of farmers who at last produces that boasted wealth of the American Republic.

THE MARKETING PROVISIONS OF THIS BILL.

It is estimated that last year the farmers of this country produced approximately \$10,000,000,000 in farm products. The amount is so stupendous that it is unthinkable, and no mind is so acutely disciplined that it can even approximately know what these figures mean. There is but one way to accurately understand the sublime eloquence of these figures, and that is ascertained under the rule of comparison. I mention these matters to draw the conclusion that this great army of men who are virile and potential in the wealth they produce and upon whom at last are all those engaged in the multiplied and varied callings, vocations, and vocations in life dependent in the extreme, should receive at the hands of that Government for which they have wrought so wonderfully and well every possible consideration that can legitimately fall in the category of those functions that come under the head of governmental assistance.

In some form or other, for some price or another, this \$10,000,000,000 of farm products were disposed of; but the interrogatory that is ever propounded—and which has not and can not be satisfactorily answered to him that bore the heat of summer and the blasts of winter to produce it—is, Was it disposed of in an intelligent manner? From sources too numerous to detail this query has been answered in the negative—and why? Has this Government, which is our pride and boast, and whose achievements are heralded in history, song, legend, and verse, been derelict in its duty to the farmer? I answer in the affirmative; and, from my viewpoint, thus will the answer remain unchanged until the Federal Government by generous and wise appropriations and most intelligent methods inaugurates and carries to a successful consummation a system of marketing, comprehensive and far-reaching in detail, and exhaust every legitimate office within its power to find a market for that which is produced by the tillers of the soil.

On page 72 of this bill is an item occupying only three or four lines appropriating \$136,600 for telegraphic tolls to find markets for that which is raised each year by the farmers of this country. This is but one of the items in the marketing features of this bill. In my judgment no section of this bill contains greater merit proportionately than these items. I have never been accused of being even in a small part a prophet, but my prediction to-day is that in a short while the day will come when these items will be written in the language of millions instead of thousands. When this is done, and the real producers of wealth can reasonably be assured that their products will command a living price and yield to them a fair remuneration for the labor expended to produce it, will the exodus from the farm to the city cease; farm life will become more attractive and agriculture will again come into her own; and into all the callings in which man is engaged will be breathed a richer and healthier breath of life.

INSTANCES OF BAD MARKETING.

We have heard much of the high cost of living, or, as some facetiously term it, the cost of high living. Would not a better term for these two expressions be found in the epigram, "The high cost of selling"? For instance, to illustrate: In the State of Oklahoma a farmer sold to a buyer for northern consumption 1,050 watermelons. The price received by all those interested in this transaction disclosed the fact that the farmer got per melon 5 cents, the buyer to whom they were sold received 30 cents, the railroad 7½ cents, and the retailer 30 cents; and the consumer paid all this cost, paying about 75 cents per melon.

The farmer got a price ridiculously too little, the railroad was overpaid, the buyer netted a good profit, and the consumer paid dearly for this delicacy. As has been well said, this form of marketing should be impossible. One of the lessons to be culled from the foregoing is to the effect that the farmer who planted the melon and who paid for the seed, who had his money in-

vested in the ground upon which the melon was grown, and who put his days of honest toil into the melon, and used his teams to haul it to the railroad, was ridiculously and discouragingly underpaid; the buyer assisted in robbing him; in a way the railroad was a party to the crime; and the poor consumer was the sad beneficiary of an archaic and disgraceful system that causes him to complain and become rebellious in company with the producer and causes both to wonder where the fault is. Let me also subscribe to the doctrine that it should be the burden of Congress to lessen the gap between the producer and the consumer, and when this is done a long way has been gone in solving this matter that is knocking at the doors of Congress for solution, and which at last is but the simplest of justice to the farmers of this country.

ANOTHER LAMENTABLE INSTANCE.

In round numbers the United States produces over a billion dollars in poultry and eggs each year—more money than is realized from the South's cotton crop. If the farmer could realize upon this in full he would be fortunate. But does he? No. Ten per cent, or \$100,000,000, is lost to the farmer at the initial point of shipment, and an additional 30 per cent, or \$300,000,000, is lost between the place from which it is shipped and the consumer, making a total of \$400,000,000 out of a billion product. What is true of these commodities is proportionately true of every other farm product. Let me again say, and let us ever bear in mind that the gap up to the present time between the producer and the consumer is ruinously wide, and that a constant effort by Congress should be made to yearly lessen it. The unnecessary middle man should be eliminated. In most instances he is the drone in the human hive, constantly consuming off of him who is the real producer.

INNUMERABLE INSTANCES OF THIS CRIMINAL SYSTEM OF MARKETING COULD BE CITED.

In the year 1915 cantaloupes in August were shipped into Washington in such great quantities that commission merchants would not handle them at all. Then, again, in one single day in the same month, 58 carloads of peaches were dumped into St. Louis, which city in normal times can absorb about 14 or 15 carloads a day during the peach season. In speaking of Alberta peaches, it has been stated that last year approximately \$60,000,000 of these peaches rotted in the orchards of Arkansas, when at the same time there were millions of people who desired and wanted these peaches, if, indeed, an intelligent system of marketing could have informed the producer and consumer of their respective wants and needs. Again, another glaring instance of bad marketing conditions in the United States, 116 carloads of apples were shipped into New York City, and this so depressed the market on apples that a shipment of apples in northeastern Pennsylvania netted a consignment of only about 17 cents a bushel after freight and commission charges had been paid. During the autumn of 1915 Virginia apple growers sold apples f. o. b. for the Glasgow market for \$1.25 per barrel. The barrels cost from 38 to 42 cents apiece. After the expenses of picking, sorting, grading, and packing are deducted there is left not more than 50 cents per barrel to pay for spraying, cultivation, overhead charges, and interest on the investment. Thus instances ad infinitum could be recited here to-day, but I will not enumerate the RECORD nor trespass upon the time of the House to do so. The lessons I desire to present have been presented. Suffice it to say that these conditions can be found, I dare say, as relates to every farm product in every county and State of this Union. For these facts and figures I am indebted to Mr. Royal Meeker in an article contributed to the American and Economic Review of March, 1915.

THE STORY OF THE MIDDLE MAN—A SPLENDID INSTANCE OF SANE MARKETING.

When the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Houston, appeared before our committee last February, and was discussing the proposition of marketing, I took occasion to ask a question or so. In answering he made reference to the fact that California had evolved a most successful plan for marketing the citrus fruits, and upon investigating the matter I found, to my way of thinking, a splendidly written article by a Mr. Yoakum on the subject of marketing by California of the citrus fruits of that great State. As stated in that article—

A few years ago the citrus-fruit growers of California were a widely scattered, unorganized, and shiftless group of independent farmers. They were losing money steadily. The grower received only a very small percentage of the amount the ultimate consumer paid for the oranges or lemons of California. Some one conceived the idea of organizing all the big producers of that region into a sort of protective association. Soon the idea took hold and spread. It was diligently pushed forward by the big growers, and soon it spread to include about 65 per cent of the citrus crop. The result has been threefold. First, it has put the products of that region into every market of this country and has driven foreign fruits practically out of these markets. Second, it has made the citrus farmers of California one of the wealthiest

groups of farmers in the world. Then it has given to all the people of the whole country better fruit at fair and reasonable prices. The markets are to-day supplied steadily, consistently, and certainly with the grades of fruit they need. Here and there other special farming groups have worked out similar plans. The apple growers of Oregon based their marketing campaign upon special care and skill in packing. They succeeded so well that Oregon apples in the hotels and on the trains in the very heart of some of the finest apple lands in the country, in central New York, in Michigan, in the Ozark country of Arkansas and Missouri. In this instance marketing became a science as exact and as exacting as the business of selling steel billets or farm machinery or any other product of a carefully and accurately organized industry.

I cite this instance to illustrate the extent to which organization can be carried in the selling of farm products.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known to-day that the people of the Federal Government, those who inhabit what is known as continental United States, have long since been engaging in a system of marketing that is archaic, and I might say almost criminally negligent. I am aware of the fact that much can be said upon this question. When we find that we are confronted with conditions that are lamentable, the necessary question that arises, the interrogatory that may be propounded is, What is the remedy? For several years I have been a Member of this body. I have paid decided attention to this, and attempted to get at the facts relative to the marketing system and to assist in evolving a remedy. From the reading in which I have indulged, that which I think is the remedy is incorporated in the deductions of him who said:

The first step to be taken is to organize the farmers into local cooperative associations. The object of these associations should be, first, to determine upon the crop or crops to be grown for shipment to market; second, to insist upon proper methods of growing the crops agreed upon; third, to standardize and guarantee the quality of the products shipped; fourth, to superintend the gathering, grading, and packing of the crops; fifth, to arrange for proper and sufficient means of transportation, handling, shipping, and terminal facilities; sixth, to bargain with railroads and other transportation companies for a freight rate that will be a livable rate for both the farmer and the transporter.

When these respective steps are taken and coordinated into a harmonious whole, into one great, effective, and intelligent system, I am firm in the opinion that the result we all seek will, in the main, be accomplished, and agriculture as a whole be lifted to a higher, a better, and happier status. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, almost daily we hear falling from the lips of the representatives of this great Government who sit in this Federal Congress encomiums upon the man who follows the plow and who uses the hoe. I wish to say in passing that I believe it is the honest endeavor of every man who has received a commission from a great people to represent his district intelligently and well, and I believe the tribute paid to the farmer by him comes from the heart and not from the lips out. [Applause.] I am somewhat acquainted with the literary accomplishments of the average Member of this House. I know that they have read extensively, thoughtfully, and well, but when I went to school I believed the proposition was laid down in rhetoric that sometimes a fact may be repeated in order that the proposition may be emphasized. In my judgment, one of the greatest men the South has ever produced is a man whose name is the household word in all sections—the great Georgian, Henry W. Grady. [Applause.] On one occasion, speaking of the dignity of agriculture and the part that the farmer plays, and commenting on the powerful factor that he is in the great equation of our national life, he in beautiful language said:

A few Sundays ago I stood on a hill in Washington. My heart thrilled as I looked on the towering marble of my country's Capitol, and a mist gathered in my eyes as, standing there, I thought of its tremendous significance and the powers there assembled and the responsibilities there centered—its Presidents, its Congress, its courts, its gathered treasure, its Army, its Navy, and its 60,000,000 of citizens. It seemed to me the best and mightiest sight that the sun could find in its wheeling course—this majestic home of a Republic that has taught the world its best lessons of liberty—and I felt that if wisdom, and justice, and honor abided therein, the world would stand indebted to this temple on which my eyes rested and in which the ark of my covenant was lodged for its final uplifting and regeneration.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, Grady stated at this time what he thought constituted national greatness. But later he amended his statement and drew a different deduction, and in language inimitable he said:

A few days later I visited a country home. A modest, quiet house sheltered by great trees and set in a circle of field and meadow, gracious with the promise of harvest—barns and cribs well filled and the old smokehouse odoriferous with treasure—the fragrance of pink and hollyhock mingling with the aroma of garden and orchard, and resonant with the hum of bees and poultry's busy clucking. Inside the house thrift, comfort, and that cleanliness that is next to godliness—the restful beds, the open fireplace, the books and papers, and the old clock that had held its steadfast pace amid the frolic of weddings, that had welcomed in steady measure the newborn babes of the family and kept company with the watchers of the sick bed and had ticked the solemn requiem of the dead; and the well-worn Bible that, thumbed by fingers long since stilled, and blurred with tears of eyes long since closed, held the simple annals of the family and the heart and conscience of the home. Outside stood the master, strong and wholesome and upright, wearing no man's collar, with no mortgage on his roof and no lien on

his ripening harvest, pitching his crops in his own wisdom and selling them in his own time in his chosen market; master of his lands and master of himself. Nearby stood his aged father, happy in the heart and home of his son. And as they started to the house the old man's hands rested on the young man's shoulder, touching it with the knight-hood of the fourth commandment, and laying there the unspeakable blessing of an honored and grateful father. As they drew near the door, the old mother appeared; the sunset falling on her face, softening its wrinkles and its tenderness, lighting up her patient eyes, and the rich music of her heart trembling on her lips, as in simple phrase she welcomed her husband and son to their home. Beyond was the good wife, true of touch and tender, happy amid her household cares, clean of heart and conscience, the helpmate and the buckler of her husband. And the children, strong and sturdy, tramping down the lane with the lowing herd, or weary of simple sport, seeking, as truant birds do, the quiet of the old home nest. And I saw the night descend on that home, falling gently as from the wings of the unseen dove. And the stars swarmed in the bending skies—the trees thrilled with the cricket's cry, the restless bird called from the neighboring wood, and the father, a simple man of God, gathering the family about him, read from the Bible the old story of love and faith, and then went down in prayer, the baby hidden amid the folds of its mother's dress, and closed the record of that simple day by calling down the benediction of God on the family and the home.

And as I gazed the memory of the great Capitol faded from my brain. Forgotten its treasure and its splendor. And I said, "Surely here, here in the homes of the people, is lodged the ark of the covenant of my country."

These statements, Mr. Chairman, are as sublimely true as anything that was ever written in Holy Writ. When we stop to think of the multiplied millions of farmers scattered all over this country who have been the victims of an archaic, a disgraceful, and a criminal system of marketing the products of their labor, is it any wonder they make an outcry? Are they to be censured for sending petitions to Congress asking that in its wisdom Congress find some remedy for this evil? That this will be done, Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt. There has been established in the Agricultural Department a Bureau of Markets. At its head is a man for whom I entertain the greatest respect and in whose judgment I have an abiding faith, Mr. Brand. He is thorough, capable, painstaking, and, I believe, patriotic, and his heart is in his work. All through the many volumes that have been written upon this subject we find the index finger of progress pointing to a successful solution of this great problem. The farmers of this country to-day are respectfully demanding at the hands of this Congress a solution of this great problem, and when that is found, in my calm judgment, a better, a brighter, a happier, and a more progressive day will dawn for the people of the country. May I add further that when this Government inaugurates a system of good roads, a far-reaching rural-credits system, giving to the farmer money at a low rate of interest for a long period of time, and insures a reasonable market for that which the soil produces a period of development and substantial progress never experienced in this country will be seen on every hand, and all the people in all walks of life will share a lasting benefit.

In conclusion, allow me to say, God speed that day, to the end that soon will dawn the time when the relief the farmer seeks will be given him by the Federal Congress and he finds that his prayer has been answered and his dream come true. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] such time as he may desire.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] for his courtesy in yielding sufficient time for me to call brief attention to some letters just received in respect to the National Guard. They were written by men who have spent many years of unselfish service in the militia. All of them hold important positions in civil life. If the Army reorganization bill were before the House now I would like to read portions of these letters, and would do so to-day if the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] were not already crowded with requests for time to discuss the bill now before the House. I must therefore content myself with printing them in the RECORD, but I urge all who are interested in building up an efficient fighting force to read these letters as they shall appear in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing certain letters. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letters are as follows:

LETTER OF GEN. THARALSON.

NORTH DAKOTA NATIONAL GUARD,
Bismarck, April 11, 1916.

HON. GEORGE M. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. YOUNG: I am sorry to bother you, but I am interested in the militia bill now before Congress, and it is not a political question; it is too vital to be termed as such.

I notice in the Washington dispatches that Senator NELSON took particular pains to criticize the militia lobby, as he called it, and a couple of us in particular. I am not making an apology for being interested. I have been in the militia for nearly 27 years and know the needs as well as the condition of the guard, and you are getting more out of the

guard than out of any branch of service in the United States. They work for nothing and pay their own board. What other body is doing as well?

The members of our State militia are as fine a body of men and officers as there is anywhere, and will compare favorably with any army, and with my long service I have had ample opportunity to compare them with the Regular Army, both here and in the Philippines, and our officers will show up favorably with the officers of the Regular Army of the same grade.

The members of the militia feel that they are in the service for patriotism only, as it is a detriment to every officer and enlisted man that is in it, both in a business and financial way. We, of course, admit that every man is given a uniform after he has enlisted. He pays nothing and gets nothing except the pleasure of going to drill each week, while the officers get \$20 clothing allowance from the State every year after one year's service and is asked to furnish his own uniform and equipment and allowed to wear it if he attends drill and performs 80 per cent of ordered military duty, and are expected to attend camps, officers' schools, etc.

In the State of North Dakota during camp the magnificent sum of \$1.75 per day is paid to a Lieutenant, \$2 to a captain, \$2.25 to a major, and \$3 to a colonel, and with this magnificent salary he is supposed to keep up his work for a year and have an equipment that is up to date. Can you imagine anything more unreasonable, and is it any surprise that our condition is not up to standard of the Regular Army, where both officers and men are paid liberally?

Last fall during the National Guard convention we picked an executive committee and, as far as the North Dakota Guard is concerned, we stand by that committee to a man. During the latter part of February the National Guard Association of our State had a meeting and by unanimous resolutions agreed to stand by the action of the executive committee of the National Guard Association. At this meeting we had the officers of the regiment, the noncommissioned officers of the staff, and three delegates from each company that had been elected by their respective companies, and in that way I think we had a very good expression of the whole guard.

While the Grain Growers' convention was in session January 19, 1916, they took up the subject of preparedness as follows:

"Whereas there is being urged an armament campaign and a vast expenditure for frenzied preparedness for war;

"Whereas there is being urged a larger standing army and a huge continental army; to expend millions to private firms for a bigger Navy;

"Whereas such an armament program, we fear, may plunge this Nation into needless wars and vast expense, and our citizens into great distress;

"Whereas the militia regiments of the various States were primarily organized to repel invasions and are as such fundamentally the nucleus of a volunteer army of the United States, and are thus by the proposal of a continental army to be cast aside as useless junk;

"Whereas we feel that there is a paid propaganda working throughout the Union to spend vast millions on increased Navy and war preparations: Be it

"Resolved, We, farmers and others in assembly in Fargo, N. Dak., January 19, 1916, do hereby petition our Senators and Representatives of Washington to be calm, and deliberate with care these proposals; that we ask Congress to assist the militia of the country to be equipped and increased as our ideal citizen soldiery; that we ask for an efficient Navy without the pork barrel; and that we demand the Government to build its own warships, and own and build its own factories for ammunition, guns, and other equipment for the maintenance of an Army and Navy."

I believe that with the representatives of the militia and the resolutions of the farmers we have a very good expression of the sentiment of the people of our State. The guard is not against the Army by any means; we know that should be increased, particularly in enlisted men, as the strength of the companies should be greater in times of both peace and war.

If the people are afraid of militarism they will never be afraid of an Organized Militia with some control in the State. What the people are afraid of is a big organized force, controlled from Washington, with no control in the State. The militia force is just the kind of force to prevent a war of aggression; such force will never be used in an unworthy cause, because the people in the State have direct control.

This is the reason the Constitution makers fixed it as they did. The militia is a constitutional force required by and provided for in the Constitution, and by the Constitution was made the main reliance of the country. The country has always done well under that system, and Congress will make a mistake if they abandon this constitutional force, or, I think, in assisting another force that is bound to put it out of business. I would like to see Congress put the Division of Militia Affairs in control of the militia and appropriate enough money to enable the militia to do business, and the results are bound to be good.

The continental army was repudiated, and I hardly think that section 56 of the Chamberlain bill is anything but the continental army in another form, and, as far as I am concerned, and I believe 95 per cent of the fathers in the State of North Dakota feel the same, they do not want their boys to join the continental or the Regular Army, and if the militia is to be the third in the line of defense then you are not going to have any militia, as they will not belong if their duties are to quell riots and break strikes. I believe that I am safe in saying that if you should ask any militiaman how long they would stay in the service provided they were not subject to call for service except during riots and strikes I do not think you would find any man would say that he would want any such service, and I do not believe that the militia should be used in local trouble, as in such a case you are likely to have to fight your friends and neighbors, which is the reason the militia is so unpopular with the labor unions.

As officers of the National Guard of North Dakota we have district judges, doctors, dentists, and men prominent in nearly every walk of life, and these men have only one idea in view and that is their country.

As far as the civilian camps are concerned, such as held in New York last year, they are of no value to anyone and will not bring an Army that is any use in time of need, as neither men over age or the very rich will be likely to be found in the trenches at any time.

If a man is to take two months away from his business in any one year, his employer, if he has one, will be likely to tell him that he can get along without him for the balance of the year.

I am perfectly willing to admit that the militia makes mistakes; they also make them in the Regular Army; they make them every-

where, and the only question in my mind, and I believe in the mind of every other citizen who is loyal to his country, is to get a system that will give the best protection for the least money. While our opinions may be divided on that, I think that records have proved that the National Guard is about the most economical of anything that has been given us up to this time, and conditions are too serious to cast aside the National Guard which has proven fairly good under pitiable conditions, having received no Federal support to speak of, and take up something that is not even feasible to men who have made a study of the subject.

I do not want you to think I am attempting to tell you what to do, but simply to give you our views and hope that you will take them in the same spirit that they are given.

The officers of the guard are not jealous, as charged, and men as a rule are not jealous of losing a job that brings them nothing but trouble, and we expect and ask nothing but partial pay for the work we perform, and personally I am old enough to escape army service should I so desire, and I expect to sever my connection with the guard during the next year or two, but I am interested in it, having spent the best part of my life in it.

With kindest personal regards, and hoping to see you when you come to the State, I remain,

Yours, very truly,

T. H. THARALSON.

LETTER OF COL. FRaine.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Col. J. H. Fraine, in command of the First Regiment, says in part:

Perhaps no man in the State is better known as a "preparedness" crank than I am, and I assuredly want to see the most efficacious preparation we can get, but I don't think we should discard the tools we have until we are assured of being able to get some others somewhere.

If it is the intent to have compulsory military training in this country, and the Chamberlain bill will so provide, then I am for the so-called volunteer army, because then we can get it, but unless we have some compulsory provisions we can't get the men and therefore the plan will fail, and meanwhile the result to the guard will be that it will have been smothered to death and will also be out of existence.

LETTER OF MAJ. HENRY.

Maj. F. S. Henry, State land commissioner, says in part:

The National Guard of North Dakota, as well as in the United States, is against Senator Chamberlain's bill, especially section 53, and we feel it is a slap at the guard and in time will do away with our organization. It does not seem to me that the majority of the members of the Senate of the United States understand the real conditions. To my mind it is either a question of sink or swim and it is up to the Government of the United States at this time, we feel, that the guard be recognized and the young men who give their time in training themselves for efficient service should be given some encouragement. The officers of the National Guard are not asking for remuneration and do not insist on any favors in the Congress of the United States, but we do feel that the men, the young men especially, who attend drills four times a month during the year should be paid by the United States for this service, and every encouragement that can be given them should be done.

CAPT. RITCHIE'S LETTER.

Capt. David S. Ritchie, of Valley City, N. Dak., a prominent lawyer, says in part:

There is not a guardsman whom I know but who is wholeheartedly in favor of national preparedness. In fact, when you consider that the guardsmen put in years of service, give their time and their money for the sole purpose of acquiring, or endeavoring to acquire, a military knowledge in order that they may give to the Nation in time of need intelligent service, that they have given this time to the Nation without cost to it, is it not rather a crime to say to them that they are actuated only by selfish and mercenary motives when they honorably act to perpetuate and to increase the efficiency of their organization. There is not a guardsman whom I know but who realizes that in its present condition the National Guard does not represent an efficient military force, but there is not a guardsman, nor do I believe there is an officer, in the Regular Establishment who has in any way been associated with the guard but who realizes at present that the National Guard, under proper conditions, can be made into a unified, efficient military force. The first step necessary will be to federalize it. Make it subject to the control of proper Federal authority at all times. We feel that the question is one of federalization of the National Guard, and not one of maintenance of the officer, of several adjutant generals. We also feel that the National Guard should be given preference over a volunteer army or continental army, and this position is one which is not taken without reason. The advantages which the National Guard federalization plan of to-day holds over a volunteer-army plan will be found in the fact that the National Guard is now organized. You have the several military units with their full organization. It has officers and men which will form a nucleus upon which to build. Having these things, it only remains to federalize it and for Congress to provide for a uniform system of training and for uniform government and control. With such steps taken, having the frame of organization with which to work, the guard can be welded into a compact and efficient whole. The objection of to-day is that it is composed of 48 separate and distinct armies, and that would be overcome.

On the other hand, with the Federal volunteer army it would be necessary to start to perfect an organization beginning at the bottom and to first obtain the material with which to build. This, of course, will be a very serious matter. Another matter which should be taken into consideration is that in constructing your volunteer army—that is, in organizing it and giving to it the proper instruction—it will be absolutely necessary to use officers. Then the question is, Where are these officers to come from? Certain it is that there are not now sufficient officers in the Regular Establishment to properly officer the now existing organizations, so that it will mean a large increase in the commissioned personnel. To this we have no objection, but fundamentally we lay as a reason why the continental army could not be successful the fact, which may not be known to the Regular Army officer and which is probably not well known to anyone but a National Guard company commander, they are going to have great trouble securing enlistments, for the reason that when a man enlists it will be

necessary for him to take his training in camp each year, and this will result in the losing of a civil position. The men are hardly patriotic enough to enlist in the volunteer army in time of peace and by so enlisting lose their means of livelihood. At this point I wish to say that, as a company commander in the National Guard, I do not find that the young men themselves have any objection to enlisting and receiving training, but, on the other hand, rather desire to do so; but, as against this, we find their employers objecting, saying that it takes altogether too much of their time; and I know of a great number of instances where the guardsman has lost his position by reason of going to the camp of instruction. It might be well to insert in the bill some provision protecting the enlisted man in his position.

Now, then, if the officers detailed for instruction to the volunteer army, the money used, and the time given were detailed, used, and given for like purposes in the National Guard would not the National Guard be brought up to a proper state of efficiency? What we need as a guard is instruction, uniform organization, and Federal control, and I am satisfied, given these things, that we have sufficient gray matter to make ourselves proficient.

JUDGE HANLEY'S LETTER.

Capt. James M. Hanley, of Mandan, N. Dak., a judge of the district court, says in part:

In regard to the constitutional objections offered to the militia, these are greatly magnified. The militarism that the people fear is a large force controlled at Washington and not answerable to the people—that is, the State—and the Constitution makers undoubtedly had in their minds the thought—when they left part of the control of the militia in the States—that it was a safeguard against the force being used in a war of aggression or for any purpose of which the people did not approve. I think the Congress should hesitate before this constitutional force is abandoned; and, undoubtedly, the continental-army scheme, if adopted, would put the militia out of business.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING].

Mr. STERLING. Mr. Chairman, I regret that this bill has no provision for Government aid for the production of atmospheric nitrogen. The question of an adequate nitrogen supply is one of the utmost importance at this time. The problem presents two aspects, the military aspect and the agricultural, both of which stand out with such importance that I consider it the duty of the Government to do something to encourage industry along this line, and a failure to do so is a dereliction of duty.

A sufficient nitrogen supply is one of the most important elements in any program of preparedness which may be adopted. Whatever this Congress may do with reference to an Army and a Navy, all will be futile unless adequate steps are taken to supply the Government with gunpowder. Our great battleships might sail the seas and monster cannon tower above our fortifications, they are but mere toys, without explosives.

Congress may plan to train the young men of the country in the tactics of war and furnish them with uniforms and bur-nished guns, yet that would not constitute an Army unless the Government is prepared with an amply supply of powder. There is no other factor so absolutely essential in the composition of an Army as that.

Nitrogen is the essential ingredient in all explosives used in warfare, and at the present time it may be abundantly obtained from two sources. One is the natural deposits on the plains of Chile; the other is the atmosphere. For nearly 100 years the entire world has relied upon Chile for its main supply of sodium nitrate from which powder is made. There is no other place in all the world where it has been found in deposit in quantities available for commerce, either for military or agricultural uses. It is now well known that the Chilean deposits are not inexhaustible. Surveys show that at present rates of exportation from that country, the supply will cease before the end of the present century; and if the consumption increases in the future as it has for the past 10 years the supply will be exhausted by the middle of the century. The United States has looked to Chile for its nitrogen supply. In 1909 we imported 353,000 tons at the cost of more than \$12,000,000, and these imports have increased from year to year until in 1915 we bought of Chile 577,000 tons of nitrate of soda at a cost of more than \$16,000,000. The cost per ton has ranged from \$28 to \$36, exclusive of the cost of transportation and export duties imposed by the Chilean Government of \$12.54 per long ton.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to place in the RECORD at this point a letter from Secretary Redfield, giving information concerning our trade in Chilean nitrates:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 21, 1916.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have before me your letter of March 23 requesting information relative to the annual imports of Chilean nitrate into the United States, the prices per ton, and the Chilean export duty on nitrates.

In reply it affords me pleasure to transmit the following statement, which shows the imports of nitrate of soda into the United States from July 1, 1908, to January 31, 1916, with the import value per ton for the periods stated:

Period.	Long tons (2,240 pounds).	Values.	Average import value per ton.
Fiscal year ending June 30—			
1909.....	353,494	\$12,583,417	\$35.59
1910.....	550,495	16,874,602	30.65
1911.....	546,525	17,101,140	31.29
1912.....	481,739	15,431,892	32.03
1913.....	589,136	20,718,968	35.17
1914.....	564,049	17,950,786	31.82
1915.....	577,122	16,355,701	28.34
Six months ending Dec. 31, 1915.....	440,375	12,997,734	29.52
January, 1916.....	90,534	3,223,869	35.61

The average import price is based on the wholesale price in the principal markets of the country from whence imported at the time of exportation to the United States. It is exclusive of the Chilean export duty amounting to 3.38 gold pesos per 100 kilos, the equivalent of \$12.54 per ton of 2,240 pounds. I regret that the department has no information respecting the actual prices paid during the period in question by domestic importers of nitrate of soda. The Chilean export duty on that article, about which you inquire, is given in the first sentence of this page.

Very truly, yours,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
Secretary.

Hon. JOHN A. STERLING,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

European countries have drawn on the Chilean supply much more heavily than has the United States. England and France have been large users of nitrates from that source. Germany has relied on Chile prior to the present war for its supply of sodium nitrate, and has required more than any other nation, 80 per cent of which it has used for fertilizer.

Frank S. Washburn, of New York, president of the American Cyanamid Co., in an article by him on the subject of "Facts in the nitrogen case," states that Germany imported during 1914, up to the outbreak of the war August 1, more than 800,000 tons, and that her army captured at Antwerp 200,000 tons more, and that she had consumed during the first year of the war the entire amount of this vast supply in the manufacture of explosives. It is said that Germany alone has consumed during the war gunpowder at the rate of a million dollars per day. The allies combined, of course, have consumed a great deal more than that, and that all of the principal warring nations are now engaged in the production of nitrogen from the atmosphere, from which they get the nitric acid consumed by them in the manufacture of powder.

Thus it may be seen that the military aspect of the nitrogen problem is of wonderful importance. It seems to me it is of equal, if not of greater, importance in the consideration of our national defense than any other single question. If the time should come when we would be engaged in war with a foreign power, we would be helpless unless we were prepared with an ample supply of explosive-making material. We might be able to secure it from the mines of Chile. If, however, our enemy should drive our ships from the seas or our Navy should be engaged in other parts of the world or in defense of our coasts, we would be cut off from this supply, or if for any cause the Panama Canal should be out of commission and our ships would be required to carry our needed supply around that great southern continent, we would be placed at a great disadvantage in the conflict. I submit in view of the situation, as we can see it now in the light of the European war, it is not prudent for our Government to delay the hour when it makes itself wholly independent of the world for its supply of explosive-making material.

It is true that there has been developed in this country a source of nitric acid as a by-product in the production of coke. This source, however, is uncertain and fluctuating, and would barely produce enough of nitric acid to meet the demands for other than military and fertilizing purposes. The supply from that source, of course, is limited by the amount of coal used for coke production. Mr. Washburn estimates that to produce the minimum amount of nitric acid needed in times of war, which he places at 180,000 tons, from coal alone would require an investment of \$100,000,000 in coke-oven plants and 27,000,000 tons of coal per annum. To provide ourselves with this necessary from that source in time of war would be at such an enormous cost that it could not be considered.

Let us consider briefly the agricultural aspect of the problem. This phase of the question is of equal importance with the military aspect, and much more constant. The nitrogen supply is already becoming one of utmost importance to the agricultural interests of the country, and growing more so each year. The

three great soil essentials that concern the American farmer are potassium, phosphorus, and nitrogen. The chemist tells us that in a large part of the American soils devoted to food production potassium is found in enduring quantities, and that phosphorus may be supplied from the inexhaustible mountains of phosphate rock contained within the territorial limits. Then nitrogen remains as the limiting factor in food production, unless nitrogen may be obtained in enduring quantities and in usable form. The older settled lands of the world realize this more forcibly than do we, yet in America agriculture has already abandoned once productive fields in search of newer soils where nature's supply of nitrogen has not yet been impaired.

The farmer of the Middle West has commenced to realize the limitations of his soil in this respect and has stood off disaster by the production of legume crops which have gathered nitrogen from the air and stored it in the soil. But there is a limitation to that process. The production of legumes for the sole purpose of supplying nitrogen is expensive. It is well enough so long as nitrogen is produced in that way simply as a by-product in the making of legume feeds for live stock, but when he gets beyond that point and grows legumes for nitrogen alone he is paying a very high price.

It has been demonstrated that nitrogen as a fertilizer has had great influence in determining the productive cost of food. In England, where its necessity has been recognized for many years, the yield of wheat per acre has been nearly three times that in the United States, and Germany has produced on half the acreage of agricultural lands nearly twice as many bushels of wheat, oats, rye, and barley as has this country. On the experimental fields of Rothamstead, England, by the use of nitrate of soda the yield of wheat was increased from 12 to 36 bushels per acre, and in this country, at Briar Cliff farm in New York, the hay crop was increased from \$15 to \$28 by the application of sodium nitrate to the amount of \$2.62 per acre. By experiments in the State of Indiana in 10 counties the yield of wheat was increased on an average of 11.6 bushels at a cost of \$3.67 per acre, and in 37 experiments in the State of Illinois in 1913 the average increase was 5.2 bushels of wheat per acre, which increase was valued at twice the cost of the nitrogen fertilizer that was used.

It has been demonstrated beyond question that already the soils of America are in need of nitrogen, and that that need is increasing and will increase from year to year until American production of foodstuffs will be far less than it is to-day and the cost of living thereby proportionately increased unless the soil is restored to a more productive condition by the application of this plant food. Much discussion has been had in recent years regarding the high cost of living and many plans devised or suggested whereby it may be reduced. I have no doubt but what our transportation and trade systems have had much to do with this great increase in the prices of foodstuffs. The primary reason, however, lies in the fact that the growth of population has been much more rapid than the increase in the production of food. Population will continue to grow, but the day is near when production will cease to grow at all, but, on the contrary, will be diminished on account of the impoverished condition of the land.

It is plain that very soon the source on which we have relied for nitrogen will fail. The Chilean supply can not last but a few years, and as that supply grows less the price to the consumer is bound to increase.

For these reasons I urge the early consideration of Government aid for the production of nitrogen. I do not mean that the Government should undertake to engage in the business of nitrogen production on its own account. I do believe, however, that it ought to demonstrate to private enterprise that nitrogen can be produced from the atmosphere in such vast quantities as to supply the needs of the Government for military purposes and the farmers of the country for fertilizing purposes. Science has already proceeded far enough to demonstrate the fact that such a thing is entirely practical. But it is a new field, and private capital hesitates to venture until it can be shown that nitrogen may be produced in that way at a profit in competition with imports coming from Chile. We can not afford to wait until those deposits are entirely gone. We ought to see to it that the industry is sufficiently established before that time arrives, so that we may be able, independent of the world, to supply our Government and our people with an ample supply of life-giving and life-preserving nitrogen.

Scientists have weighed the atmosphere surrounding the earth and can tell us the weight of a given volume. We know that 79 per cent of that volume is nitrogen, and they say that there are 4,000,000,000,000,000 tons of it in the atmosphere and that above every square mile of the earth's surface rests 20,000,000

tons, or 7 tons to the square yard. Nature has placed it there for the use of man, and it remains now for him to deduct it in form for his many uses.

I do not pretend to have knowledge of what is the best plan on which to proceed. We all know that the first requisite is cheap power. At the present time it is certainly not practical to make nitrogen from the air by steam power; and wherever it has been made from that source, and is now being made, at a reasonable cost, it is by the use of hydroelectric power. Norway, with her immense water power, is successfully engaged in the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen. The only industry on this continent in that line at the present time is that of the American Cyanamid Co., in Canada, located there, as I understand it, because it could get cheaper water power on that side of the Niagara than on this side.

The first step, then, in the United States looking toward the development of this industry is cheaper water power. We have water power in vast abundance which I believe might be rapidly developed if the Congress of the United States would extend more liberal laws so as to encourage capital to invest in these enterprises.

There is now pending in this House a bill from the committee of which I am a member which it is believed will encourage the development of water power. It is folly for the Government to hedge its control of waterways about with stringent laws. They ought to be sufficiently liberal as to invite capital to develop this power to some useful purpose, to promote cheaper production along all lines of manufacture. There is no such thing as exhausting the water power contained in the waterways of the country, and the sooner they are made useful the sooner will their influence be felt in the cheaper cost of living.

Men of competent understanding have proposed plans for the use of water power in the production of atmospheric nitrogen. Some of them certainly are feasible, and the Government can only determine the most practical way by careful experiment.

Persons seemingly qualified to judge of the requirements of the Government in times of war have estimated that the Government should have available 180,000 tons of nitric acid per annum for military purposes or ready means whereby that amount could be secured quickly. A plant capable of producing so much would be maintained at a vast expense in times of peace. Mr. Washburn's plan, which I think has been suggested to some of the committees of this House, combines a private plant with a governmental plant, which in times of peace could be utilized in the manufacture of fertilizers. The following is the detailed statement of such a plan found in the paper by Mr. Washburn above referred to:

First. The Government is to develop 100,000 primary hydroelectric horsepower at any place which will serve the military and commercial purposes to which the power is to be applied. This would call for an installation of 125,000 to 130,000 horsepower capacity measured on the switchboard, which taken at an assumed installation cost of \$100 per horsepower would amount to \$12,500,000 to \$13,000,000. The Government is to own the entire plant.

Second. Private capital is expected to construct at an estimated cost of \$23,000,000, including working capital, a fertilizer plant, rent the requisite hydroelectric power for its operation from the Government and pay 3 per cent on the Government's investment for developing the same together with the cost of operating the power house. The fertilizer plant is to produce a high-grade, concentrated universal fertilizer equivalent in plant food constituents to 2,200,000 tons of standard 2-8-2 fertilizer goods.

Third. Private capital is to install at an estimated cost of \$1,000,000 the buildings and special appliances necessary to introduce a subsidiary process, exclusive of the fertilizer processes, by which 20,000 tons of nitric acid per annum would be produced for the Government's peace-time requirements.

Fourth. The Government is to install at an estimated cost of \$5,000,000 the buildings and special appliances necessary to introduce a subsidiary process, exclusive of the fertilizer processes, by which the plant will stand in absolute readiness to produce 90,000 tons of nitric acid per annum and have all the buildings and everything, except easily procurable articles of merchandise, in store on the premises necessary to complete the plant within three months for an additional 90,000 tons.

Fifth. The Government is to have nitric acid at all times in such quantities as it may desire at the cost to the manufacturer for furnishing it plus such additional amount as profit as the Secretary of War, in his judgment, may determine from time to time as reasonable.

Sixth. Provisions are to be made against exorbitant or discriminatory prices being charged for the fertilizer produced under this plan.

Seventh. Provisions are to be included by which 45,000 to 90,000 tons nitric-acid capacity shall be in readiness within 18 months at moderate increased expenditure if any at all.

I venture these remarks for the purpose of calling attention to the importance of this great problem of nitrogen production with a hope that they may help to arouse interest in the question. I am convinced that if the Government is to make itself independent in its nitrogen supply for military purposes and the agricultural interest placed in a position where they can command nitrogen fertilizer in the near future, the Government itself must make the start. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REILLY] such time as he may wish.

[Mr. REILLY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] to consume some of his time. I will close with another speech.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has eight minutes left.

Mr. LEVER. How much time have I left, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 27 minutes left.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I want to invite the attention of the House to two recent statements. One is from the Comptroller of the Currency and the other is from the society called the American Society of Thrift. The one is a governmental publication and the other is the publication of a voluntary association. The one came to my office this morning, and I am sure copies of it have been examined by many Members of the House. It states that the banking resources of the national banks of the country are nearly \$14,000,000,000. That sum will exceed the banking resources of the famous Bank of England, the Bank of France, the Bank of Germany, of Russia, of Switzerland, of Japan, all combined. The resources in the national banks, according to this statement, are nearly \$3,000,000,000, or nearly \$1,000,000,000 more than the law requires. The surplus and undivided profits will reach over \$1,000,000,000.

That is a remarkable statement of simply one branch of the banking business of the country. It does not include the vastly greater number of trust companies and private banking firms, which together supply only a fraction of the country's wealth. Now, keep that in mind as I read this contrast from this report of the American Society of Thrift. Sixty-six out of every 100 people of the United States die penniless. Twenty-five out of every 100 have been able to accumulate \$1,300, so that they would have that amount when they died. Of course, this does not mean what they earned, but what they saved. Nine per cent had accumulated and saved \$5,000. Two per cent had accumulated sufficient to be classed among the well-to-do, so that they lived off the income. Ninety-eight per cent live upon what would be classed the daily accumulation or wage or salary. And this is the most remarkable statement of all: Ninety-seven per cent of those who reached the age of 65 depend, in part at least, either upon relatives, friends, or some charitable movement for clothing, shelter, and food.

Gentlemen of the House, I have not been able to verify these figures. I have not had time nor convenience to do so. They are stated by the association as coming from the census reports of the Government, and I hesitate to quote them without having been able to go into a verification of them. However, they are startling in the mere fact that they have been published. They have been made the basis of many editorials of the press of the country. I dismiss the question as to whether they are true, and assume that there is some basis of fact for the statements. What is the cause? That is one of the pertinent questions which enlists public attention.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. FESS. I would like to yield, but I want to make a statement. I very much dislike to decline to yield. There is no discourtesy meant.

Mr. SLOAN. Oh, no.

Mr. FESS. The chairman of the committee made the statement that the tenantry system seemed to be increasing. I asked him the question whether that propertyless class was not also increasing in the towns. I am rather of the opinion that the class that owns no property is increasing both in the country and in the towns, although I can not verify it, not having the chance to go into the question. There are localities where well-to-do farmers move to the town and rent their farms. This increase of tenantry may not indicate an increase of any class. Many members of this committee, in speaking on the Agricultural appropriation bill, have spoken of conditions on the farm that ought not to be, and have suggested various remedies, so that I think I can safely say that many people in the country are inclined to lay the cause of this condition at the door of the Government, or at least would suggest that the

remedy is legislative enactment. One lays the cause to the lack of distribution, another to methods of transportation, and still others to monopolistic control of farm production. Naturally, men so convinced will look to the Government for remedies. I am not one of those who attribute the cause to the Government, and I will not agree altogether with those who think that its remedy is in legislation. We are now, and have been, suffering with overlegislation. It has almost become an epidemic among our people. However, I do think that suggestions made by those who have discussed this bill are rational and many of them constructive, and that probably those remedies will assist, but I do not think they will cure. A rural-credit system would assist. Better transportation to assist in marketing will assist. Governmental control of monopoly will also help. But regulation must not give way to strangulation. I have noticed that the tendency in legislation has been, and now is, paternalism. Anyone who will study the enactments of the last 50 years must be impressed with this tendency in Government, having the Government do for the community or the individual. A simple recital of the measures adopted in the last 20 years, or even the various bills introduced in this and the last Congress, tells the same story. I also notice that there is a rapid growth in socialism in the country. Nobody can close his eyes to that fact. Those voting the Socialist ticket do not, by a long way, measure the Socialist sentiment in the country. It is very apparent, and there are many people in the country who believe that socialism is the remedy for what they call this inequality.

I do not share in that conviction either. Equality will not be produced, neither will inequality be promoted by governmental decree. Human nature is not the result of laws of Congress. I believe that much of this inequality must be laid, first, to the lack of devotion or application to the utilization of one's energies. Good luck is not a law of success. Employment of talent, conservation of energy, and application to the work at hand are conditions of success. Much of this inequality is now and has been due to a lack of organized thrift. The country does not stimulate the maximum production of her people. This is especially true on the farm, as may be noted when we compare the yield of our acres with that of Germany. The same conclusion is noted in our system of industrial training. In the Province of Bavaria there are more vocational schools than throughout this entire country.

I believe that very much of this inequality is due to the wicked waste, not only of the individual but of the community, of the State, and of the Nation. On the farm this is noted by the treatment of the farm machinery, stock, gathering crops and various other items. I also believe that much of it is due to the false standard of high living which breeds extravagance that is serious. This is so apparent that it might be classed as a national characteristic.

Now, I speak with reference to young men I have watched in my own community, to say nothing of our young women. Somebody sets the standard. He can afford it because he may have been born with a silver spoon in his mouth; has little else to do but to spend money. Others come along who can not afford it. They want to wear the same clothing, they want to have the same indulgences, they want to spend their time in amusement, and every bit of it costs not only money but it costs energy. They make no connection between income and outgo. I think right there is a source of much of this propertyless ones in the community. Anyone who spends more than he receives will die not only penniless but the subject of charity.

I know this is not popular to say; I know people will take offense at this statement, but I think that this country is a country of open opportunity, and that there never was a time before where the young man with equal energy has such an opportunity to make good as to-day.

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

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. FESS. I am grateful to the gentleman. A young man was walking out of a New England State, and he found that the night was overtaking him, and he could not get to his destination. He stopped at a farmhouse, asked the farmer if he could do some work to pay for his lodging, and said that he could not get to his place that night. The farmer said, "No; you do not need to do any work; you can come in here; you are welcome." The boy said, "No; if I can not find something to do to pay for my night's lodging, I will go on." The farmer was impressed and said, "Well, it is dark, but I will take a lantern and go out to the woodpile, and you can split up some wood." He held the lantern, and the boy split some wood and stayed with him that night and went on in the morning. That was the famous George Peabody, who became in later life the

country's great philanthropist. He started with nothing. This story can be duplicated many times. It finds a place in the details of every department of American life.

I remember distinctly the story of a boy passing under an awning between boxes and barrels of groceries when a lady and gentleman passing by were obstructed. The boy was standing under the awning, and she said, "Get out of the road and let people pass." He stepped out into the rain. It attracted the attention of the gentleman, and he said, "Come in out of the rain, my lad." He stepped in, and the man put his hand on his head and said, "Where do you live?" "I have no home." "Where did you come from?" "Down town." "Where is your father?" "I don't know, sir." "Where is your mother?" "She is dead." "What are you doing here?" "I am looking for work." "What can you do?" He held up his hands and said, "Anything my hands can find to do." This man said, "Will you go with me?" The boy replied, "If you have anything for me to do." And he took him to his home. One night, talking by the fireside, he asked this boy whether he had any ambition or not, and the boy replied, "I would like to be a scholar and I would like to be a gentleman." And the man was wise enough to say to him, "Well, you can be both. You do not need to be well born; you do not need to refer back to your father or mother. You can be both; opportunity is open for you." [Applause.]

When that boy was one day cuffed by the proud woman, she called him a vagabond. That little orphan boy held his hands up and said to the woman, "Please don't call me a vagabond." She reminded him that he was a vagabond; that he had no home, no father, and no mother, and she said, "You are a vagabond." And he said, "No; a man told me that anybody that had two hands and a brain can do something, and I have both." That boy came to be one of the rulers of the country which gave him birth. The Government can do nothing more than to keep open opportunity to the citizen. While the citizen must learn that success must be with him who embraces the opportunity and who is willing to pay the price of close application to duty, frugal living, and a rational conserving of his powers. This is the cure of poverty; legislation will not reach it. [Applause.]

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

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON].

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, on the 19th day of February of this year I introduced a resolution in which I ask for the appointment of a commission to prepare and recommend a plan for the establishment of a national insurance fund and for the mitigation of the evil of unemployment.

We had a most interesting hearing on the resolution before the Committee on Labor of the House. Men of all political faiths appeared in support of the resolution and urged the need of a comprehensive study of the subject.

Up to 1912 there was only one political party which grasped the importance of dealing with the problem of unemployment, with health insurance, and old age pensions from a national standpoint and as national conservation measures. In 1912, Mr. Roosevelt, in his anxiety to smash the old Republican Party, which in his opinion had survived its usefulness, was gathering together planks for a platform which should bring to his support all the discontented. He consulted a number of men who had made a study of social problems, among them a well-known Socialist, for planks dealing with the social problem. Among these planks we find some dealing with the problem of social insurance.

The phrases "social legislation," "social conscience," "social insurance," are rather new to America. There is no country in the world in which the spirit of individualism is so strong as in the United States. Individualism is the narrow application of the doctrine of self-help. "Help yourself, and never mind at whose expense," is the slogan of this philosophy. This kind of individualism assumes that every man can improve his condition and take care of himself and his family and can rise out of poverty and destitution by personal effort. Any effort on the part of the individual to invoke the aid of the community, and particularly of the law, is condemned as repugnant to the American idea. Before our very eyes men have risen from poverty to opulence, from positions of insignificance to positions of prominence. We have financiers who started as shipping clerks. We have lawyers, judges, statesmen, who started as office boys. And with these men as a practical example of what America and Americans can do, social legislation, social insurance, social problems, are to many utterly unintelligible expressions.

This Republic had its birth in a rebellion against an oppressive Government. Jefferson's theory that that government is best which governs least expresses perhaps better than all the books

on liberty the theory of American individualism. When this doctrine was proclaimed there were some men in America who were richer than others, but there were no extremely rich nor extremely poor. At least, everyone had a chance. The resources of the country were untouched. There were new lands to be occupied; opportunities were unlimited; a strong and energetic man was bound to succeed. It was a fair contest and a fair race, in which the man with ability survived.

No one will seriously argue that we have the same state of affairs to-day. Some industries have reached a stage of monopoly. No matter how able, how energetic, how self-reliant the individual may be, he can not hope to succeed in the race against a powerful aggregation of capital. He is no longer competing with an individual who is a little richer than he is. He is called upon to compete with an aggregation of power in the form of organized capital, a tremendous, overwhelming force beyond the power of any individual to successfully contend with, and surely beyond the power of the individual to overcome.

The doctrine of self-help must be revised in the light of this new phenomenon. Instead of the good, sound philosophy which spurred on every man to exert himself to the utmost for himself and his family, so that he might some day, through thrift and intelligence, reach a state of independence and be his own boss, there has come another kind of self-help. Many an able man finds that he can help himself only by placing himself in the service of organized capital. It has come to be the highest ambition, and this ambition is being fostered, to become a corporation manager, the editor of a paper backed by a powerful corporation, a corporation lawyer—in short, some kind of a corporation tool. And there is growing up a peculiarly servile and contemptible type of man, and the most contemptible of them all is perhaps the corporation lawyer.

Who is the great lawyer nowadays? Is it the man who has contributed a new thought to jurisprudence or a higher ethical conception? Is it the man who has through the channels of legal activity enlarged the liberties of the people? No. Our great lawyers are the men who have received big fees in the service of organized capital. They are the men who guide the destinies of corporations and promote their interests as against the interests of the people.

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

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. McCRACKEN. Would the gentleman apply that to Mr. Brandeis?

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Brandeis is one of the few lawyers who have tried to make the profession of the law nobler. He has applied his talent to prove the constitutionality of a law regulating the hours of labor for women. He has tried to bring the spirit of life into the dead letter of the law. He has broken away from the old traditions of the corporation lawyer and has acted as the lawyer of the people, as the lawyer of the future.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. I will.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Is not that fact the reason why Mr. Brandeis is being opposed for confirmation?

Mr. LONDON. That is the principal reason; and if not on his own merits Brandeis should be confirmed because of those who oppose him. [Applause.] When Taft and Choate and Root oppose a man, be sure that man represents a noble idea and noble principles. [Applause.]

But enough of this.

Modern industry is organized on such a gigantic scale that in most industries the individual capitalist must combine his capital with that of others in order to make his capital effective. It has become more and more difficult to fight single-handed the battle of life. While capitalist and capitalist are forced to join in corporations, worker and worker are irresistibly driven to join in unions, farmer and farmer into granges, and the most intelligent elements of all classes into the Socialist Party. It is this new kind of self-help which seeks to accomplish the salvation of the great masses through cooperation on the economic and on the political field that is forcing to the front these new notions translatable into the phrases "social legislation," "social conscience," "social insurance."

I intend to present to you a program of social insurance, which is part of the constructive program of the Socialist movement. Broadly speaking, the subject of social insurance can be subdivided into the following branches:

1. Unemployment insurance.
2. Sickness and disability insurance, which takes in sickness, industrial accidents, and occupational diseases.
3. Invalidity and old-age insurance.
4. Provision for widows and orphans.

In the ultimate analysis social insurance carries with it obligatory insurance against the hazards of unemployment, sickness, old age, and death.

Social insurance had its origin in Germany in the eighties. The Socialist movement had not only gained a foothold there, but threatened to engulf both the capitalist class and the Monarchy. Prior to that the Iron Chancellor had hoped to crush the rising movement of the Social Democracy by repressive measures. Socialist publications were suspended; their organizations were disbanded; the Social Democrat was declared an outlaw. These repressive measures failed.

A new policy was then adopted by the Iron Chancellor and the Imperial Government. The Imperial Government undertook to wean away the masses from the Social Democracy by a series of national measures calculated to mitigate the evil conditions in industry. A comprehensive program insuring the worker against old age, sickness, invalidity, and accidents, and which continuously held out the promise of more thoroughgoing improvements, was offered to the workers.

The Imperial Government has again failed to check the growth of the Social Democracy, which has become the largest party numerically in Germany, but it has contributed to the development of the most efficient, most intelligent, and most healthy working class of modern days. The German Imperial Government has been spurred on by the Social Democracy. Now the whole world talks of German efficiency.

Let us take up first the subject of unemployment insurance.

It has long been contended by the Socialists that our present method of production and distribution involves the presence of a large army of unemployed. It would stand to reason that if industry is to be maintained on a competitive basis, which is the ideal of the conservative, that there must be competition between worker and worker for a job. In order that employer and employer may compete they must be able to compete at the expense of the wageworker, because after all the principal cost of production is the wage paid to the worker. Competition between employer and employer involves competition between man and man for a job, and the constant presence of a number of men who are out of employment, of the jobless man seeking to replace the man who has a job. The Commission on Industrial Relations estimates that the industrial worker loses on the average one-fifth of his time because of unemployment. The commission proves that "even in normal times the number of unemployed is appallingly great."

It appears that from 7 to 15 per cent of all the members of unions are unemployed at some time during the year. We are all familiar with unemployment during periods of depression and during the acute stages of depressions known as crises. We all know that a crisis means unemployment. Thus from the somewhat uncertain figures as they are presented by the census of 1900, the number of unemployed in that year reached the startling figure of nearly six millions and a half. Statistics of unemployment were gathered in 1910, but they were probably so staggering that they were never tabulated, and they have never been made public. We have just emerged from a crisis during which there were almost as many unemployed as employed men. And the worst about it is that crises are of rather frequent occurrence—we have had them almost every 10 years. Because the evil of unemployment assumes a threatening character during each crisis, it does not mean that we are free from unemployment in normal times.

It will be readily conceded that every change or threatened change of the tariff disturbs industry and throws men out of work. It is a matter of history that protectionist industries, whenever a downward revision of the tariff was threatened or effected, have held out before the workers the prospect of shutting up the plants.

We all remember the solemn warning issued by the President, that all who would attempt to coerce their employees by threatening to shut down factories in resisting a downward revision of the tariff "would hang as high as Haman." The protectionist did not threaten, he only prophesied, but prophesied calamity with such insistence and with such emphasis that it had the effect of coercion. The protectionist did not hang as high as Haman, but a large Democratic majority in Congress was reduced almost to zero.

The man working in a protected industry, with nothing to fall back upon when separated from his job, can not afford to take any chances; and when he hears the political orator proclaim that a reduction of the tariff would be followed by joblessness, he is in nine cases out of ten likely to vote back into power the protectionist interests. If the worker had something to fall back upon it would not be so easy to intimidate him.

Our age has been characterized by the constant introduction of new machines and new appliances, of new methods of division of labor, of heretofore unknown systems of efficiency. While every new machine, every new invention, every method that simplifies work or increases the productivity of man inures to the ultimate benefit of mankind, it has the immediate effect of causing a constant shifting of labor, of separating men from their jobs. Ultimately a blessing, the introduction of a new machine or a new device is an immediate curse to the worker who loses his job. The object of introducing a new machine is to increase production and to economize on labor, and unless the introduction of a machine in a particular industry will result in a demand for the article commensurate with the increased productivity, there will be idle men pounding the sidewalks.

The full extent to which the productivity of labor is increased by the introduction of machinery can hardly be appreciated. I shall cite just a few instances. Thus, while it took 222 hours to turn out 10 pairs of men's fine-grade shoes by hand, it takes just 29 hours to turn them out by machine. The making of a watch movement, which requires 195 hours by hand, takes only 5 hours by machine. One dozen corsets, 210 hours by hand, 18 hours by machine. Newspapers, printing and folding 36,000 pages, 216 hours by hand, 1 hour by machine. Loading 100 tons of ore on cars, 200 hours by hand, 1 hour by machine.

It is a poor consolation to the breadwinner of the family ousted from his job to be told that in the long run mankind will benefit by the new machine.

In some industries unemployment is more constant than employment. This is particularly true of seasonal trades and of those trades that serve the whims and caprices of fashion. In the building trades, in the clothing trades, in the canning industry, in the lumber camps and sawmills, the busy season is quickly replaced by the slack. Only a small proportion of employees have work throughout the year in these industries. The resulting rivalry for a chance to be employed has a depressing effect upon the general level of wages.

It seems as if some industries could not exist at all under present conditions, so miserable are the wages therein and so short is the duration of employment, unless there were a large army of casual workers ready to take any kind of a job.

There has been an average of 15,000 bankruptcies every year, and every bankruptcy means a tragedy in the home of the employee.

The creation of a new market, the disappearance of the demand for an article by the substitution of another in its stead, the springing up of a new industry, the decay of an old one—all of these things have the effect of shifting the workers from their jobs.

Unemployment, then, is not an accident, not a rare thing, not an occasional thing, but an incident of industry. It can always be predicted, so far as seasonal industries are concerned. It is sure to come with the application of every invention. It is sure to follow a change of the tariff. Every fluctuation in the world of commerce, every depression, every crisis, every change brings in its wake unemployment.

And very often, while tens of thousands of men walk the streets of our large cities in search of work, you will hear the farmer imploring the city laborer to come and help him out in gathering the harvest.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Is it not a fact that in many instances the amount of money that the laborer receives while employed in the harvest field is taken up in the charges of transportation to and from the place of work?

Mr. LONDON. Undoubtedly. The farmer will pay the city laborer \$3 a day while he works, but after the rush is over the city laborer must fall back upon his own resources—which are nil—and finding himself without means of transportation, he only helps to glut the labor market. As somebody has recently expressed it, the city laborer is invited to the farm with a brass band, and is driven out with a club as soon as the harvest is in.

We can not meet the problem of unemployment with spasmodic relief or temporary public works, nor by relying upon the kindness of employers who, under competitive conditions, very often can not afford to be kind, nor upon vagrancy or poor laws. Unemployment is an ever-present hazard of industry, and must be dealt with as such.

The Department of Commerce sends out daily consular reports, giving information as to trade, manufacturing, and finance all over the world. A system of unemployment exchanges covering in a complete network the entire country could be made to perform the same function for the laborer.

In order that it should be successful it must be organized on a national scale and by the National Government. It must be made sufficiently elastic to enable the widest possible cooperation with the labor unions, and municipal and State labor exchanges. The employment exchanges established by employers' associations are for the most part ordinary strike-breaking agencies.

A national system of unemployment exchanges will not of itself furnish jobs. It will furnish information, eliminate a great deal of waste, and centralize the labor market.

The 80 public employment exchanges scattered in about 20 States offer but scant assistance.

A majority of the civilized countries of Europe have come to recognize unemployment as a characteristic feature of modern industrial life. Of the various methods dealing with unemployment on a permanent basis, I will just say a word about the Ghent system. The system which has its name from the city of Ghent, in Belgium, the first city to introduce it, consists chiefly in subsidizing labor unions which pay out-of-work benefits. It is a purely voluntary system.

The boldest step in the direction of introducing a national system of unemployment insurance was taken in England in 1911. It may be worth while to give a brief outline as to how the English law works. The law was first made compulsory in reference to seven industries embracing about 2,400,000 workers. Each employer is required to pay into the insurance fund 10 cents—2½ pence—a week for every worker, one-half of which he deducts from the wages of each employee. These payments are made by affixing stamps to an insurance card. The cards are obtained by the workers at the post offices or from any one of the unemployment exchange offices. The State treasury contributes 3½ cents, so that employer, employee, and the Government each contribute to the insurance fund. At the end of the first year of the operation of the insurance law there was a surplus of \$8,000,000. Six hundred thousand workers in industries to which the law was not made compulsorily applicable came voluntarily within the provisions of the law. The most remarkable thing about it all is that 30 per cent of the men who applied for aid out of the unemployment insurance fund received positions during the first week—England had a short time before that established a system of unemployment exchanges—and that only 1 per cent of the total applications for relief were rejected. As the law now stands, the worker is entitled to not more than 15 weeks' unemployment benefit during any one year, 7 shillings each week. Of course, the amount is very small as compared with the American standard of living, but, as was said at the hearing, it is just 7 shillings more than nothing.

To encourage trade unions to provide unemployment insurance the British act grants a subsidy to every union which pays a certain amount of out-of-work benefits. The entire act is based upon the fullest possible recognition of the trade-union as the agency which is best adapted to carry into effect the provisions of the law.

The unions practically act as agents for the fund. The individual member of the union makes his payments to and receives his benefits from the union, and the union is reimbursed from the national unemployment fund.

It goes without saying that it would be extremely unwise to adopt in toto any European system of unemployment insurance. It must be made to conform to the higher standards of American life; it must not be permitted to destroy the individuality of the worker; it must be founded upon the broadest possible cooperation with the labor unions. Instead of being compulsory upon the individual it must be made compulsory upon industry and upon the unit of industry—the employer. We are dealing with the effects of involuntary idleness, for which the individual worker is not and should not be held responsible.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has five minutes remaining.

Mr. LONDON. I thank the gentleman.

We are dealing with the problem of unemployment on a national scale.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Does not the gentleman think that if we could forbid monopoly of natural opportunities that that would solve a great deal of the unemployment in the country?

Mr. LONDON. Undoubtedly. I will come to that a little later. In the discussion yesterday the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OVERMYER] said that we used one-fourth of the available land and that this one-fourth of the land we used yielded only one-half of what could be produced by intensive farming. In the course of his remarks he also said, "We have the land

and we have the brains." Yes; the trouble is we have the land but utilize only one-eighth of it, and we have the brains and do not seem to use any part of them. To come back to the subject of compulsory unemployment insurance.

Upon examination, unemployment insurance will not appear as novel as it appears to be at first sight. Look at our workmen's accident compensation legislation. For years the people of the United States were indifferent to the problem of the worker injured in industrial accidents. It seemed to be such an elementary proposition that a worker injured in the course of his employment should be compensated when disabled. It took years of agitation, and only after almost every country of Europe had introduced a method of compensating employees disabled in industry 31 States became reconciled to the principle that industry owes an obligation to the worker to at least partially compensate him for loss sustained by accident. The burden in these cases falls upon the industry itself, or upon the employer. In less than 10 years, 31 States have adopted the principle of workmen's compensation. I was amused when I received—after the adoption of the workmen's compensation act in New York—the announcement of the publication of a textbook consisting of six or eight volumes and upon which the author had spent many years of his life. The book dealt with the fanciful theories spun by corporation lawyers to defeat the claims of the workers for compensation. These volumes of the old-fashioned lawyer were so much waste paper now, because of the advance of social thought in America. He had been working away at old precedents and decisions while the minds of the people were working in the direction of a nobler method of dealing with the victims of industry.

Most of these compensation laws are defective and inadequate. In most jurisdictions they still distinguish between disablement due to an industrial accident and disablement due to occupational disease.

We now all understand that employers have been forced to insure themselves in a fund, out of which the injured workers shall be paid, has resulted in a reduction of the number of accidents and in better methods of safety. In the same way inclusion of occupational diseases will work in the direction of compelling employers to introduce the most sanitary conditions in industry, so that the health of the worker will become the concern of the employer.

It is not, then, a new theory that I am advancing when I seek to apply the principle which has been recognized in accident compensation to unemployment. Both are risks and incidents of industry.

While we provide for unemployment insurance we must not forget that the primary object is to minimize unemployment and to prevent it as much as possible. Let us make a start and we will find that some order may be introduced in industry.

Why not begin with the extension of public works? Why not force the lands now held for speculative purposes out of the hands of the absentee landlords and out of the grip of land sharks? Why not get busy conserving the natural resources? Conservation occupies a prominent place in the platforms of all political parties. It is a sad reflection on the statesmanship of America that we have been thus far unable to save millions of acres of land from inundation by floods; that we have permitted the forests to be destroyed; that the building of public roads in agriculturally and industrially backward sections of the country has not been organized on a systematic basis. Year in and year out river and harbor appropriations are made, all without plan, without order, without system. Work which is essential to the very life of the nation is conducted in a haphazard manner, to the great amusement of newspaper wits, who charge Congress with "pork-barrel" legislation.

I urge that simultaneously with insurance against unemployment there should be taken up the problem of organizing the public works of the country, such as the reclamation of arid lands, reforestation, the exploitation of our natural resources, work for the prevention of floods and inundations, for the reclamation of swamp lands, the building of public roads, canals, and similar undertakings. The present free and easy method of spending millions of dollars without any plan, with only local and temporary conditions in view, should be replaced by a permanent and national development scheme.

It is a conservative estimate that the unappropriated natural resources of the United States exceed \$30,000,000,000 in value, an average of \$300 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. But this is a commercial way of valuing things. The worth of the natural resources still in the possession of the Government of the United States is incalculably more than thirty billions. Who can estimate the worth of natural resources which, when utilized by the Nation and not thrown away in dribblets to private owners, will give the means of life

to millions of men and for generations to come? It would be like attempting to figure out in dollars and cents the value of the sun.

I have given so much time to the subject of unemployment that I will have to be brief in dealing with the other branches of the subject of social insurance—old age and sickness. Old age and invalidity insurance, just like accident and disability insurance, do not involve a new principle. It is rather the application and extension of an old principle. We have long ago become accustomed to treat with reverence the veterans of our wars who are in need. I ask you now to treat with the same consideration the veteran of industry who is in need. There is no substantial reason why a distinction should be drawn between the man enfeebled by old age who has been rendering useful service to the country in industry or in agriculture and the former soldier.

The morality of the Bible is supposed to lie at the basis of our moral system. Respect for the aged is a precept which is inculcated in every school child. Can we afford to repudiate one of the fundamental principles of our moral code by discarding the aged? And do not forget, please, that, so far as industry is concerned, men become superannuated before they become old.

It is not an unusual thing, but rather a frequent occurrence, to meet old professors, old teachers, and old statesmen, and the older they are the higher are they regarded by the community. It is not so in industry. The man becomes old for the purposes of industry when the ever-quickenning processes of production make it impossible for him to compete in physical exertion with the younger man. The very term "superannuated" shows a cynical contempt for the dignity of a human being. It conveys the notion that the superannuated has had too many years of life, more than our anarchical system of society can utilize for purposes of exploitation.

If industry were conducted with some regard for human life and not exclusively for profit, an opportunity might be found for the superannuated to be useful in a service requiring less physical exertion and more suitable to the diminishing vigor of the man guilty of the crime of getting old.

The question what will become of the aged is no concern of the employer. All that the employer is concerned about is that his overhead charges will be increased if he maintains in his establishment a man who turns out less than others. Nor is the fact that some railroad companies and other large corporations have introduced old-age funds of much avail. When the private corporation establishes an old-age fund it practically says to the employee: "As long as you will be submissive during the days of your vigor and virility, when you are capable of demanding and enforcing your rights, and as long as our will will be law for you in your days of youth and strength, we will give you a little something when you reach the age of 50 or 60—after 15, or 20, or 30 years of continuous employment with us." This is not an old-age pension. This is a tuft of hay held out to a mule.

Other civilized countries have attacked this problem with the result that compulsory old-age insurance exists in Germany and France; old-age pensions in Denmark, Great Britain, France, Australia, and New Zealand; and a subsidized system of old-age insurance in Italy, Belgium, Serbia, and Spain.

In England, when the old-age pensions law was adopted, it was found that the treatment of the old in the past had been so inhuman that fully one-half of the aged were entitled to pensions under the new system. I wonder if the statesmen of the United States will wait until a similar condition confronts us here?

Sickness insurance, covering every form of disability, whether due to industrial or to nonindustrial causes, is again a problem which is soluble only by the community as a whole. We have learned that society owes an obligation to compensate the worker against loss due to industrial accident. We are slowly coming to understand that occupational disease must be brought within the purview of compensation laws. Health insurance, which forms such a prolific source of profit to insurance companies and of waste to the insured should be organized on a national scale and as a national function. There is no reason why profit should be made out of misfortune. The poorest strata of society now pay to the various industrial insurance funds \$1 in order to get back 40 cents. Insurance companies have come to be one of the great financial powers.

Insurance against loss by unemployment, sickness, invalidity, and old age must be undertaken by society and not left to private corporations.

I have given a brief outline of the subject of social insurance, which is part of the constructive program of the Socialist Party. I have not by any means exhausted the subject. I have only indicated the existence of the problem and have shown that

it is not insoluble. Accident insurance has been established throughout Europe and in 31 States of the Union. Compulsory sickness insurance has been introduced in about half of the countries of Europe, and voluntary subsidized sickness insurance in five or six other countries of Europe. Compulsory old-age insurance exists in two European countries. Old-age pensions and voluntary subsidized State systems of old-age insurance exist in 10 European countries, including Great Britain, France, and Germany. Unemployment insurance is rapidly spreading in large European cities and exists by national law in three countries of Europe. A beginning has been made in some countries in introducing widows' and orphans' pensions.

If the worker could afford to buy all these forms of insurance, to buy unemployment insurance, sickness insurance, old-age pensions, so as to make ample provision for his widow and orphans, one might be justified in contending that it should be left to the individual. But will anybody seriously claim that the great masses of the workers can afford to buy these forms of insurance?

The worker should not be asked to assume all the burdens, all the risks, all the hazards of modern industry, with its accidents, occupational diseases, life-sapping intensity, with its sudden rushes and its long slacks, with its constant fears and anxieties. And in the end the worker will pay for it all. I know that the struggle for bread will continue to be bitter, and that the emancipation of the masses can become a reality only with the abolition of the competitive system of society in which the propertyless are at the mercy of the class which controls the land and the means of production. It is not so much the economic advantage, although that will not be slight, which will accrue to the masses, as the introduction of a principle of ethics into industry, of a moral law into a sphere of life where the law of force rules to-day.

Human society should be something more than a mere aggregation of bipeds, each seeking to devour the other.

I urge the appointment of a commission to take up the task of organizing a thoroughgoing, nation-wide system of social insurance.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this completes the time on this side of the House, and unless the gentleman has some other time—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has no more time.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may be authorized to correct the totals.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the Clerk may be authorized to correct the totals. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the bill under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

Salaries, Office of the Secretary of Agriculture: Secretary of Agriculture, \$12,000; Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, \$5,000; solicitor, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$3,000, and \$500 additional as custodian of buildings; private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture, \$2,500; executive clerk, \$2,250; executive clerk, \$2,100; stenographer and executive clerk to the Secretary of Agriculture, \$2,250; private secretary to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, \$2,250; 1 appointment clerk, \$2,000; 1 assistant in charge of information, \$3,000; 1 officer in charge of supplies, \$2,000; 1 assistant, \$2,000; 1 inspector, \$2,750; 1 inspector, \$2,250; 1 law clerk, \$3,250; 1 law clerk, \$3,000; 1 law clerk, \$2,750; 4 law clerks, at \$2,500 each; 8 law clerks, at \$2,250 each; 1 law clerk, \$2,200; 6 law clerks, at \$2,000 each; 3 law clerks, at \$1,800 each; 3 law clerks, at \$1,600 each; 1 expert on exhibits, \$3,000; 1 telegraph and telephone operator, \$1,600; 1 assistant chief clerk and captain of the watch, \$1,800; 4 clerks, class 4; 12 clerks, class 3; 19 clerks, class 2; 23 clerks, class 1; 1 auditor, \$2,000; 1 accountant and bookkeeper, \$2,000; 1 clerk, \$1,440; 1 clerk, \$1,020; 7 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 12 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 clerk, \$840; 15 messengers or laborers, at \$840 each; 12 assistant messengers or laborers, at \$720 each; 1 messenger or laborer, \$660; 1 mechanical superintendent, \$2,500; 1 assistant engineer, \$1,400; 1 assistant engineer, \$1,200; 2 assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each; 8 firemen, at \$720 each; 11 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 3 elevator conductors, at \$600 each; 1 superintendent of shops, \$1,400; 1 cabinet-shop foreman, \$1,200; 4 cabinet-makers or carpenters, at \$1,200 each; 3 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at \$1,100 each; 9 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at \$1,020 each; 3 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at \$900 each; 1 electrician, \$1,100; 1 electrical wireman, \$1,000; 1 electrical wireman, \$900; 3 electrician's helpers, at \$720 each; 1 painter, \$1,000; 5 painters, at \$900 each; 5 plumbers or steam fitters, at \$1,020 each; 1 plumber's helper, \$840; 2 plumber's helpers, at \$720 each; 1 blacksmith, \$900; 1 tinner's helper, \$720; 1 Lieutenant of the watch, \$1,000; 2 Lieutenants of the watch, at \$960 each; 50 watchmen, at \$720 each; 4 mechanics, at \$1,200 each; 1 skilled laborer, \$1,000; 2 skilled laborers, at \$900 each; 2 skilled

laborers, at \$840 each; 1 skilled laborer, \$720; 1 janitor, \$900; 22 assistant messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$600 each; 1 carriage driver, \$600; 21 laborers or messenger boys, at \$480 each; 1 messenger or messenger boy, \$360; 1 charwoman, \$540; 2 charwomen, at \$480 each; 15 charwomen, at \$240 each; for extra labor and emergency employments, \$12,000; in all, \$402,350.

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

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, may I offer an amendment?

Mr. MANN. After the point of order is disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point.

Mr. MANN. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I just wanted to make an inquiry about the private secretary to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. How is that place provided for now?

Mr. LEVER. The place has been provided for heretofore on the extra-labor roll of the Secretary of Agriculture, the \$12,000 appropriation which is carried from year to year.

Mr. MANN. What do you mean by the extra-labor roll?

Mr. LEVER. You will find that at the very close—

Mr. MANN. The emergency-employment roll?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. It is in the last line of page 4.

Mr. MANN. How long has that been used to provide a private secretary to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. LEVER. I can not tell the gentleman that, but I assume some little while. The theory is that this extra roll is to take care of clerks for a six months' period, temporary clerks, and things of that kind, but the theory has not been carried out.

Mr. MANN. Of course I know what the theory was. Whoever started it was guilty of a gross abuse of the appropriation. I will not say that the continuing of it is a gross abuse, because people very often automatically continue something where it is already in existence. I assume that this private secretary has been provided for a good while, but whoever paid a private secretary to the Assistant Secretary out of an emergency appropriation intended for temporary employment committed a gross abuse.

Mr. LEVER. Let me say to the gentleman that I think we shall be prepared to offer an amendment to this bill in the miscellaneous items which will cure the complaint of the gentleman, which I agree is a just complaint, so as to confine all these temporary employments to a period of six months only, as the theory is now.

Mr. MANN. I suppose they would employ a man for six months, and when the six months were up they would employ him for six months again. The only way, of course, is to have people honestly administer the law.

Mr. LEVER. That is very true.

Mr. MANN. Because there is no way of preventing executive officers who have some discretion from improperly exercising the discretion at some time.

Mr. LEVER. I understand that this private secretary heretofore has been carried as a clerk, but when Mr. Vrooman became Assistant Secretary they transferred this clerk and named him secretary to the Assistant Secretary.

Mr. MANN. He probably was in as a clerk before at \$1,800.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; very likely.

Mr. MANN. And now they have provided for a private secretary, at \$2,250, out of a fund that was appropriated for temporary employees. I had supposed that the practice had begun some years ago. I did not know that it had begun with the present Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. But it is a very bad practice, whoever it was that began it.

Mr. LEVER. I will say, however, that this individual has been transferred at the same salary that he was getting before the transfer. That is the case with all transfers, except where we have set it out and where we will be prepared to show it.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt but that every executive officer has some pet, and that usually the private secretary is the pet, and if he can pay that secretary out of a lump sum he usually pays him a very good salary. I do not happen to know the private secretary.

Mr. LEVER. I do not know him myself.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether he is efficient or not, but if he is, he probably earns his \$2,250. But I do not believe in men acting that way about an appropriation.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Anderson] has suggested an amendment to me which I have under advisement now, which we hope will be agreed upon and which will very much clarify this situation and improve it in the future.

Mr. MANN. I notice you have just as much of an emergency appropriation for temporary employment as you had for the present year.

Mr. LEVER. That is true. The emergency appropriation has really been increased \$9,000, at the very urgent request of the Secretary himself. They say they need this appropriation to take care of emergencies which may happen that we can not foresee.

Mr. MANN. Then when we give it to them they use it for the purpose of appointing a private secretary.

Mr. LEVER. That is sometimes the case.

Mr. MANN. That is the case here; and then they say they must have an emergency appropriation. Every department of the Government gets some kind of an emergency appropriation, and most of them abuse it from time to time. I am not referring to the existing officials specifically. I think perhaps they are no worse than those who preceded them.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is making a general statement, and I concur in it.

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on page 3, line 3, where there is one assistant engineer at \$1,400. The members of the committee will remember that we used to have a chief engineer. That has been dropped, and the word "assistant" has no relation to anything, and I move to strike out the word "assistant."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 3, strike out the word "assistant."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, as I recall, that item was intended to read, "one chief engineer." It formerly read, "one assistant chief engineer," and my recollection is that the committee struck out the word "assistant" and made it "one engineer."

Mr. LEVER. No. We struck out the word "chief," I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question with reference to the number of law clerks employed in this section. I see this year we have 28 law clerks, at an expense of \$61,400. Last year, if I correctly read the text, we had 27 law clerks, costing \$58,400. I would like to inquire, Mr. Chairman, how these law clerks are distributed?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that the law clerks are under the solicitor of the department, but are carried upon the statutory roll of the Secretary's office. There has been an increase of only one law clerk on this roll, and he comes to this roll by way of transfer from the lump fund for the enforcement of the cotton-futures act.

Mr. CLINE. Does each bureau under this bill have one law clerk or more?

Mr. LEVER. No. The law clerks of the Department of Agriculture are concentrated on this roll.

Mr. CLINE. I understand; but is each bureau of the Department of Agriculture supplied with a law clerk?

Mr. LEVER. No. Some bureaus are; as, for instance, the Forest Service has a law clerk stationed at each of the forestry districts, some seven or eight. The balance of the law clerks are carried on the solicitor's roll and are under the control of the solicitor.

Mr. CLINE. Do they attend strictly to the law questions that arise under the bill?

Mr. LEVER. That is my information.

Mr. CLINE. To one not fully acquainted with it it would seem that from the fact that the bill is generally the same year after year, but few new questions would be apt to arise.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman will realize that in recent years a great deal of new legislation has been given to the Department of Agriculture, as, for example, the cotton-futures act, and the migratory birds act, and the Weeks forestry act. Those matters involve a number of new questions.

Mr. CLINE. These bills do not embody very many disputed questions.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes; the Weeks law in the matter of clearing up titles and getting titles required the services of a board of law clerks.

Mr. CLINE. Do these 27 clerks have any duties to perform except to settle law questions?

Mr. LEVER. None whatever that I am informed of.

Mr. CLINE. I simply wanted to know how they were distributed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Can the gentleman from South Carolina tell us how many increases there are in promotions or salaries carried in this bill, directly or indirectly?

Mr. LEVER. I will have that in a moment.

Mr. MANN. I notice the paragraph increases the amount appropriated \$50,000 for employees generally over in the Agricultural Building. What is the reason for the increase in the number of laborers, elevator conductors, and so forth? What is the occasion for the increase; how has the department extended itself so as to need the additional laborers?

Mr. LEVER. The statement of the chief clerk before the committee was that on account of the transfer of the Office of Roads to the building opposite Willard Hotel, where they had two elevators, it was necessary to have an additional elevator conductor. As to the messengers, the statement was that two new buildings, or three, had been added since the last bill.

Mr. MANN. Does the Agricultural Department occupy the whole of the old building that was used by the Department of Commerce?

Mr. LEVER. I think so, The Office of Public Roads does so. The subcommittee examined that, but I did not.

Mr. MANN. I should think the Division of Roads had made a wonderful increase since it was taken from the Department of Commerce.

Mr. LEVER. As I recall, the Department of Commerce when located there had practically no one except the Secretary and a few clerks.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman does not recollect correctly. I was quite familiar with that myself.

Mr. LEVER. That was so when I went there.

Mr. MANN. Probably the gentleman only went to see the Secretary.

Mr. LEVER. It occupied three or four rooms.

Mr. MANN. They occupied the whole building. Now, the increase here is from \$352,000, in round numbers, to \$402,000.

Mr. LEVER. I have the statement now that the gentleman asked for. The summary is: Promotions, \$9,860; new places, \$40,580, transfer from lump sum without corresponding reductions, \$11,470, making a total of \$61,910.

Then by reductions: Places dropped, \$9,460; decrease of salary, \$660; total, \$10,120, making a net increase, according to this statement, of \$51,790; but that was not allowed in toto, so the increase is a little less than that—about \$50,000.

Mr. MANN. I notice that as to the chief engineer you change his title. I suppose the office is precisely the same, but because you change the title you add \$500 to the salary. Very likely it is needed; I do not know.

Mr. LEVER. As a matter of fact, the testimony before the committee was that this man would have more work to do than the old chief.

Mr. MANN. The old engineer worked his full time, and this one will not work any longer time now, and if he does he would want pay for overtime.

Mr. LEVER. This is an entirely different man; the old chief has been dropped and this is a new man brought in. I asked the question myself, if this man did the same work that the chief engineer used to do, and the answer was, "The same and a great deal more."

Mr. MANN. Oh, they always say that.

Mr. LEVER. That may be, but we have to take the testimony of the witnesses.

Mr. MANN. You have to take the testimony with a great many degrees of allowance. They have probably put some man in that somebody connected with the department wanted to take care of, and pay him \$500 more than the man who had been in the service was getting. The man may be worth it, but I doubt it.

Mr. LEVER. The statement before the committee was that the mechanical work of the department has been completely reorganized and put under the charge of this man.

Mr. MANN. Yes; at a considerable increase of cost—reformed at an additional expense.

Mr. LEVER. No; there is no increase, except this \$500.

Mr. MANN. Here you have one skilled laborer, at \$1,000; two skilled laborers, at \$840; one more at \$700; and various other places; that is a part of the reform.

Mr. LEVER. These places do not apply to this particular proposition, but to the roll in general.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Office of Farm Management: One chief of office, \$4,000; 1 executive assistant, \$2,250; 2 clerks, class 3; 3 clerks, class 2; 6 clerks, class 1; 2 clerks, at \$1,100 each; 1 clerk, \$1,080; 1 clerk or photographer, \$1,020; 8 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 10 clerks, at \$900 each; 4 clerks or map tracers, at \$840 each; 3 clerks or map tracers, at \$720 each; 1 lantern-slide colorist, \$720; 1 messenger or laborer, \$720; 1 messenger.

ger, messenger boy, or laborer, \$660; 3 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$480 each; 1 laborer, \$360; 4 charwomen, at \$240 each; 1 library assistant, \$1,440; 1 photographer, \$1,400; 1 photographer, \$1,000; 1 draftsman, \$1,440; 1 draftsman, \$1,200; 2 draftsmen, at \$900 each; in all, \$60,810.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I suppose these new places are mainly transfers from the lump-sum appropriation to the statutory roll?

Mr. LEVER. I will say that the Farm Management Office heretofore has not had a statutory roll, and this is the first time the statutory roll appears in the bill.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. LEVER. I am mistaken; this is the second time it has appeared in this bill, and all of these new places here are transfers except one new clerk of class 2 and then one \$740 clerk.

Mr. MANN. Is there any reduction in the lump-sum appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. The lump sum has been increased by the committee to do a certain line of work. The lump sum has been decreased wherever there has been a transfer made to the statutory rolls in accordance with the transfer, but there is an actual increase in the lump sum, due to other causes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I have no criticism of this; but I want to ask what this Office of Farm Management does?

Mr. LEVER. I want to read to the gentleman just what this office does.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I am sure the gentleman can tell us better than he can read it.

Mr. LEVER. I am going to read it, because I asked the question myself before the committee, and it brought it out very distinctly. This is Dr. Spillman's statement:

I may say that the Office of Farm Management was founded on the idea that many farmers know a great deal about their business, and that of the 6,000,000 farmers in America all are experimenting more or less, and occasionally here and there discover something of importance. And it has been—and we hope always will be—the function of the Office of Farm Management to visit among the farmers and gather up their experience and interpret that experience for other farmers, believing that we can render valuable service in that way. Perhaps the central idea in the Office of Farm Management is to find out how much money the farmers are making, how they make it, and why they make it.

Mr. MANN. I suppose these employees are mainly social visitors?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. They go to the farmers' houses and stay over night and gossip and have a choice line of stories to tell.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, I would not think so.

Mr. MANN. Are they selected by civil-service regulations based upon their story-telling capacity?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, I do not think the gentleman wants that to be taken seriously.

Mr. MANN. I have not any doubt that that is the most effective work they do.

Mr. LEVER. As I understand this work, it is under a competent man, Dr. Spillman. Their business is to visit in communities and make a general survey of the practical situation. They will find an entire community engaged probably in the same kind of agriculture, but they will find that a certain percentage of farmers are making regular returns upon their endeavors and some are not. They study these individual cases, and why this individual should be making money and his adjoining neighbor not making anything, and from that in many instances they are able to make suggestions which are very valuable. I look on this as a very valuable piece of work. It is a new piece of work.

Mr. MANN. They gossip with the farmer.

Mr. LEVER. Very likely they do, and a good deal of good information is gotten by gossip.

Mr. MANN. Finding the machines out in the rain, they tell him, "Why, don't you know that rust will destroy these machines after a while? You ought to build something and put them under cover." That is a remarkable statement, of course, and everyone does not know that. Do they ever publish anything resulting from this bureau?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes; they publish some farmers' bulletins, which are very valuable.

Mr. MANN. I religiously read every farmers' bulletin that is published, and I think they are sort of falling down over there on the farmers' bulletins. Perhaps that accounts for it.

Mr. LEVER. I confess to the gentleman that I do not have time to read them all.

Mr. MANN. I read all of them.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is to be commended.

Mr. MANN. Hoping to get information, and I sometimes do. Some of it I know is misinformation. I have not yet seen anything resulting from this service.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman will understand that this service is really the field laboratory work of the Department of Agriculture as against investigational work which might be called the test-tube work, as they refer to it. They are trying to get information from bright, intelligent, progressive farmers, and after gathering that information they give it to other farmers for their use.

Mr. MANN. With all due respect to this bureau, and doubtless they do some good work, I should say that if ever there was created under the Government a lazy man's job this bureau has that place.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I desire to renew the point of order if the gentleman from Illinois withdraws it.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order. I do not think there is anything subject to the point of order.

Mr. COX. I renew the point of order.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to one further fact. One of the employees suggests:

Why not let the department give short courses for Congressmen, particularly members of the House committee? Why not give them short, snappy illustrations of what the department is doing and why? That could be done in such a way that Congress would jump at it.

Here is another suggestion:

We have thousands of colored lantern slides and thousands of reels of movies

And they suggest that these should be used to educate the ignorant Congressmen, and I am sure that when the gentleman from Illinois understands what this money is being used for he will raise no further objection to this worthy bureau of this department.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana make the point of order?

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order in order to get information. I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether in this transfer from the lump-sum appropriation these salaries remain at the same amount they were fixed at under the lump-sum appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. Absolutely, except where we call attention to it.

Mr. COX. Is the lump-sum appropriation reduced?

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. COX. This Office of Farm Management—I believe the gentleman says Dr. Spillman is at the head of it?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. COX. Is he the gentleman who testified before the committee that he went out into the State of Pennsylvania and laid that State out and investigated among the farmers, and told them how to increase their corn yield and where they could make more money and less money?

Mr. LEVER. I am inclined to think he is.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that I read Dr. Spillman's evidence and found it very entertaining, but that is about the only thing that I can say for it. Undoubtedly he is a man of ability, but I am unable to see where he brought out a single fact or a single circumstance that this bureau could put into use among the farmers that would enable them to increase their yield in corn, wheat, rye, barley, cotton, or anything else.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman misinterprets the function of this entire Office of Farm Management. That office is not engaged in the work of telling people how to increase yields of various kinds of crops, but the work of this bureau is to go upon a man's farm and see the kind of agriculture in which he is engaged—how much oats are sowed, how much wheat, how many cattle he has, how many horses he has, and so on—and then to investigate and endeavor to find out from this man whether or not he is making a profit. He will find, for instance, that he is probably not making a profit, or, if a profit, a small one. Then he finds a neighbor of his who is likewise engaged in the same kind of agriculture, and he finds that he has a few more cattle or that he has planted a little bit more oats or has sown a few more acres of wheat, but that man is making a profit, as compared with the other man who is making less. Now, the difference between profit and loss—

Mr. COX. Is a question of bookkeeping.

Mr. LEVER. The difference between profit and loss may mean a difference in the number of acres on a given farm that should or should not be sown in any one kind of crop. Now, those facts are very valuable to have.

Mr. COX. As I recall Dr. Spillman's evidence, it was along this line, that he found quite a lot of farms in the counties in Pennsylvania where he inspected, some of them growing 20 per cent in corn, some of them growing 30 per cent in corn, some growing 10 per cent and some 15 per cent in oats, and so forth,

Mr. LEVER. And some making a profit and others not.

Mr. COX. And he undertook to find a reason why certain fellows, because they planted a certain percentage of corn, were making money. It looks to me that is a trivial proposition. Any farmer who knows the A B C of farming ought to know when, how, and where he is making money. He ought to know how much corn he ought to plant. He ought to know whether he is making money on his corn crop or on his wheat crop or on his oats, or on all three of them. In my candid judgment, after reading the evidence, with all due deference to Dr. Spillman's ability, there is nothing in it. It is simply a place to give a lot of men a few fine jobs and from which no uniform benefit will come to the mass of the people.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw the point of order?

Mr. COX. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether he knows how many places this bureau visits a year, and whether they make a detailed report of the results of their visit?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know about the number of places that they visit. It is almost impossible to find that out. I will say they are making investigations and surveys at all times, and they are gathering the results of their investigations and surveys and bringing them back to Washington, collating them, and in the course of time they will be issuing a statement as to what conclusions they find from these investigations.

Mr. MADDEN. What do they do with the draftsman in that bureau?

Mr. LEVER. The department has collected certain information relative to the shifting of agricultural industries in the United States. For instance, they find that wheat at one time was grown in a certain section of the country, and now it is not grown there, but is grown in another section. This draftsman is employed for the purpose of visualizing that information, setting it out on a map, which would be very interesting, not, perhaps to the layman, but to the economic student of agriculture.

Mr. MADDEN. What about this photographer? Does he photograph the crops as they are growing to show whether they are prolific or not?

Mr. LEVER. Just what that particular one does I do not know.

Mr. MADDEN. They have two here. I did not know what they were for.

Mr. LEVER. They have quite a number scattered through the department.

Mr. MADDEN. In this bill?

Mr. LEVER. As to this particular one I do not know just what he is doing.

Mr. MADDEN. The truth of the matter is—

Mr. LEVER. I know he is well employed in the bureau.

Mr. MADDEN. Is it not a fact that the men of this bureau just go to the farmer and get such information as the farmer gives—

Mr. LEVER. That is just the purpose of this bureau. It is not a bureau for the dissemination of information in particular, but a bureau for the gathering of information.

Mr. MADDEN. What do they do with the information after they gather it?

Mr. McKELLAR. Have they ever issued a bulletin?

Mr. LEVER. I think they have. They gather this information together and then they interpret it according to their judgment.

Mr. MADDEN. So that it will be available to the farmer in the shape of bulletins?

Mr. McKELLAR. They have never given out any bulletins at all up to date.

Mr. LEVER. I am not so sure of that. I will say to the gentleman that this is about the third or fourth year of this work.

Mr. McKELLAR. It seems to me that with this large appropriation they ought to be giving out some information to the farmers.

Mr. MADDEN. I understood the gentleman to say the lump-sum appropriation had been reduced.

Mr. LEVER. I said it had been reduced by way of the transfer. On the face it shows an increase here, because we have increased the amount for the lump-sum work.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course the gentleman understands that unless we give out this information in bulletins to farmers the very getting of information by the bureau would be of no service whatever.

Mr. LEVER. There can be no disagreement between the gentleman and myself on that proposition.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

There is another matter before the House for a moment to which I am sure no one will object. The gentleman from Iowa spoke of pictures in the department and possibly moving-picture illustrations for the benefit of Congress. At different times there have been applications for permission to take moving pictures of the House in session. At one time some of us gave our consent, as far as we were concerned, to some people taking moving pictures if they would put their cameras in the gallery, so that they would attract no attention, but they found they could not take a moving picture of the House owing to the lack of light. This morning the Clerk of the House saw me and stated that there was before the Clerk and the Speaker an application to take a moving picture of the House in session now. I asked what would be required now, and they brought some man to me who I suppose has charge of it, and he said they would have to put possibly half a dozen lights in the House—strong electric lights. I do not know, of course, but moving pictures have come, and, I guess, permanently in the United States, and not many people have a chance to see the House in session. I am not at all sure that they would be inspired if they saw a moving picture of it; but does anybody here have any objection to it?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that I will have absolutely no objection if he will have it taken while this bill is not on the floor, because I am afraid it would delay business.

Mr. MANN. It would last only a few minutes, and not delay at all. It is supposed to be a moving picture of the House proceedings. Of course, it might be possible that they would like to take a moving picture while we were calling the roll.

Mr. HOWARD. Is that a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MANN. No.

Mr. HOWARD. Because I thought if it was intended to be done now, I would like a better attendance here.

Mr. MANN. That is not for now.

Mr. LEVER. It would enhance the value of this picture, it seems to me, if you would have it taken while the Agricultural Committee bill was on the floor.

Mr. MANN. The Clerk has never done anything of that kind without consulting both sides of the House, and I am asking now if anybody has any objection to it.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I will.

Mr. COX. Was not the same performance gone over in the Senate a year or two ago?

Mr. MANN. No; I think they had a mock session over there and took a moving picture of that mock session. There was decided objection made to it, and I think properly, possibly.

Mr. COX. I know I saw some rather drastic criticisms on what was done over there. I do not know just what it was. I doubt very much, Mr. Chairman, the wisdom and the propriety of this.

Mr. MANN. I have doubt about it myself, but I have come to the conclusion that I shall not object to it now.

Mr. COX. I shall object if it ever comes up in the way of a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; we would not do anything of that kind. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I want to make one observation in the discussion of this bureau. Here are 60 or 70 persons employed in this bureau at an expense of \$60,000, and this employment has been in force for two or three years according to the chairman, and from the discussion that has been had on this subject for the last 10 or 15 minutes it is very difficult for me to understand where there has been any benefit derived from it. If the purposes of the operation of this bill is to get out and make individual visits to farmers and gather information, of course every man knows here that when he gets the information from a farmer the information that is applicable to the next farmer depends upon local conditions and the environments of the next farmer, or the farmer he proposes to give it to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLINE. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the gentleman think the trouble with this particular bureau now is that it is not being conducted in a way that will benefit anybody, and ought it not to be if we would leave this appropriation here? I have no objection

to it at all, but, if we are to have it, does not the gentleman think we ought to have it so as to do the farmer some good?

Mr. CLINE. I will say to the gentleman that I am not objecting to the appropriation, but I want to see it made practicable. I want to see the bureau get something out of it that is practicable. The information so far is that there has not been a bulletin published from the information derived from anyone by this Bureau of Farm Management.

Mr. MADDEN. And the further information is disclosed in the discussion that men who are employed in the bureau have no knowledge of what will develop profitable farming; but, on the other hand, they are going around to the farmers and inquiring of them.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Indiana is falling into the error that a great many men fall into who try to understand the Department of Agriculture. [Laughter.] The department is primarily an investigational body.

Mr. CLINE. I understand the gentleman.

Mr. LEVER. And we are going out to get information. Now, the gentleman wants to issue a large number of bulletins before we have information on the subjects under inquiry. He claims that we ought to be issuing bulletins to the farmers of the country. As a matter of fact, this office, as I recall now, has issued some bulletins. I remember a bulletin issued about some hay-growing experiments in South Carolina. It did not occur to me awhile ago.

Mr. CLINE. I am not finding fault about that; but I do say that 60 men working in a bureau for three years and spending in the neighborhood of \$700,000 ought to give some evidence in results for the money that is paid out by this bureau.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana to strike out the last word. I think this is a very good provision in this bill. It seems to me that the department ought not to be criticized for not getting out bulletins as soon as gentlemen think they ought to do it. The fact that these men go out and consult farmers and get information from them seems to me to make their employment worth a great deal.

I remember in Illinois a few years ago, where they were holding farmers' institutes, as they do in every county of the State, a man who was lecturing was trying to inform the farmers of what was going on in their line, giving such information as he had, and he told me this story: That he used to lecture on clover, before they had information about these plants storing nitrogen in the ground, and tell the farmer how much good the clover did to the land; how the roots went down into the ground and made the ground mellow and improved it in that way. He said he used to go out in the field and dig up a bunch of the clover and soak the roots in water and shake the dirt off of them and exhibit them to those attending the farmers' institutes. He said that on one occasion he was giving this exhibition and some one in the audience asked him, "What are those little knots on the clover?" He said, "I do not know, but I suppose it must be a disease of the clover plant"; and he said that back in the audience was a Pennsylvania German who rose and said, "My father used to say that those knots on the clover are what did the land good." He said to me, you see, we were learning something since that time. The old Pennsylvania farmer probably could not give the scientific reason for it, but he believed that there was something about those knots that did improve the land.

Mr. COX. Was he a Government employee on a salary?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know about that. I am not going into that now. But it shows this, that even these Government employees may go out and get some information from the farmer, and I believe it is a good plan for them to do it. Then they get some ideas of the troubles and trials that the farmer has to contend with, and they are able to come directly in contact with the farmer, and I think that is a good thing.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I agree with the gentleman that they can get information from the farmers, but why employ men to go out and get information for the farmers when they have to get the information from the farmers? Why not employ the farmers at first hand?

Mr. FOSTER. That might be better.

Mr. COX. The farmer is not in the civil service.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt but that, coming in contact with these farmers, they get some very useful information from them. The farmer is not entirely void of information that he might be able to give the Government. I think his experience has taught him a great many things that he has not learned in a scientific way, but he knows those things, and any man who has lived in an agricultural community can call to mind many

very intelligent farmers in that community who have farmed in a scientific way, possibly without their knowing the scientific reason for it. But you can all realize that from the success they have had. They have done that themselves; they have studied it; they have not had any farmers' bulletins or scientific knowledge, but they were men of intelligence, and those men have been able to give information to these employees and those teaching agricultural subjects very important knowledge.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course they are men of intelligence.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the embarrassing position in which a Member of Congress, and particularly a member of the committee, is placed in pointing out things that may reflect upon the efficiency of the department. But, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that Congress has appropriated \$207,000,000 in the last 10 years for the support of the Department of Agriculture, and in view of the fact that appropriations have jumped from \$13,000,000, and now they are asking for \$30,000,000, it seems to me that a Member should at least have the courage to rise from his seat and point out to the people and to the Members of Congress what this money is being used for and what results are attained.

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

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why can they not get this same information from the farm demonstrators that the Government sends throughout the country? Would not that be a far more preferable method of getting this information?

Mr. HAUGEN. I have no quarrel with this branch of the department; but, Mr. Chairman, the department has been rather extravagant in its claims. It has pointed out certain achievements attained. We were told a few years ago by one of the department employees that they had ceased to give figures, because figures could not be found to describe the enormous magnitude of the achievements. We have been told, as the reason for the existence of this department, that four blades of grass now grow where only one or none grew before.

I have jotted down from the Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1914 some figures, and I find that the Government reports do not bear out the statements made by that department employee. I turn to page 126, and there I find that the yield of wheat from 1866 to 1875 was 11.9. In 1898 it went up to 15.3, and in 1914 to 16.6.

Here we come to the blades of grass. Hay, 1.50 short tons in 1908, dropped to 1.31 in 1913. Oats from 1866 to 1875 was 28.1. In 1897 it was 27.2. Rye was from 1866 to 1875, 13.6; in 1914, 16.8. Barley was from 1866 to 1875, 22.9; in 1900, 20.4; in 1914, 25.8. I find on page 113 that potatoes, exclusive of sweet potatoes, were 95.4 in 1907 and 90.4 in 1913. And so all along the line. The further we look the more discouraging it looks.

Now, Mr. Chairman, having failed in their effort to increase the yield, they come before this department and propose a remedy. Now, what warrants these appropriations? They tell us now that the trouble is in overproduction, the statistics of the Government show there has been no increase in yield. The only remedy proposed is simply to grow less. The distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REILLY] asked the question of Dr. Spillman, "What is the remedy?" He was then speaking of the overproduction of apples, and the reply was that the remedy is to grow fewer apples.

Here is what Mr. Spillman, Chief of the Office of Farm Management, had to say:

Mr. SPILLMAN. They are pretty nearly doing that.

The point I am making, gentlemen, is this: That to go out and teach the farmer how to grow 200 bushels of potatoes to the acre instead of 100 bushels does not solve the problem; to go out and teach him how to grow 50 bushels of corn to the acre where he is now growing 30 does not solve the problem. But that is the kind of teaching that most of us have been doing in the past, and I am as guilty as anybody. I have talked eloquently—as eloquently as I could—to get the farmer to grow more corn to the acre and to try to teach him how to grow two blades of grass where one grew before. But that does not solve the farmer's problem, gentlemen.

Temporarily there may be underproduction, but taking the average of a long series of years there is a permanent and unavoidable overproduction of apples.

Mr. REILLY. What is the remedy for that proposition?

Mr. SPILLMAN. To grow fewer apples.

Mr. BOOHER. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee how many employees there are in the Bureau of Farm Management? Are there any more than are given on page 10 of the report of the committee?

Mr. LEVER. This is just the statutory roll; yes. I can give the gentleman the information later by looking it up.

Mr. BOOHER. I do not care about that. How many farm inspectors are there—the men who go out and interview the farmers and get information of the farmers? How many of those are there who are engaged in this work.

Mr. LEVER. I could not tell that except by figuring it up. It is all set out in this Book of Estimates.

Mr. BOOHER. Is there a single one of these inspectors that has any practical knowledge of farming, or have they simply passed a civil-service examination and been appointed because there is a salary attached to the place?

Mr. LEVER. No; I think I may say very positively to the gentleman from Missouri that every man engaged in this work under this Office of Farm Management can be very well characterized as a farm student, a student of farm economics.

Mr. BOOHER. They are all appointed under the civil-service rules, are they not?

Mr. LEVER. They pass a kind of civil-service examination—not such as would be taken by an ordinary clerk.

Mr. BOOHER. Are they required to have a knowledge of farming?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes.

Mr. BOOHER. An expert knowledge of farming?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; they have to stand an examination that is in keeping with the position they seek. Practically all of these men are graduates of agricultural colleges.

Mr. McKELLAR. I would like to ask the chairman a question, if I may interrupt the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOOHER. Go ahead.

Mr. McKELLAR. How many farms have they investigated? This is a large appropriation. How many farms have been investigated by this bureau, and what are they doing?

Mr. LEVER. It is not so much a question of the number of farms they investigate, as of the number of communities and the farms therein.

Mr. McKELLAR. If they do not investigate a number of different farms in the different States of the Union, their mission wholly fails.

Mr. LEVER. I can not tell the gentleman how many farms they have investigated. They are making a general investigation of typical farms in different parts of the country.

Mr. COX. It is stated that they have investigated 600 in the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOOHER. There is not a State in the Union but has its farm organizations scattered all over it—granges, farmers' unions, and farmers' congresses. In my district for the last four years they have had a farmers' congress, attended very largely by farmers from Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, and Missouri. They are carrying on that work themselves. They get the best lecturers from amongst the best farmers whom they can get, and they remain in session sometimes for five days. It does seem to me you can get more information from a meeting of a county grange, and that a farmer who is interested in farm work and the improvement of farms can get more information by attending one of their own granges at the country school-house in one evening than he will get in a whole year from this farm-management business, conducted by the Department of Agriculture. The idea of going out and telling a farmer how he can make a success of cattle feeding is to me preposterous. A man who has had any experience in the business at all knows how he can do that. He has got to go to the stockyards and buy his cattle right. He has got to feed them right, and he has got to buy his corn right. If he does not, he will get himself in a hole every time.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. You bet your life.

Mr. HOWARD. It does not take an expert for them to know that.

Mr. BOOHER. No; it takes a little common sense mixed with good judgment of the business he is engaged in.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat surprised at the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] that a so-called governmental expert, out for the purpose of advising farmers as to farm management, knew nothing of the fertilizing qualities of nitrogen as gathered by the clover plant.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say he was a Government expert. I said he was a man traveling through the country lecturing to farmers' institutes.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. The fact that he is on the civil-service list is prima facie evidence against him, is it not?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say he was a governmental expert.

Mr. REAVIS. It seems to me that these experts are of the most value to the farming communities when they get first-hand information from the farmers themselves and disseminate that information to farmers generally. One of the finest examples of

a man quietly and modestly doing a great thing is furnished by a young Swiss farmer in my district, living about 30 miles from my home, Arnold Martin by name. He farms about 20 acres of land, and from the product of that 20 acres has sent his children through the State university in my State. A few years ago, upon a few acres of that land, he raised, so I am told, over a hundred bushels of corn to the acre. A governmental expert going to Pawnee County, in which Mr. Martin lives, was told of this young farmer and of his achievements, and he went to his home and learned that this young Swiss farmer furnishes the seed corn to the farmers living adjacent to him in order that his corn might not be polluted. I want to say to you further regarding his accomplishments that last year, from his farm exhibit, he took the first prize at the Iowa State fair, the Nebraska State fair, the Oklahoma State fair, and the Colorado State fair, and then showed his exhibit at the exposition in San Francisco and took the first prize there; and the representative of the Government of China, after viewing that exhibit, paid that young man a dollar an ear for his seed corn in order that he might plant it in China. [Applause.]

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REAVIS. Yes.

Mr. COX. Did he get any of that superior knowledge from any employee operating under this paragraph of the bill?

Mr. REAVIS. I am coming to that. As soon as the efficiency of that young man was learned of by the Government he was placed in this department that you now criticize and was sent across the country giving the farmers practical information as to how he himself managed that farm. [Applause.] He would be in that employment now were it not for the fact that his farm methods have become so celebrated in the Middle West that he is constantly employed before granges and farm institutes, and last year alone that young man earned a very large income from his exhibit prizes, his addresses, and the sales of his exhibits that he had raised on the 20-acre farm. I say to you that there is no man in America of more service to this Nation in the line of agriculture than that young Swiss farmer who has shown the farmers of this Nation what can be done on 20 acres of ground. [Applause.] I am glad indeed that I am privileged to place his name in the records of this Congress, for he has done much.

The Clerk read as follows:

For studying methods of clearing off "logged-off" lands with a view to their utilization for agricultural and dairying purposes; for their irrigation; for testing powders in clearing them; and for the utilization of by-products arising in the process of clearing; in cooperation with the States, companies, or individuals, or otherwise, \$5,000.

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

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask how long we are going to investigate powder for the purpose of blowing out stumps.

Mr. LEVER. The statement was made that this would be the last year of the appropriation; that they now want to assemble the facts and make up the report.

Mr. BOOHER. Have they given the country the information as to what kind of powder will blow a stump out the easiest?

Mr. LEVER. I presume they have; but the gentleman from Oregon is more familiar with that than I am.

Mr. BOOHER. I would like to ask him, then, if he or his people have got the stumps out?

Mr. HAWLEY. The purpose of this appropriation is to complete the investigation which the department has concluded and to work up the material and prepare it for publication and distribution.

Mr. BOOHER. This appropriation is not to blow out any more stumps, but to print the information they have got.

Mr. HAWLEY. There may be some investigation that they have not yet concluded, but the principal part of the money will be spent for publication and distribution of this information.

Mr. BOOHER. Has the gentleman any information as to when we will get this knowledge that the department has secured about the best powder to blow out stumps?

Mr. HAWLEY. During the coming year.

Mr. BOOHER. I have got some stumps that I want to blow out and I do not want to blow them out until I get the strongest powder. [Laughter.] Can the gentleman give me any information as to what would be the best powder?

Mr. MADDEN. I just heard the gentleman from Oregon say that the best way is to go to a dentist.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman from Missouri allow me?

Mr. BOOHER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOWARD. I can give the gentleman some information about the stump business. If it is a small stump, take a half a stick of dynamite and put under it.

Mr. BOOHER. What is a small stump?

Mr. HOWARD. Ten inches in diameter and down. The gentleman must have enough fuse attached to it so that he can get out of the way before the explosion takes place. If it is a big stump, put in a stick of dynamite on one side and one on the other and cut your fuse so both sticks will go off at the same time. It cost me, on an average, \$450 an acre to blow out a few stumps, so that when you get this information to the farmer he will not be able to blow his stumps out, and that is the way you are spending the money.

Mr. BOOHER. Every stump above 10 inches the gentleman calls a big stump.

Mr. HOWARD. Oh, no. Small, medium, and then it grows bigger and bigger until it gets to a large stump, and it then costs more and more to blow it out, and my nigger had to run faster and faster to get out of the way. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAWLEY. I will say that out in my country we do not call it a stump if it is only 10 inches through. We take those out with a corkscrew. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order and move to strike out the last word for the purpose of saying that I understand this is really a very important item, that it is quite necessary for the Government to make this investigation in order to take the stumps out of the Brazos and Trinity Rivers before the improvement. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

WEATHER BUREAU.

Salaries, Weather Bureau: One chief of bureau, \$6,000; 1 assistant chief of bureau, \$3,250; 1 chief clerk, \$2,500; 1 chief of division of stations and accounts, \$2,750; 1 chief of printing division, \$2,500; 3 chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; 8 clerks, class 4; 11 clerks, class 3; 23 clerks, class 2; 31 clerks, class 1; 22 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 10 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 foreman of printing, \$1,600; 1 lithographer, \$1,500; 3 lithographers, at \$1,200 each; 1 pressman, \$1,200; 1 printer or compositor, \$1,440; 5 printers or compositors, at \$1,350 each; 14 printers or compositors, at \$1,300 each; 6 printers or compositors, at \$1,080 each; 5 printers or compositors, at \$1,000 each; 4 folders and feeders, at \$720 each; 1 chief instrument maker, \$1,440; 3 instrument makers, at \$1,300 each; 1 instrument maker, \$1,200; 2 skilled mechanics, at \$1,200 each; 5 skilled mechanics, at \$1,000 each; 1 skilled mechanic, \$840; 1 skilled mechanic, \$720; 6 skilled artisans, at \$840 each; 1 engineer, \$1,300; 1 fireman and steam fitter, \$840; 4 firemen, at \$720 each; 1 captain of the watch, \$1,000; 1 electrician, \$1,200; 1 gardener, \$1,000; 4 repairmen, at \$840 each; 6 repairmen, at \$720 each; 4 watchmen, at \$720 each; 17 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$720 each; 6 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$660 each; 31 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$600 each; 88 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$480 each; 5 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$450 each; 37 messenger boys, at \$360 each; 1 charwoman, \$360; 3 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$337,060.

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

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I have a point of order pending, but I do not object to the gentleman proceeding.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, my object in moving to strike out the paragraph is to abolish the Weather Bureau. Does the gentleman from Illinois want to consider his point of order now?

Mr. MANN. No; I want to strike out a part of the paragraph.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, the Weather Bureau business has been growing up by leaps and bounds. I see they have a lot of new legislation at this time. I have been studying the weather business a long time and have been watching it. We have a man down in Georgia by the name of Snyder who lives in the district of my colleague, Mr. Wise. This man has been competing with the Weather Bureau in Atlanta, Ga., on prognostications. All he has got in the world that I know anything about, or anybody else, is that he goes into the woods and gets a sourwood stick that has a fork, and he makes his prognostications with that forked stick. The Weather Bureau is costing \$1,700,000 a year, and Snyder has given the Weather Bureau in Georgia cards and spades by his prognostications and is away in the lead. In other words, he hits it twice where they miss it three times. [Laughter.] That is about as near as anybody can get to it.

Now, let us take an ordinary, practical illustration of the efficiency of this bureau. They can get up here and talk to you about meteorological observations and the Caribbean Sea and one truck and another, but this Weather Bureau was inaugurated for the farmers, in my judgment, and for the shipping interests of the country. I remember here about three years ago one afternoon—and I reckon all of the older Members of Congress remember it—we were sitting in our usual calm, deliberate way of transacting the folks' business, and all at once a sort of tornado struck this town, and in a few minutes the wind was blowing so hard out here that it took four men to hold a blanket over a gimlet hole. It approached this town, blew down trees all over the city, unroofed houses, and killed some folks, blew down a building, and just for curiosity I went

off and searched the records and these great weather prognosticators and general managers of the weather situation sitting over here drawing—well, I see he has increased his salary this year from five to six thousand dollars in this bill—these great weather prognosticators did not let a soul on the face of this earth here in Washington know about this storm that was coming in order to give them time to get into a well or a cellar or a cyclone pit or run out to the tall timber. They let that storm just slip up on us here without any warning, and just suppose for an instant that that storm had caused the dome of this Capitol to fall, had blown it down, look at what this great Nation would have suffered by killing such men as were in this House at that time! It is appalling to just think of it. An irreparable injury would have been done.

The truth of the business is they do not know anything about it; it is all guesswork. They said to-day it would be cold to-night, and if I were a betting man, I would bet 40 cents to a burnt ginger cake that it will be warm.

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

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. What about that great celebrated weather prophet of the forked sourwood stick?

Mr. HOWARD. Why, he predicts two weeks ahead. He will tell you in April what is going to happen in May. Mr. Chairman, an economy of a million dollars can be brought about in this Weather Bureau, and I can tell you how it can be done. The Government of the United States ought to employ in all the principal cities of this country a \$1,200 clerk who knows the points of the compass.

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

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I have a point of order pending on this paragraph.

Mr. HOWARD. I just want five minutes more.

Mr. LEVER. Make it 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Does that affect the argument as to the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. It certainly would not. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from a very prominent citizen in my district, and he sent me one of these Weather Bureau cards of prognostication. It stated what the weather was going to be on that day in Atlanta, Ga., and I wish I had it here, so that I could show it to you. On a certain day about a week ago that card stated that it was going to be fair and warmer, and on that very day, when they had posted that card all over the country, we had snow in Atlanta, Ga., and the sun never shone for half a minute during the whole day and all of our fruit was killed. Yet we are spending \$1,777,000 in order to keep on the pay roll a lot of guessers. That is all they are—guessers. I know and you know that, for instance, if the wind is blowing from the northeast and it is freezing in New York right now, we can calculate the velocity of the wind, which can be done with a little bit of a machine—calculate the distance from New York to Washington—and any man that has as much sense as you can put in a thimble can predict that the barometer is going to fall in Washington. That is all it is, and that is all they are doing; and it is an absolute waste of the people's money.

Let us get to the real farmer. You will hear them say that the farmers get up and cover their garden truck, and all such things as that. I am talking about my district now, and there is not a farmer in my district that this appropriation helps, because when he gets the information of the day they prognosticate what is going to happen, that day has passed; and the truth of the business as to the efficiency of this bureau, so far as Georgia is concerned, is that it is of absolutely no benefit to the people. Why, I knew an old nigger named Uncle Lindsay Horton that my father owned and who lived with us for 30 years after the war, and Uncle Lindsay could go out and sort of turn his side to the wind and say, "Hit agwine to be rainin' befo' night," and I would put old Uncle Lindsay, if he were living, up against Chief Marvin or anybody else on guessing what the weather is going to be. It was instinct with him, and that is all it is with these fellows, and we are paying \$1,777,000 a year for that; and they have a whole lot of stuff in here about preparedness. He says you have got to keep this new bureau, which I suppose

the gentleman from Illinois has made a point of order against, because it is a matter of preparedness. Well, my conscience, how many sins are going to be committed in the name of preparedness?

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I will.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman point out how it can be made cheaper and more economical?

Mr. HOWARD. I will tell the gentleman what he can do. You can get one man who can read temperatures and barometers, and put in a chief as an ornament, if you like, and employ some men in the cities in different sections of the country and pay them \$1,200 a year and give them these orders: "When it is freezing in Indianapolis and the wind is blowing from the northwest, notify Cincinnati it is going to be cold." [Applause.] That is all it is necessary to do. Is not that plain enough, and is it not economical? Why do you want to spend \$1,777,000 of the people's money to perpetuate and increase this thing that we all know is clairvoyancy, a greater portion of it? Extension! I say, instead of increasing it we ought to decrease it. I am in favor of putting Snyder in charge here with his sourwood limb, because—

Mr. LEVER. I have not any doubt of that at all.

Mr. HOWARD. Because he is competing successfully against the bureau and beating them at their own game.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the conclusion the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] has just reached, to my mind, is the reason for his attack upon the Weather Bureau. I am satisfied the gentleman states the exact truth and states the exact animus of his attack when he says if he had his way about it he would put Snyder and his sourwood stick in charge of this bureau.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I do.

Mr. HOWARD. I said that based absolutely upon the question of efficiency, because Snyder is more efficient than Marvin.

Mr. LEVER. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the present Chief of the Weather Bureau, who has been in the service some 25 years and is regarded by the professional world as a great scientist along the line of that work, is more competent to manage this great bureau than the gentleman's constituent, whom I do not know, but who the gentleman himself admits makes his prognostications by use of a sourwood stick in his hand. Somehow it looks like clairvoyance with a vengeance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would not take up the time of the committee to defend this bureau except for the fact that for the past six or eight months there seems to have grown up in this country a systematic attack upon the present service, and that attack can find its animus in certain individuals and certain so-called scientists who say that they can predict what the weather is going to be three or four months in advance of its happening. I do not believe they can do it. The Weather Bureau says they can not do it, and I am inclined to think these attacks on this service come for that reason and for that alone.

Now, I want to call the attention of the committee to what happened in Galveston in 1915. They had the most severe tropical storm that ever struck that city. The Weather Bureau notified the people of Galveston six days in advance of the coming of that storm. Just 20 years from the day before that time another great storm visited Galveston. This bureau was not so well equipped then as it is now. In the storm of 1893 3,000 human lives were lost and a million dollars of property was destroyed, although the storm in intensity was not nearly so great as the storm of 1915, in which 300 people lost their lives.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I do.

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman knows the reason they did not do so was because the United States built a sea wall to protect them.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman does not know any such thing, and I desire to take the testimony of the people of Galveston rather than the unsupported testimony of the gentleman from Georgia. Now, let us see what they said about it. This is a letter under date of August 30, 1915:

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
Galveston, Tex., August 30, 1915.

HON. CHARLES F. MARVIN,
Chief of Weather Bureau, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the board of commissioners of the city of Galveston held August 26, 1915, it was unanimously adopted that the thanks of the board of commissioners and the citizens of Galveston be extended, through you, to Mr. W. P. Stewart, local weather fore-

caster, for the very valuable and untiring services rendered in giving warning to the people of Galveston and vicinity of the approach of the storm of August 16, 1915.

Yours, respectfully,

JNO. D. KELLEY,
City Secretary.

TWENTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY,
Galveston, Tex., August 30, 1915.

From: The Commanding Officer.

To: Mr. W. P. Stewart, weather observer, Galveston, Tex.

Subject: Assistance rendered during the storm; especially to the Twenty-eighth Infantry.

1. I believe that thousands of persons in and near Galveston owe their lives to you and your efforts to give them notice of the approach of the storm and of its changes after its arrival.

2. The Twenty-eighth Infantry is especially indebted to you, as it was through your courtesy to Lieut. Hardin, permitting him to remain at your office during the storm and enabling him to communicate to us information that resulted in timely efforts to save lives and protect property.

3. I wish to thank you for the whole regiment. I would say rather for everyone who came within your protection.

E. H. PLUMMER,
Colonel Twenty-eighth Infantry.

[From the Galveston Tribune, Aug. 31, 1915.]

THE WEATHER MAN.

When the time comes, and it is very near at hand, for remembering with gratitude those who lent their aid toward lessening the loss of life from the recent tropical hurricane, the fact should not be overlooked that probably hundreds of lives were saved through the persistent and insistent admonitions of Local Forecaster W. P. Stewart and his corps of assistants. Warning after warning was sent to the people living outside the protection of the sea wall and that the loss of life on the island west of the city was so small is to be attributed to the earnestness with which the people were implored to leave their exposed homes and seek safety on the higher ground of the city. Those who disregarded the warning paid for their temerity with their lives.

It has been recounted in thrilling lines how the Weather Bureau at this point displayed its warning signals, sent danger rockets high into the skies, used motorcycle messengers and telephone lines in an effort to impress the people with the imminence of their danger in remaining exposed to the force of the oncoming hurricane. No lines of duty were regarded in the anxiety of the office force to reach every danger-threatened individual, nor were long hours of service or physical weariness permitted to halt for a moment the work engaging the attention of the men who alone appeared to have any adequate conception of the destructive nature of the wind hurrying in this direction. Whether there shall follow official recognition or not, the splendid work done by the local corps of the Weather Bureau will ever remain a stirring picture in the minds of the people of Galveston and this vicinity. Their splendid service has earned them a warm place in the affections of the people.

Another consideration is that the good work of the local Weather Bureau could not have been accomplished but for the whole service. From August 10, the day on which the first report of the hurricane was received, until it struck the Gulf coast, the United States Weather Bureau kept track of the storm, and shipping and other interests were kept posted. It was a case of good work on the part of the bureau from start to finish.

We are prone to give slack consideration to those matters with which long intercourse have made us familiar. The true need of street car service was never felt so keenly as during the few days subsequent to the storm, when the people were compelled to walk long distances between their homes and places of business. The light of the kerosene lamp never appeared so dim as when brought into mental comparison with the incandescent bulb, now glowless. The luxury of a tub bath becomes a near necessity when the paucity of city water forbids the use of the fluid for other purposes than drinking and cooking. The weather service furnished by the United States Government has been with us for more than 40 years, but its real utility has never before been so brilliantly, so forcibly, impressed upon us as it was during the few days preceding the arrival on the Texas coast of the recent storm. If the national weather department has done nothing more in return for the money expended in its maintenance than the service rendered in connection with this latest storm, it has paid for itself a thousandfold, it has established its right to perpetuation, it has shown itself to be an important part of our material progress.

But in the remarkable achievement credited the Weather Bureau in connection with the recent storm or previous meteorological abnormalities, this governmental utility has not performed all the functions that called it into existence. The United States Weather Bureau was not created nor is it maintained solely for the purpose of warning the people of the possible visitation of a storm. That the Weather Bureau performs a very important service in holding down the high cost of living is not generally recognized, but the frost warnings, the advance advices of approaching rains, the continuation of extended periods of drought, intimated by this bureau, are all of value to the farmer, and advantage being taken of the advance knowledge thus imparted has saved many a crop; and thus, indirectly it may be, saved the farmer from loss and at the same time averted a dearth of foodstuffs, operating to keep down the market prices. Should one care to investigate the field of operation of the National Weather Bureau, it would be found that numerous indeed were the good offices rendered, and deeply are the people indebted to that department.

[From the San Antonio Express, Sunday morning, Aug. 29, 1915.]

TO THIS TRIO OF THE HEROES OF PEACE MANY GALVESTONIANS OWE THEIR LIVES—W. P. STEWART, I. R. TENNEHILL, AND J. W. GRIGER, OF ISLAND CITY'S WEATHER BUREAU, SPREAD BROADCAST WARNING OF HURRICANES COMING SO PEOPLE FLED TO HAVENS OF SAFETY.

After the news story writers of great events have had their inning, there is always some one to glean the aftermath. The greatest field for news gathering that has opened in Texas in the last 15 years was the West Indian hurricane which visited Galveston August 16 and 17.

When the waves had subsided and a fairly open way had been made to the stricken city, this writer was sent to harvest the aftermath. After being told by evidently well-meaning people that he was taking his life in his hands, and that he should carry a bottle of water and a package of crackers, as the city was famine stricken, your correspondent

was agreeably surprised to find nothing more formidable than a soldier on sentry duty at Texas City, who examined his pass and courteously allowed him to board the boat.

The havoc created by the great hurricane at Texas City was so great and the devastation of the country around about so complete, that it presents rather the appearance of a wilderness than of a wreck. The news story of the disaster at that point has been fully told, and in many cases profusely elaborated upon. As to the number of deaths resulting from the storm at any point in its path, there is a question in the minds of everyone at this time as to the accuracy of the reports. This is probably true in the case of the men who prepared the reports. One thing is certain, however, and that is that no man can look upon the track of the storm and not feel that it is a miracle that the list of deaths is not a hundred times greater.

Estimates of the loss of property were made early in the stories of the storm. It is easy to see that these estimates were based upon the things visible at a casual glance. The big things that were readily seen. This writer believes, after a reasonably careful look at the territory from Velasco to Port Arthur, that \$50,000,000 will not more than cover the property loss.

This estimate is based on the matter of figuring everything that has been lost, from the little express wagon that stood on the back gallery of some humble home to the crushing by the waves of the pavement of the wonderful sea-wall boulevard in the city of Galveston. From the driving far inland of some poor fisherman's tiny boat to the grinding of the keel of a great ocean liner as it grounded on the prairies at a point so far inland that \$100,000 or more will be required to float it again. From the wrecking of a sewing machine, with which some poor woman made her living, to the chaos that exists in the big oil-refining plant at Texas City, or the crushing of a mammoth dock at Galveston. From the washing out of a board culvert between a country home and the graded county road to the demolition of the great Galveston causeway.

THE BIG PORT.

All these extremes exist, and every kind and variety of damage that the human mind can conceive exists between the extremes. The loss of cattle, horses, and mules in the storm is almost incalculable, and its exact figures will probably never be known. As regards the particular communities their losses are their own, as regards the State of Texas the aggregate loss is hers, and to it is added the irreparable loss of having her seaport, her great gateway to the balance of the world, blocked for an indefinite period.

This latter statement is made advisedly, because it is a well-known fact that up to the 17th of the current month there was only one recognized port on the Texas Gulf coast, and that port was Galveston. Only recognized ports do business, and ports are not recognized in a day, nor are docking facilities produced in an hour.

There are other deep-water ports in embryo on the Texas Gulf coast. Some are a commercial joke, made for rate purposes only, while others (Port Aransas, for instance) that have deep water, good harbors, and are only waiting for recognition to prepare ample docking facilities. The commercial interests of the Southwest can not be justly accused of having put all their money into one pocket by backing Galveston. That city is and for many years to come will continue the greatest seaport on the Texas coast. Where the expenditure of such enormous sums of money are required for the enterprise, it is wonderful progress for a country to open one such port in a generation or two. Other ports on the Gulf coast will follow, and the disaster to Galveston will hasten their recognition.

No one man of intelligence pits his wisdom against that of an army of thinkers, but there are many men in Texas who have been asking for the past week why Galveston has been disposed from the hour the storm subsided and the first pioneer newspaper reporter succeeded in making the perilous trip into the city to treat the hurricane and its results as if the people of that city were directly responsible for it? As if, in fact, they were guilty of some crime that should be suppressed and kept from the world. Houston has followed the same policy. These two cities are two of the greatest in Texas, or anywhere else for that matter, when it comes to having a citizenship of live wires and good stayers. They have started many things, but no one would accuse them of having started a West Indian hurricane and tolling it across the cities they have expended millions in building.

THE BARRIER AGAINST DEATH.

In the city of Galveston there are two factions. One faction insists this is the greatest storm in history, and rejoices in the fact that the sea wall saved the city. The other insists that the storm was not so great as that of 1900. All the people of that city are of one mind in stating to the world that the damage to the city is comparatively trivial, and that a few weeks will see it back to normal. This, of course, is impossible, but no man with red blood in his veins can help loving the people of Galveston for making themselves believe it to be true and trying to convince the world that it is true.

The accepted estimates of the property loss in the storm of 1900 is \$17,000,000, in round numbers. Leaving all the balance of the storm area out of the reckoning at this time, and confining the matter to the city of Galveston alone, it is extremely doubtful if any man capable of performing the service would undertake to repair the present actual damage of the city for \$20,000,000. It is conservatively estimated that the damage to stocks of goods in the lower stories of wholesale and retail houses on the Strand and Market Street alone will reach \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000. The people of Galveston up to this time are so full of thankfulness that the death list was confined to less than a score in the city, as against ghastly, grisly thousands in the 1900 storm, that they have not yet taken account of property losses. Men who had weathered both storms told this writer that had it not been for the sea wall there would not be brick or shingle left on Galveston Island to-day.

SEAS ENVY MAN'S SUCCESS.

The damage to the docks at Galveston was surprisingly light. Only one pier was destroyed completely, and the damage to others is comparatively light. Many vessels were damaged, some sunk and lost, and others went aground, while yet others weathered the storm in safety. Approaching the docks, one wonders if there has really been a great storm, as the evidences of such a calamity are not apparent. All of the machinery of the shipping industry is practically intact, and, by way of prophecy, the shipping industry is all the future Galveston can hope to be.

Immediately upon landing and starting uptown, the tracks of the demon of the sea became evident. The buildings on Market and Strand are strong and were built to withstand the buffeting of the seas. They are not much damaged, but their stocks, the treasures

of their strongholds are in ruins. A little farther out, where the business section gives way to the lighter residence structures, the damage from the wind becomes apparent in wrecked roofs, broken houses, and heaps of debris.

Still, the ruin is not sufficient to warrant the belief in a story of a great storm. Not until the neighborhood of the sea wall is reached does one realize that "The seas turned green with envy at man's happiness and sought to drown the world."

A section of the city along the sea wall ranging in width from one to three blocks was battered into an unrecognizable mass of debris. All early reports of the calamity stated that all houses along the sea wall were gone. This was largely construed to mean the bath-houses and buildings outside the wall, but unfortunately that was not what was meant. A reliable citizen of Galveston said he was on the sea wall at 5 o'clock Monday evening, and the water at that time, the mean tidal height and not the breakers, was within 1 foot of the top of the seawall. From the damage done, indications are that at the height of the storm the tide was on a level with the top of the wall and the breakers went unobstructed into the city, crushing the houses as they came.

There are places where the seas tore up the heavy concrete pavement for a quarter of a mile or more and made the brick pavement of the boulevard look as if a giant plow had been run through it. Once the pavement was broken, the waves dug up the sand with which that part of the city had been filled in and carried it in fiendish glee up the streets, which it left a deposit ranging from 1 to 4 feet deep on the brick pavement of the principal thoroughfares of the city.

THE HEROES OF PEACE.

When one sees this and realizes the force with which this water, flying fairly in the face of the wind, struck the city and demolished hundreds of homes, he wonders how so few lives could have been lost.

There is an answer, but up to this time it has not been given in the public prints as fully and convincingly as it should have been. There was no one in these homes, except in the Galvez Hotel, which breasted the waves like a mountain of granite, yet did not come quite unscathed from the fray. The reason there was no one in these houses when the sea smashed them as so many eggshells is that three men had labored, and their labors had incited an army to deeds of bravery.

These three men were W. P. Stewart, local observer of the United States Weather Bureau, and his two assistants, I. R. Tannehill and J. W. Gieger.

For days the hurricane had been kept track of by the Government from the time it left the island of Dominica until it reached a position threateningly near the Texas coast. On Sunday morning warnings were sent out. By Sunday evening the hurricane signals were sent up, and the observers began working to warn all the coast of Texas. Up in their office at the top of the city, where the gods of the storm shrieked defiance at the inequity of man and threatened to tear the building in pieces and scatter it to the four winds of heaven, these three men labored 56 hours without sleep and with only the little food that some one thought to bring them from time to time. So great was the strain that they did not think how long they had been there, and when the storm passed they collapsed from fatigue. Had it not been for the insistent warning of these men and the heroic efforts of the strong men of the city under these warnings, the calamity of 1900 would have been repeated despite the sea wall.

WINDS SCREAM IN RAGE.

Not only did the grim monster of the deep stalk to the very doors of the city on the Gulf side and enter them to find their prey had escaped, but the same thing occurred on a larger scale on the bay side. For two days the sea, like a crafty general, had regiments, brigades, and divisions of white horse following one another at a furious pace from far out in the sea. As they approached the harbor they doffed their white caps as if paying obeisance to man's power, and then wound their sinuous, slimy way back through the channel into the bay, where they filled every nook and cove, and even marshaled their hosts far out upon the land that the sea had never claimed before in history.

Just when the mighty seas had broken into the doors of the city and finding the tenement empty and themselves despoiled of victory, another mighty cry went up. Far up in the clouds, at the top of the town, the little needle of the anemometer was writing another message. The wind was increasing from the northeast. It came on with a scream of rage and blew at a velocity ranging from 60 to 120 miles for six hours. As soon as the little needle began to write its message of warning the warning was sent to the people on the bay side of the city, and none too soon. As it was, many waded in water to their necks seeking safety in the great buildings in the heart of the city, and some lost their lives in the effort.

From this source came the greatest damage to the city. At the signal given by the whistling of the titanic winds, the pent-up hordes of waves came rushing from the bay, and, striking the unprotected bay front, demolished the light structures of the residence section and filled the downtown district with water to an average depth of 5 feet. That part of the residence city that fronted on the bay was composed chiefly of homes of the working class of people. Several blocks in width and reaching from the business district to the western limits of Galveston were swept away as a carefully wielded broom would remove the fallen leaves from a sidewalk. Further in toward the heavier and more substantial homes is a jagged line of wrecked houses that finally built into a breakwater that held the waves from crossing the island until the wind changed its course to the southeast, and in a measure relieved the pressure and saved the residence part of the town from annihilation.

THE SPIRIT OF GALVESTON.

While walking across this great swept section of sand this writer saw an old man standing looking at a broken sewing machine, a few cooking utensils, an old iron bed, and other scraps and fragments of household goods. Upon being accosted the man, who gave his name as James H. Siator, said, "This is what is left of my home." He gave the street and number of the place, but there was nothing in blocks of the place to indicate anything like a street line or that the land had ever been platted. It is true that none of these buildings were very valuable, but each represented a home of some sort, and in the aggregate represented much value.

This old man answered a question that has been asked many times since the storm, when people have asked if Galveston would be rebuilt. He looked at the ruin for a few moments and then said, "Yes; that's my home. I spent all I had building that cottage, and just as soon as the ground dries and I can get money to do it I shall build another in the same place."

That is the spirit of Galveston. Men who go down to the sea in ships constantly throw dice with fate. Galveston is a seafaring town,

and her people are thoroughly imbued with the spirit. Every broken piece of the pavement along the sea wall will be replaced; children will again play upon the great concrete seats that the angry waters hurled across the way in their fury. Thousands will bathe in the surf, and great ships will continue to come and go.

No people in America, save only those of the city of San Francisco, have developed such a spirit of determination as have the people of Galveston; and it remains to be seen whether the people of the Golden Gate will meet their second calamity with the determination and heroism with which Galveston has gone to work to rehabilitate the city.

To-day Galveston is stretched upon the beach licking her wounds, and before the sea water has been dried from her drenched mane this lion of the Texas coast is being attacked by the dogs of commercial prowess. Every port on the coast is offering aid to the stricken city and at the same time secretly hoping to profit by her misfortune. The great causeway, over which passed the produce of an empire to be sent to foreign countries and the imports from the uttermost corners of the earth, was destroyed. Much money and labor will be required to replace it. The most sanguine do not hope that this can be done soon. The railroads hope to have a trestle into the city soon, but Galveston as a port has outgrown single-track trestles. While she is repairing her damage other ports that have a mainland approach will fight for the supremacy. The honors lie between Texas City and Port Aransas. Texas City has been storm swept; Port Aransas has never been the victim of a storm in the history of tidal waves of great magnitude.

It can not seem wise to the commercial interests of the Southwest to have only one port on the Texas coast; and, whatever may be said, the recurrence of the same kind of a calamity within 15 years will put commerce to thinking of providing against the chance of having business tied up for want of shipping facilities.

It has been said, "The way to fame is like the way to heaven—through much tribulation." If that be true, then indeed should Galveston become a famous city.

GALVESTON'S HISTORY.

History says Galveston Bay and Island were discovered by Spanish explorers and were named in honor of Conde de Galvez, who happened to be governor of Louisiana at the time.

About the year 1817 Jean La Fitte, the Gulf pirate, who had a peculiar penchant for scuttling and sinking Spanish galleons after having put their crews to the knife or caused them to walk the plank, decided that Galveston Island would be a cozy spot for a base of operations. Accordingly he established a private town on the east end of the island, where the city of Galveston now stands. The citizenship was composed of marine highwaymen, and the pirate chieftan was supreme ruler. As a principality of pirates the town continued for something like three years. Being hard pressed by the United States ships of war on account of undue playfulness with an American vessel, La Fitte abandoned the island, and it was about 13 years before an effort was again made to build a town there. It is said that at one time the island was inhabited by a lone fisherman.

History is rather lacking in regard to the place until 1833, when President Burnet of the Republic of Texas, finding Santa Anna uncomfortably close on his trail with a force of Mexican "soldados," embarked his troops and took them down the bay to Galveston Island on a duck hunt. The republic had a navy, and about that time Galveston Island seems to have been its main base.

In 1836 Col. Michael B. Menard saw the island and liked it. He bought a league and a labor of land from the State for the munificent sum of \$50, and located his grant on the eastern end of the island. This was the foundation of the real city of Galveston. Col. Menard organized an association called the Galveston City Co. All of the land titles in the city are held under titles from that company. It is said the company still exists, but practically all the land has changed title since then.

Galveston County was organized in 1838, but was so far removed from the other part of the State, both on account of the bay that lay between it and the seafaring character of its people, that it was not represented in the councils of the State until the third Congress of the Republic of Texas was held at Houston in 1838. It appears that Houston was so close the people of the island thought it would not be a neighborly thing to fail to send a representative, so they sent one, Mosely Baker, as representative.

ALWAYS READY TO FIGHT.

It appears that the men of Galveston have always been willing when invited to a fight. The first regiment of Texas soldiers to join Gen. Taylor in the war between the United States and Mexico was composed of men from Galveston County.

The first railroad train run into Galveston across the bay in 1860. Prior to that time trains had been run from Harrisburg to Virginia Point and the balance of the journey made by boat. From that time until the jetties were completed in 1896 most of the ships were loaded in part by lighters, on account of the low water over the bar. Altogether something like \$10,000,000 have been spent on the jetties and other harbor improvements by the Federal Government, and at present the channel has a depth over the bar of about 26 feet at mean low tide.

The census of 1900 gave the city of Galveston a population of 38,000. In the great tidal wave of that year the loss of life was variously estimated at 6,000 to 10,000. The city had become so important as a seaport, and the people were so heroic in their efforts that the rehabilitation of the city was phenomenal. Their work during the 15 years between the 1900 storm and the storm of this year, which is said to have been by far the greater storm of the two, reduced the death loss from thousands to not more than 50 at most, and while the property values have increased many fold, have reduced the property loss to a figure said to be below that of 1900 loss.

J. E. GRINSTEAD.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing other resolutions from the citizens of Galveston on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Does the gentleman from Illinois make the point of order?

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether, debate having been limited, I can ask any question about it; otherwise I shall make the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I did not expect the limitation upon debate to do that.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order—I suppose that makes it in order—on one chief of bureau, at \$8,000.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order, and if the gentleman will let me offer an amendment, I will now do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: On page 5, line 8, "one chief of bureau, \$5,000," in lieu of the language in the bill at present.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 5, line 8, by striking out the words "one chief of bureau, \$5,000."

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. HOWARD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. What became of our amendment to strike out the whole paragraph? I did not withdraw it. I was advocating it vehemently over here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thought that the gentleman formally stated that he was going to offer an amendment. The Chair did not really understand—

Mr. HOWARD. Of course, if the House votes out this paragraph, as I know it will, the following paragraph will go out with it.

Mr. MANN. Let it have a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Chair will put the motion of the gentleman from Georgia to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. He made the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is going to put the motion of the gentleman from Georgia to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. HOWARD. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 1, yeas 51.

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Weather Bureau: For carrying into effect in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in the United States, in the West Indies, in the Panama Canal, the Caribbean Sea, and on adjacent coasts, in the Hawaiian Islands, in Bermuda, and in Alaska, the provisions of an act approved October 1, 1890, so far as they relate to the weather service transferred thereby to the Department of Agriculture, for the employment of professors of meteorology, district forecasters, local forecasters, meteorologists, section directors, observers, apprentices, operators, skilled mechanics, instrument makers, foremen, assistant foremen, proof readers, compositors, pressmen, lithographers, folders and feeders, repairmen, station agents, messengers, messenger boys, laborers, special observers, displaymen, and other necessary employees; for fuel, gas, electricity, freight and express charges, furniture, stationery, ice, dry goods, twine, mats, oils, paints, glass, lumber, hardware, and washing towels; for advertising; for purchase, subsistence and care of horses and vehicles, the purchase and repair of harness, for official purposes only; for instruments, shelters, apparatus, storm-warning towers and repairs thereto; for rent of offices; for repairs and improvements to existing buildings and care and preservation of grounds, including the construction of necessary outbuildings and sidewalks on public streets abutting Weather Bureau grounds; and the erection of temporary buildings for living quarters of observers; for official traveling expenses; for telephone rentals and for telegraphing, telephoning, and cabling reports and messages, rates to be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture by agreements with the companies performing the service; for the maintenance and repair of Weather Bureau telegraph, telephone, and cable lines; and for every other expenditure required for the establishment, equipment, and maintenance of meteorological offices and stations and for the issuing of weather forecasts and warnings of storms, cold waves, frosts, and heavy snows, the gauging and measuring of the flow of rivers and the issuing of river forecasts and warnings; for observations and reports relating to crops and for other necessary observations and reports, including cooperation with other bureaus of the Government and societies and institutions of learning for the dissemination of meteorological information, as follows:

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] what it is proposed to do in the Caribbean Sea more than is now being done?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, they have now in the Caribbean Sea about 11 or 12 stations from which they are getting daily reports as to the condition of the atmosphere. It is the purpose of the department and the purpose of the committee to give them sufficient appropriation to install about 12 other stations, which will not only enable them to have that many additional reports

but to have double daily reports from all the stations rather than daily reports from them. There seems to be a long stretch of territory, over 3,000 miles, in that tropical country in which they have only one station, and the distance is so great that a great many of the storm centers are lost. They do not come in contact with the weather observers.

Mr. MANN. Is it expected to put stations down along the Lesser Antilles on the one side in the Caribbean and Central America on the other side?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; that is the idea.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman know what would be the expense of those stations?

Mr. LEVER. The total expenditure for the Caribbean Sea work—the additional work that is carried in the bill—is \$30,000, not including the building at Panama. We felt that this was a very important matter, and discussed it last year, but we were not satisfied then that we ought to recommend it; but the more the committee has thought about it the more it regards this as being extremely important. They take it, of course, that the Caribbean Sea is going to be used in the future a great deal more than it has ever been used in the past, and we thought in the interest of shipping and navigation and commerce we ought to get as nearly as we can accurate reports of the conditions of the weather in that section.

Mr. MANN. I should doubt very much whether a knowledge of the weather there would be of any great value to steamships going through the Panama Canal. It might be, but I doubt it. The only weather that they fear when coming out of Panama this way is a norther, which happens once in two or three years perhaps. They do not have any difficulty in knowing when they are coming.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman, too, in addition to the service expected to be rendered to navigation it is thought by the committee that the commerce of the Gulf coast and the Atlantic coast can be greatly protected by having advance warnings of storms that may be set in that direction, just as in the case of Galveston.

Mr. MANN. Well, the Galveston case the gentleman cited he very much exaggerated—at least the people of Galveston did—at the request of the weather observer down there. Doubtless they did good work, and I do not criticize the Weather Bureau. I think it is a wonderful—

Mr. LEVER. It is a wonderful service.

Mr. MANN. I do, generally speaking, but I do not always so regard it.

Mr. LEVER. We remember the days when we have the colic, but we do not think of the days when we do not have the colic. That is the case with the Weather Bureau.

Mr. MANN. I know that every morning and every evening I look to see what the weather indications are, and I suppose that is unconscious proof that I do put some faith in it. If I did not, I would not take that trouble. However, that has nothing to do with this case. The Caribbean Sea, of course, does not extend all over the world. I have no doubt if you get information from South America or the islands along the eastern side of the Caribbean Sea it might help some, but it might help some also to get information from Africa and Asia. I do not know, and they probably do not know, how far we should go with this. The gentleman says "the committee," but, after all, that means the Weather Bureau.

Mr. LEVER. Of course the Weather Bureau recommended this last year. The committee disallowed it at that time, because they did not look into it, but they did look into it at this time and allowed it.

Mr. MANN. The trouble is that when we start into these experimental propositions we can not stop.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. REAVIS. I arise from the purpose of inquiring of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture why the policy of the Weather Bureau to supply information and prognostications with reference to the weather during the winter months has been discontinued? The Weather Bureau has had a policy of notifying the interior, at least, of weather prospects for a week in advance as an aid to shippers. That has been practically, if not entirely, stopped during the winter months, when it is needed the most. Can the gentleman tell why that policy has been adopted?

Mr. LEVER. I can not give the gentleman that information. I really did not know that was the custom in that section of the country.

Mr. REAVIS. It was brought to my attention by shippers of cattle and apples in Nebraska that they had been subjected to severe loss by the stoppage of these reports.

Mr. LEVER. About the best that the Weather Bureau can do in the way of accurate forecasts in advance is 24 hours, and I should think that if they have discontinued that practice it is because they have felt they could not make it an accurate matter.

Mr. REAVIS. They do not discontinue it in the summer months, when there is no great necessity for it, but they have discontinued it in the winter months, when we need it most.

Mr. LEVER. I shall be glad to go into that matter and get the information for the gentleman which he desires.

Mr. REAVIS. I would be glad if the gentleman would.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of a site and the erection of a building at Cape Henry, Va., to be constructed under the supervision of the Chief of the Weather Bureau, plans and specifications to be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, and for all necessary labor, materials, and expenses connected with this work, \$22,500.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I do not know; perhaps the building may be necessary, but I am at a loss to understand why this department should be given the right to come to this committee and get an appropriation for the purpose of erecting a building when you have a Committee on Public Buildings here which does that kind of work.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will say frankly to the gentleman from Indiana that without a doubt this item and the following item are subject to points of order. But it has been the custom for many years, ever since I have been a Member of Congress, I think, in matters of Weather Bureau buildings, to provide for them on the Agriculture appropriation bill, and to have them under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture. The committee thought that these two buildings were absolutely necessary. And, following the policy which we adopted some years ago, instead of covering this appropriation up in a lump fund, which we might have done, and which was done at one time, we set it out on the face of the bill so that the Members of the House might have accurate and detailed knowledge of the contents of the bill.

Now, if the gentleman will permit, at this time we have a Weather Bureau building at Cape Henry. It is a three-story, old, rickety, worn-out, wooden building. That building is located on property which belongs to another department of the Government.

Mr. COX. To the War Department?

Mr. LEVER. No; it belongs to the Lighthouse Service. That is a misstatement in the hearing. Now, in addition to that, we understand that the War Department is beginning certain improvements of its property down there, so that the present location of our Cape Henry building would not be suitable for the purposes for which it is now being used, and we desire to locate the new building at a site that will make it more useful in the performance of the function for which it is to be used.

Mr. COX. I do not want to do wrong or to injure the department, or to put it to any unnecessary trouble or expense, but if this building were to take its usual and ordinary course or channel by the Public Buildings Committee reporting the proposition here, would not the Department of Agriculture still have control of it, as it has now?

Mr. LEVER. That is probably true; but, of course, the gentleman understands that the probabilities are that there will be no public buildings bill at this Congress, and the committee regards this as in the nature of an emergency appropriation.

Mr. COX. That may be, but has the department already purchased a site, or contracted for one?

Mr. LEVER. No. The department has not purchased a site.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman know anything about what the site is going to cost?

Mr. LEVER. The department thinks, and the testimony before the committee is, that the site will not cost more than \$2,000.

Mr. COX. Does the committee believe that the site can be procured and the building constructed within the limit of this appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; the department estimated \$25,000 for each of these items. We called in Dr. Marvin and asked him if he could not cut these items down \$22,500 each, and after think-

ing it over for some time he said he thought it could be done if they would skim close to the surface.

Mr. COX. Then the gentleman believes, as the result of his investigation, that the site can be bought and the building constructed within this appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. I have no doubt of it. I know that Government buildings elsewhere have been erected at a cost of from \$12,000 to \$15,000.

Mr. COX. I have read the hearings in this case, and it seems to me they need the building. I am not going to make the point of order, after hearing the gentleman's explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana withdraws his point of order.

Mr. MANN. I renew the reservation of a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserves a point of order.

Mr. MANN. Is there not a large amount of land owned by the Government down there in connection with the lighthouse reservation and the new land for the Army?

Mr. LEVER. I understand that the Lighthouse Service has a reservation down there, and the War Department owns some property there; but my recollection is that a statement was made before our committee to the effect that it would probably be impossible to get a suitable site for this kind of building on the Government property.

Mr. MANN. What kind of building is it? You could not find a more suitable site for an office building, or for a country residence, or for a fort, or anything else, than right there on this cape.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will let me say what I was about to say I think I can convince him that this situation is a little different. The Weather Bureau station at Cape Henry is not only a Weather Bureau station in the ordinary sense of that word, but it is also a station which must be equipped for taking observations of ships as they come in, in aid of navigation, and they want as clear a lookout as possible so that they can take their instruments and put them up on the top floor of the building, a three-story building.

Mr. MANN. Why, Mr. Chairman, I have been at this point, both by land and by sea. Standing where I am in this Hall I can see anybody who comes in at the door. I do not have to be up in the top of the building to see anyone who comes in here. Now, nobody can get into that inlet without anybody on the ground seeing the vessel, for a long distance, just as far as he can see, to the horizon. That reason is pure folly.

Mr. LEVER. I have never been there myself, and of course I am taking the statement of Dr. Marvin.

Mr. MANN. I have been on the ground several times and I have come into the inlet on boats several times. That is perfectly plain. Now, the lighthouse reservation, as I remember it, is quite a large reservation. I think they have a new lighthouse there. They used to have an old one back there, if I remember correctly from my service on the committee dealing with lighthouses. I do not remember how much ground we have recently purchased, but we made an emergency appropriation last year or the year before for the purchase of quite a tract of land there for the forts.

Mr. LEVER. Let me read this statement, which I think the gentleman will find interesting.

The firing of heavy artillery in practice work would be detrimental to the delicate instruments used by the bureau, and would interfere with the conduct of its regular work. So therefore we want to get as far away as possible, etc.

Mr. MANN. I should think, if that is the case, they would want to get away from Cape Henry entirely, because we are going to put there one of the greatest forts on earth, probably with 16-inch guns, and there will be no sense in putting up such a building at Cape Henry, which, two or three years from now, will be out of use, because they will be practicing with those new 16-inch guns.

Mr. LEVER. Let me read further from Dr. Marvin's statement:

Furthermore, the requirements of the vessel reporting work, which is one of the most important activities of the Government, necessitates the location of the building close to the shore line, so as to command the most unobstructed view of the fairway of vessels. There seems to be no question of the necessity of the Cape Henry building being located outside of the fortification site.

Mr. MANN. Personally I can not see any excuse for the Cape Henry weather station at all. They have a weather station at Norfolk, or ought to have one.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman understands that this Cape Henry station is one of the termini of the telegraph lines going up to Norfolk, Cape Hatteras, and so on, in the interest of the service.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, they do not need to come up that way. I make the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. I concede it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the acquisition of a site and the erection of a building in the region of the Panama Canal, to be constructed under the supervision of the Chief of the Weather Bureau, plans and specifications to be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, and for all necessary labor, materials, and expenses connected with this work, \$22,500.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order.

Mr. MANN. What do they expect to do down there—buy a site?

Mr. LEVER. We asked Dr. Marvin about that. He was not sure, and I do not think I am sure myself, that they can get a suitable site within the zone, although if we own Ancon Hill it seems to me that would be a good site. The committee discussed confining the location of the site to the Canal Zone, but the Chief of the Weather Bureau said that he would like to get the most suitable site, and, while it was very likely possible that he would locate within the zone, he did not want to confine himself or tie himself up so that he had to do that if he found he could get a better site elsewhere.

Mr. MANN. I think he had better go down there and have somebody study the situation a little bit. Of course we own practically all the land in the zone, or are trying to acquire it, anyhow. I do not know where they might locate it. They might stick a weather station off in the wilderness there. It is a wilderness for quite a considerable distance on both sides of the zone. I have been up the rivers on both sides of the zone.

Mr. LEVER. My own thought would be that Ancon Hill or the hill opposite the Culebra Cut—Gold Hill—would be a good site.

Mr. MANN. The ground is sliding into the canal on each side of Gold Hill or Contractors Hill. Why do they need such an expensive building as this for the Weather Bureau? What is there about it?

Mr. LEVER. Of course they feel that they ought to build this out of substantial material and make it a building that is in keeping with the dignity of the Government.

Mr. MANN. The dignity of the Government is all right. They build concrete buildings in Panama now, in the zone, in the main. That is substantial enough construction.

Mr. LEVER. I take it that if they put up a good concrete building and equip it, it will cost pretty nearly that much money.

Mr. MANN. That will depend on how large a building they construct.

Mr. LEVER. They need a considerable building for the Weather Bureau station in that country, I think.

Mr. MANN. They have erected a very large number of pretty good concrete buildings there in the new town of Balboa.

Mr. LEVER. I have not been to Panama recently and do not know what material they are using for their buildings.

Mr. MANN. They are using concrete.

Mr. LEVER. This station, in addition to its own work, is to be a kind of central point for the gathering of weather information from all the outlying stations from which the Government gets its reports.

Mr. MANN. There are no outlying stations there.

Mr. LEVER. We get a good many reports from other nations than our own. They are cooperating.

Mr. MANN. They would not get them there. They would not send weather reports to Panama from other nations. They might be in communication with headquarters here.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, not only that, but I take it that they would gather communications from South and Central America. That is the statement of Dr. Marvin.

Mr. MANN. If they sent them to the United States, they would send them by wireless; they are completing an expensive wireless plant there.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman from South Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman from Illinois, is going to make the point of order, there is no use in consuming more time.

Mr. MANN. I thought we might inquire into it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the gentleman will allow me, I want to ask a question. Is there any weather bureau of any kind there now, any station of any sort?

Mr. LEVER. They have some reports from there, but we have no building.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is there any estimate in the hearings as to how much the building would cost?

Mr. LEVER. The appropriation is \$22,500. The department estimated an appropriation of \$25,000, to include the building and site, but the committee reduced the estimate to \$22,500.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the gentleman think it might be well to postpone it until we know exactly what we do want and what we are going to get?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that I do not want to postpone it, but I realize that the paragraph is subject to a point of order.

Mr. TOWNER. Is it not true that one of the principal uses that it is expected the Government will make of this plant is the reporting of seismic disturbances? Everyone understands that this is on the earthquake crevice or line in which the Pacific coast gets these earthquake disturbances, and they come from the south.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that that was not urged as a reason for the appropriation, but I think it is a strong reason. It is very important to study these earthquake conditions.

Mr. TOWNER. It is on the earthquake crevice of the Pacific coast, and it is directly within the province of the Department of Agriculture to make a study of seismic disturbances.

Mr. HAUGEN. I would like to inquire of the chairman what buildings on the island now are owned by the Government. That question was asked of the committee last year, and my recollection is that the department promised to furnish us with the information.

Mr. LEVER. We have received the information in the shape of a letter from the department. They say that while there are buildings down there that can be used, yet the department is not sure that the buildings will be suitable for this kind of work. That is the information we have.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, a large share of the buildings down there were where the lake now is. There is a little settlement opposite Gold Hill, but most of the buildings that were of any value have been moved over to Balboa Heights at a less expense for moving them than it would have been to construct new ones and abandon the old ones. I think practically all of the buildings that are of value and are available are still in use, but the most of the buildings have disappeared.

Mr. HAUGEN. I have understood that there was a large number of buildings in the vicinity of Culebra Cut that are now on high ground.

Mr. MANN. There were a lot right across from Gold Hill, but some of those are now down in the canal.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the item.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Weather Bureau, \$1,770,760.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the total appropriation ought to be corrected.

Mr. LEVER. I got consent at the beginning of the consideration of the bill that the Clerk should correct the totals.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Animal Industry: One chief of bureau, \$5,000; 1 chief clerk, \$2,500; 1 editor and compiler, \$2,250; 1 executive clerk, \$2,000; 1 executive clerk, \$1,920; 5 clerks, class 4; 1 clerk, \$1,680; 13 clerks, class 3; 2 clerks, at \$1,500 each; 23 clerks, class 2; 2 clerks, at \$1,350 each; 3 clerks, at \$1,320 each; 1 clerk, \$1,300; 1 clerk, \$1,260; 45 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk, \$1,100; 1 clerk, \$1,080; 56 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 2 clerks, at \$900 each; 94 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 architect, \$2,000; 1 illustrator, \$1,400; 1 laboratory helper, \$1,200; 2 laboratory helpers, at \$1,020 each; 1 laboratory helper, \$840; 1 laboratory helper, \$720; 2 laboratory helpers, at \$600 each; 1 laboratory helper, \$480; 1 instrument maker, \$1,200; 1 carpenter, \$1,140; 2 carpenters, at \$1,000 each; 2 messengers and custodians, at \$1,200 each; 1 skilled laborer, \$1,000; 32 skilled laborers, at \$900 each; 11 messengers, skilled laborers, or laborers, at \$840 each; 14 messengers, skilled laborers, or laborers, at \$720 each; 4 laborers, at \$600 each; 8 laborers, at \$600 each; 3 laborers, at \$540 each; 30 laborers, at \$480 each; 1 laborer, \$240; 3 messenger boys, at \$600 each; 9 messenger boys, at \$480 each; 8 messenger boys, at \$360 each; 1 watchman, \$720; 1 charwoman, \$600; 1 charwoman, \$540; 13 charwomen, at \$480 each; 5 charwomen, at \$360 each; 2 charwomen, at \$300 each; 5 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$398,470.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. We have provision here for a very large number of clerks. In the Bureau of Animal Industry at one place

there are 45 at \$1,100, 56 clerks at \$1,000, 94 clerks at \$900, and so forth. I wish the gentleman from South Carolina would explain how many of these clerks are acting as stenographers.

Mr. LEVER. I can not tell the gentleman offhand. It shows on the statutory roll.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know what proportion of them are stenographers?

Mr. LEVER. I do not. This is one of the largest bureaus in the Agricultural Department.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know it is.

Mr. LEVER. It expends in the neighborhood of \$5,500,000. It has the meat-inspection bureau, which has a permanent appropriation of \$3,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I may get the information I want under some other paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that the statutory rolls to which he has referred will show the character of the work the various clerks are doing. As to the scientific force of the bureau, if we had time they are all set out in great detail in the Book of Estimates.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not questioning the work done by these clerks, but I would like to know how many are engaged in stenographic work, because I want to inquire as to the reason of their being so employed. Can the gentleman tell me whether any clerks in the Bureau of Animal Industry assigned as stenographers are engaged in taking notes of what Members of Congress say when they have business with the bureau?

Mr. LEVER. I think I know what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has reference to, and if he will permit me, I will say that this is the wrong tree. I will say this, that if a stenographer is doing that, unless he is ordered to do it by his chief he would be culpable and guilty of misconduct. If his chief ordered him to do it his chief would be guilty of misconduct, and I would not hesitate any more than the gentleman from Pennsylvania to condemn that practice.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I appreciate what the gentleman says and I will reserve what I have to say for another paragraph. I entirely indorse the statement of the gentleman from South Carolina as to the clerks themselves. I would not find fault with any clerk for doing what he is ordered to do.

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But if the head of a department authorizes a stenographer to take notes of the statements made by Senators and Representatives who have business with the bureau in the ordinary course of business, then it is a practice that seems to be reprehensible, and about which I intend to comment when we arrive at the proper paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. I agree with the gentleman very thoroughly, and he can not condemn it any more than I can.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry: For carrying out the provisions of the act approved May 29, 1884, establishing a Bureau of Animal Industry, and the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1891, providing for the safe transport and humane treatment of export cattle from the United States to foreign countries, and for other purposes; the act approved August 30, 1890, providing for the importation of animals into the United States, and for other purposes; and the provisions of the act of May 9, 1902, extending the inspection of meats to process butter, and providing for the inspection of factories, marking of packages, etc.; and the provisions of the act approved February 2, 1903, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to more effectively suppress and prevent the spread of contagious and infectious diseases of live stock, and for other purposes; and also the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1905, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain quarantine districts, to permit and regulate the movement of cattle and other live stock therefrom, and for other purposes; and for carrying out the provisions of the act of June 29, 1906, entitled "An act to prevent cruelty to animals while in transit by railroad or other means of transportation"; and for carrying out the provisions of the act approved March 4, 1913, regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or shipment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous products manufactured in the United States, and the importation of such products intended for use in the treatment of domestic animals; and to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and disseminate information concerning live stock, dairy, and other animal products; to prepare and disseminate reports on animal industry; to employ and pay from the appropriation herein made as many persons in the city of Washington or elsewhere as he may deem necessary; to purchase in the open market samples of all tuberculin, serums, antitoxins, or analogous products, of foreign or domestic manufacture, which are sold in the United States, for the detection, prevention, treatment, or cure of diseases of domestic animals, to test the same, and to disseminate the results of said tests in such manner as he may deem best; to purchase and destroy diseased or exposed animals or quarantine the same whenever in his judgment essential to prevent the spread of pleuropneumonia, tuberculosis, or other diseases of animals from one State to another, as follows:

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a letter from Col. Rodman, of the State of North Carolina, with reference to the Navy League.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee with reference to the enforcement of the quarantine law. Does the Federal Government undertake to regulate the shipment of live stock from one State to another?

Mr. LEVER. It does under the law; yes.

Mr. STERLING. Why is it, if the Federal Government has jurisdiction of that question, that the quarantine laws of the several States control? Some of the States have quarantine laws that prevent the importation of live stock from other States, under certain conditions.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING] is a much greater lawyer than I could ever hope to be, and he knows that the quarantine regulations which the Federal Government imposes refer only to interstate shipment of live stock?

Mr. STERLING. Certainly.

Mr. LEVER. The Federal Government would have no power to go within any State and set up a quarantine district. That would have to be left to the State.

Mr. STERLING. I understand that, and that is the question I want to raise. For instance, one State prevents shipments of breeding stock from another under the quarantine law of that State. Why does the Federal Government permit that regulation of interstate commerce by one State as against another?

Mr. ANDERSON. But that is not a regulation of interstate commerce.

Mr. STERLING. It certainly is.

Mr. LEVER. If I get the gentleman's question correctly, it is this: That he complains that one State exercises the right to quarantine itself against another State. I am not a lawyer, but I take it that such a State exercises that right under its police power to prevent the importation into it of dangerous diseases and things of that kind, and that it has the right to do so under the Federal Constitution.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. Chairman, I understand the State has authority to pass laws of that kind and enforce them until the Federal Government has seen fit to take jurisdiction of the matter; but when the Federal Government has taken jurisdiction, or has assumed authority over a matter of interstate commerce, the laws of the State which undertakes to regulate it in any way become void. If I understand correctly, the Federal quarantine law gives the Federal Government the power and the Federal Government assumes the right to establish quarantine, and when it does so no State has any authority to prohibit the importation of live stock from another State. If I am right about that, it seems to me that the department—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. STERLING. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is on the committee that used to have jurisdiction of these matters, and has undoubtedly looked that up. Does the gentleman think that if the Federal Government should provide that a man with the smallpox could travel from Indianapolis to Chicago that that would force the State of Illinois to admit smallpox into the city of Chicago or into the State?

Mr. STERLING. If the Federal Government should make quarantine laws controlling a matter of that kind, then the laws of the State would have to give way to the Federal law with reference to it.

Mr. MANN. That would permit the Federal Government, if it desired, to send contagious diseases into a State against the protest of that State.

Mr. STERLING. Does the gentleman think the Government would do that? Let us not assume that the Federal Government would seek to harm its citizens.

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that his colleague may have five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter which may draw out a very lengthy debate, and I am going to ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Oh, this is a very important question in relation to these diseases.

Mr. MADDEN. Has this anything to do with the foot-and-mouth disease?

Mr. LEVER. No. I was about to suggest to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that the foot-and-mouth disease item is the very last item in the bill, and I assume, when that item is reached, that there will be opportunity for full discussion of this entire question, and that is why I make the sugges-

tion; and if my friend from Illinois [Mr. STERLING] would be willing to wait until we get to that item, I say to him very frankly that all gentlemen will have reasonable time to discuss it.

Mr. STERLING. I think this is the proper place to discuss this question.

Mr. LEVER. No; this is the general authority for all quarantine work, but the item in which the gentleman is particularly interested will be found on the very last page of the bill, and I think we will make time by holding fire until then.

Mr. STERLING. I trust I may have my time now. I may have something else to say when we reach that part of the bill.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes; the gentleman will have that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that the time of his colleague [Mr. STERLING] may be extended for five minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. Chairman, what I have to say on the subject relates to live-stock quarantine. The question propounded by my colleague [Mr. MANN] relates to diseases of human beings, but if the Congress should pass a law giving authority to quarantine in case of smallpox or any other disease, that law is supreme and exclusive so far as it relates to interstate commerce. If it only related to the public health, that would be a different question and controlled by a different principle. When the Federal Government raises a quarantine on live-stock disease, then that live stock ought to be allowed to go into any State of the Union, and the State law ought to give way.

When the Federal Government has assumed authority over a thing affecting interstate trade no other authority can prevail. For instance, in Illinois the foot-and-mouth disease prevailed for a time and the Federal Government imposed a quarantine to protect other States. As it from time to time raised the quarantine the stock in that territory was released and it should have been permitted to go anywhere; yet the States continued to discriminate against live stock shipped to those States from the territory where the quarantine had been raised. Now, I think no one will deny that when the Federal Government assumes jurisdiction over any matter relating to interstate commerce then the laws of the States must give way, and they have no right or authority to regulate it in any way. If any one question is made clear in the Constitution it is that the Federal Government shall have supreme and exclusive control over interstate commerce. It takes away from the States the right to levy imposts and gives it to the Federal Government. It gives to the Federal Government the exclusive right to regulate interstate commerce, intending thereby that interstate commerce between the States should be absolutely free, or at least giving the Federal Government the power to make it absolutely free if it sees fit to do so, and to prevent the several States from embarrassing commerce from one State to another. But the point I desire to make is this: I believe this bureau ought to see to it that where a quarantine has been raised in the territory in any State all of the States of the Union shall recognize that fact and give the people of that district the right to free trade between the States.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STERLING. I yield.

Mr. REAVIS. I take it for granted that the gentleman is familiar with the ruling of the United States Supreme Court on both the coining of money and the fixing of the standards of weights and measures wherein the court determined in each case that the States had the right to coin money or the right to fix the standards of weights and measures until the Government, acting under its constitutional authority, assumed jurisdiction, and upon the Government acting the jurisdiction so assumed became exclusive.

Mr. STERLING. I think that is exactly correct. As another illustration of that principle, prior to the adoption by Congress of the employers' liability law, the law as to personal injuries in the States controlled, whether those injuries occurred in interstate commerce or intrastate commerce, but when Congress passed that law the laws of all the States relating to that subject, so far as they affected injuries that occurred in interstate commerce, had to give way and the Federal statute became the law of the land. There ought to be but one quarantine law in this country affecting interstate shipments, and that law should be in the Federal statutes, not the State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement I made awhile ago that all of these questions will be debated further when we reach the item, I ask unanimous consent that

all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I should like to have a little time on this question of quarantine.

Mr. LEVER. How much, five minutes?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. CULLOP. I should like to have two minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will say close in 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer an amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING] desires to offer an amendment, and I will make it 17 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 17 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the chairman, I would like to make an inquiry in reference to these words:

And to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to collect—

Mr. LEVER. Where is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. CULLOP. Line 2, page 12:

And to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and disseminate information concerning live stock, dairy, and other animal products.

I assume that also refers to the treatment under the clause just preceding that. Now I would like to ask the chairman if in the treatment of hog cholera the chief has gathered his statistics as the result of the treatment and made them public?

Mr. LEVER. He has gathered the statistics and they have been printed in the committee hearing.

Mr. CULLOP. But they have not been made available in any document out of the office for circulation?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague Mr. RUBEY, who has had charge of this matter.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will find the information in the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and also partially treated in the report of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. CULLOP. Well, I regard that as a most important matter for circularizing the public with from my observation of the success that has attended one of the agents of the Government who had charge of one of the plants or experimental stations.

Mr. LEVER. I am very glad indeed to hear the gentleman testify to the good work. I think the chief will be in a position shortly to issue some publications, but I imagine he does not desire to do so until he has pretty thorough knowledge in regard to it.

Mr. CULLOP. I hope they will make it available as early as possible, as I regard it as an important matter.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] if he can tell the House whether there is a quarantine now existing against carcasses coming from foreign countries?

Mr. LEVER. There is no quarantine that I know of against carcasses coming from other countries, but, as I understand it, carcasses are permitted to be imported into this country only from countries which have a national system of inspection which the officials of this country deem to be sufficient.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. My attention has been called to one or two peculiar phases of the foot-and-mouth-disease law, which I will bring up at the proper time. They involve the matter of the destruction of cattle after they reach the abattoir, rather an interesting question in view of the fact that it has been held that the owners of such cattle can not participate in the distribution of funds as in the case of cattle taken on the farm. Under the law, however, we admit cattle free, cattle on the hoof coming in from foreign countries, although a quarantine has been established against such cattle. This, to a certain extent, protects the western cattle, although the quarantine against live stock does not seem to prevail as against the carcasses.

Mr. LEVER. Of course, the gentleman has just stated that we do have this inspection against the live stock.

Mr. HAUGEN. Let me say to the gentleman that we also quarantine against cattle imported from tick-infested countries.

Mr. LEVER. I will read:

Under inspection and quarantine of imported animals are included inspections of animals from North American countries and countries other than North America, inspection and testing of animals in Great Britain intended for shipment to the United States, and supervision over importations of hay, forage, hides, hair, wool, and other animal by-products.

The purpose of such inspection and quarantine is to prevent the importation of animal diseases into this country.

Of course, we have a Mexican-border inspection against cattle tick.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not want to take any political advantage of the situation, but it is rather fortunate, in view of the fact that we indulge in free trade in cattle as well as in meat, that the department should be in a position to establish a quarantine against live stock coming into this country. That rather saves the political face of the administration. But I have not, as I say, intended to take advantage of that fact just now. It is a matter of very great importance to the consumer that the department, which is active in the matter of the quarantine against live stock, should be no less active in a quarantine against carcasses coming in from such a country as the Argentine Republic, where the foot-and-mouth disease exists.

I have some information on this subject which is appropriate at this time, and I think the House ought to have it, particularly those of our colleagues who come from the interior of the United States and who are interested in live stock which comes to the eastern markets and enters into the export trade. This communication states:

We have been unable to secure from the department in Washington or any other source positive information on this subject, but it is generally understood and admitted that the foot-and-mouth disease is very prevalent in that country (the Argentine), and that while live stock is, under the tariff laws, admitted free of duty, the importation to the United States is prohibited under a quarantine embargo placed on account of the prevalence of foot-and-mouth disease, while the dressed meat from this same country is allowed free entry and during the past two years has been imported in large quantities.

Now, our western cattle raisers ought to be alive to this situation. It affects us in the cities, where we have to eat the meat. We ought to know whether it comes from cattle that may have died from the foot-and-mouth disease in a foreign country.

Mr. McARTHUR. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question, if he will be so kind. In the enforcement of the quarantine provision, the general carrying on of this rule in the Bureau of Animal Industry, does that bureau recognize tuberculin health certificates issued by the health authorities of a State?

Mr. LEVER. I think they do consider such certificates satisfactory.

Mr. McARTHUR. In connection with the point made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING], I will say that a number of the Western States have adopted rules, through their live-stock sanitary boards, prohibiting the importation of dairy stock from certain States in the Middle West. This is done because it is well known that the law has not been well enforced there. People out in the far West that have been buying dairy stock from a good many sections of the Middle West and East have found that the tuberculin-test certificates which accompany these cattle were, in many instances, bogus and fraudulent. I do not wish to make any reflection upon any particular State in this matter, because a lot of them come within the same classification—

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

Mr. McARTHUR. Yes.

Mr. STERLING. I know that in some States they require certificates before they will admit stock imported from a State veterinarian in that State. That produces a very great hardship on a person that is shipping from one State into another.

Mr. McARTHUR. In the State into which the stock is being shipped?

Mr. STERLING. Yes. They would be relieved very much, it seems to me, if the Federal Government had charge of that whole thing. And when a Federal Government veterinarian issued a certificate to the man who was shipping the stock, that ought to be good anywhere, so that he could send the stock anywhere in the United States.

Mr. McARTHUR. I quite agree with the gentleman on that point. I believe this entire matter ought to be handled by the Bureau of Animal Industry rather than by the State veterinarians in the various States, because in a great many States the work of investigating for tuberculosis is carried on by deputy veterinarians, many of whom are incompetent.

If this whole thing could be transplanted to the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Animal Industry in the Department of Agriculture, I do not think you would find any of those Western States rising up and putting a quarantine against stock im-

ported from any other State. What we want to see in my part of the country is the putting of this whole question under the Federal Government, so that the matter will not be hampered by the State veterinary surgeons or deputies in any State whatever.

Mr. LEVER. Of course, the gentleman understands that the bureau is acting under an act of Congress that was passed many years ago?

Mr. McARTHUR. I understand that, and I am in hearty sympathy with the work of the bureau. I do not think the appropriations for the bureau are sufficient, so as to carry on this work as it ought to be carried on. I am sorry that the appropriations are not larger.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. King] desire to be recognized?

Mr. KING. No; I do not desire to offer an amendment at this time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For inspection and quarantine work, including all necessary expenses for the eradication of scabies in sheep and cattle, the inspection of southern cattle, the supervision of the transportation of live stock and the inspection of vessels, the execution of the 28-hour law, the inspection and quarantine of imported animals, including the establishment and maintenance of quarantine stations and the alteration of buildings thereon; the inspection work relative to the existence of contagious diseases, and the tuberculin and mallein testing of animals, \$532,780.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, if I can have the attention of the chairman of the committee, I would like to make of him an inquiry with reference to the experiments in treating the foot-and-mouth disease. Has the department been able to find out some remedy by which it could handle this disease successfully?

Mr. LEVER. Our Department of Agriculture has always taken the position that it could not afford to undertake to find a remedy for the foot-and-mouth disease. It has contended that the disease was so entirely contagious that to undertake to study it through the observation of animals affected would result in its dissemination, and therefore they have not, upon their own motion, attempted any such effort as that.

The department has had the results of the experience of the German Government, which has made a very extensive study of this disease, and which maintains a station on some island far removed from the mainland, on the sea somewhere.

Mr. CULLOP. I would like to ask the chairman if there has been a return of the disease in this country during the winter just passed?

Mr. LEVER. The quarantine against the foot-and-mouth disease was not lifted until within the last three weeks, when Christian County, Ill., was finally released from quarantine, and the disease in this country has disappeared.

Mr. CULLOP. Does the Government pretend to treat this disease in any way, or does it simply try to confine it in the territory where it appears?

Mr. LEVER. The Government policy is to quarantine and eradicate the disease by killing and burning or burying infected animals.

Mr. CULLOP. That is the only way it handles it or undertakes to treat it?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that the foot-and-mouth disease has been abroad in this country for the last 25 years?

Mr. LEVER. I do not so understand. There have been about six outbreaks of the foot-and-mouth disease in this country, the first occurring back in the seventies.

Mr. BOOHER. Is it not a fact that this is the same kind of foot-and-mouth disease that affects sheep?

Mr. LEVER. The foot-and-mouth disease does attack sheep.

Mr. CULLOP. And hogs.

Mr. BOOHER. Does not the western farmer and sheep raiser treat the foot-and-mouth disease successfully, and has he not done it right along in the last 25 years?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know that that is true, but if it is it has not reached the knowledge of the experts of the bureau, or the department does not follow that treatment.

Mr. BOOHER. That is the trouble. As I understand it, the foot-and-mouth disease among sheep is treated by the sheep owner gathering his flock up and putting all those free from the disease out on a range by themselves, and those in which he

discovers any symptoms of the disease he puts in a separate flock and treats them for two or three weeks and cures them, absolutely. They do not slaughter the sheep. They do not go out and indiscriminately kill a man's flock of sheep, but they cure it. It seems to me it would pay the experts in foot-and-mouth disease bureau in the Department of Agriculture to try the remedy that is used by the sheepmen of the West. If they have not heard of it, it is time they did hear of it and put their knowledge of it into effect.

Mr. CULLOP. From the qualified success they have had in Indiana I am satisfied that they ought to avail of the knowledge and experience of the sheep raisers to whom the gentleman from Missouri refers.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that while I do not know the condition in the Western States with reference to the prevalence or the existence of the foot-and-mouth disease in sheep, I think it likely that the disease to which the gentleman refers is not in fact the true foot-and-mouth disease. I recall a disease called "stomatitis," which is closely akin to the foot-and-mouth disease; so much so, that it takes the most highly trained expert to tell the difference between the two.

Mr. BOOHER. Let me say to the chairman of the committee that some years ago I happened to be at the Department of Agriculture, and I was shown there some samples of the foot-and-mouth disease in sheep. The head of the bureau said to me that it was a disease easily cured. During this past summer I had the pleasure of talking with one of the largest sheep owners in this country who had had the foot-and-mouth disease among his sheep, and he told me it would be nonsensical to slaughter these animals indiscriminately; that with a certain kind of wash that he used it was easy to cure.

Mr. LEVER. Of course the gentleman knows that the foot-and-mouth disease can be cured, but the effect of the disease, if it became generally spread over this country, upon the livestock industry would result in such tremendous loss that the officials of the department feel it is better to spend money out of the Treasury and kill a few hundred cattle and bury them and get rid of the disease in that way than to take the risk of the loss that would come to the beef and cattle and sheep and hog industry if the disease should become general throughout the country.

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

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

Mr. BOOHER. No; I do not yield to anybody just yet.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri declines to yield.

Mr. BOOHER. The foot-and-mouth disease is no more destructive than hog cholera. Is not that the most contagious disease amongst animals?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman knows I am not an expert on that subject; and if the gentleman says it is, I will take his statement for it.

Mr. BOOHER. I understand, but I am trying to get information. Does the gentleman know of any instance in which the Agricultural Department has gone out and indiscriminately slaughtered all the hogs in the community?

Mr. LEVER. No. Let me again say that this whole item of the foot-and-mouth disease is carried on the last page of the bill, and I am very anxious that the discussion of it should center around that item. I will say very frankly to my friend that I have collected a great deal of information on that item, which I have not here with me. It is in my office, and if gentlemen of the committee will wait until we reach that item we can have a more intelligent discussion of it; and I promise a full opportunity for all to be heard, and we will gain time by it.

Mr. BOOHER. I will withdraw the request for additional time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I move to strike out the last word. In view of the statement I made a little while ago of the importation of meat from the Argentine Republic, I would like to ask the gentleman whether there is any information before the committee as to the effect of the foot-and-mouth disease on the carcass, whether it carries into the meat and whether it is prejudicial to the health of those who eat it?

Mr. LEVER. I probably have that information in my data on the foot-and-mouth disease, but I have not got it with me this afternoon.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has some information on that?

Mr. LEVER. I am inclined to think I have.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Let me say for the information of the gentleman that in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee some time ago, with reference to the importation

of meat into the city of New York, it was stated by an expert, a lady who had a good deal of information on the subject, that there was a State inspection of imported meat, but we had very little information as to whether the meat was so diseased as to be prejudicial to the public health.

Mr. LEVER. I will be glad to give the gentleman information on that at the proper time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the meat that comes in free—I am not stating this for the purpose of starting a political discussion—if the meat derived from an animal in the Argentine Republic that has foot-and-mouth disease comes into our ports and is sold to the people here, it has a very great advantage over western beef, that is subject to all sorts of American inspection. I hope the gentleman will inform us as to that.

Mr. KING. With the permission of the distinguished chairman, I will answer the gentleman.

Mr. LEVER. I will be glad if the gentleman will do so.

Mr. KING. Dr. Melvin takes the position that the foot-and-mouth germ does go into dressed beef, and he says there was a case where 900 cattle were shipped from Peoria, Ill., after the quarantine was put on, and went to the Union Stock Yards in Chicago, over 150 of which cattle were suffering from the foot-and-mouth disease, and that they went into the packing house of Philip Morris & Co., where they were slaughtered, and the meat was sent out through the country, probably some of it reaching Philadelphia, and, according to Dr. Melvin, the foot-and-mouth germ was transmitted in that dressed beef. Whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania got any of it I do not know.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is an important statement. I commend it to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], because I think we ought to have more information on it. There is a quarantine against cattle on the hoof coming into the United States, but, apparently, there is no quarantine against the carcass coming into the United States after the animal is slaughtered.

Mr. LEVER. I shall be glad to give the gentleman the information when we reach that item.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. FLOOD having taken the Chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

On April 11, 1916:

H. R. 8468. An act to relieve J. Lawrence Latham, postmaster at Eupora, Webster County, Miss., of the payment of cash and funds stolen from the post office;

H. R. 13769. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to supply tents for temporary use of the sufferers from the recent conflagration in Paris, Tex., and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy, at West Point, René W. Pintó y Wentworth, a citizen of Cuba;

S. 585. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians against the United States;

S. 922. An act for the relief of Mary E. Nicolson;

S. 1809. An act to create an additional judge in the district of New Jersey;

S. 3391. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of Indians occupying railroad lands in Arizona, New Mexico, or California," approved March 4, 1914;

S. 3977. An act to authorize the Shamokin, Sunbury & Lewisburg Railroad Co., its lessees, successors, and assigns, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the borough of Sunbury, Northumberland County, Pa., to Monroe Township, Snyder County, Pa.;

S. 3978. An act to authorize the Catawissa Railroad Co., its lessees, successors, and assigns to construct a bridge across the West Branch of the Susquehanna River from the borough of Milton, Northumberland County, Pa., to the borough of West Milton, Union County, Pa.;

S. 4190. An act authorizing the Yankton County Bridge Co., a corporation, to construct and maintain a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at a point between Yankton County, S. Dak., and Cedar County, Nebr.; and

S. 4671. An act to exempt from cancellation certain desert-land entries in Riverside County, Cal.

April 12, 1916:

S. 707. An act for the relief of Beverly E. Whitehead.

April 13, 1916:

S. 5016. An act to authorize the reconstruction of an existing bridge across the Wabash River, at Silverwood, in the State of Indiana.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for the eradication of southern cattle ticks, \$632,400, of which sum \$50,000 may be used for live-stock demonstration work, in cooperation with the States Relations Service, in areas freed of ticks, and of this amount no part shall be used in the purchase of animals for breeding purposes: *Provided, however*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in the purchase of materials for or in the construction of dipping vats upon land not owned solely by the United States, except at fairs or expositions where the Department of Agriculture makes exhibits or demonstrations; nor shall any part of this appropriation be used in the purchase of materials or mixtures for use in dipping vats except in experimental or demonstration work carried on by the officials or agents of the Bureau of Animal Industry: *And provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated by this paragraph \$75,000 shall be immediately available.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a speech delivered by Hon. CARTER GLASS, of Virginia, at the Jefferson banquet held in this city last night.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a speech delivered by Hon. CARTER GLASS at the Willard Hotel last night. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, who is going to ask to have the other speeches printed?

Mr. GARRETT. I do not know.

Mr. MANN. I take it that either in this body or the Senate some one will ask to have the President's speech printed, in which he called the Republican Party provincial. It would be a good deal of a joke to make a request in this House to print a speech of the President in which he said that the Republicans were provincial. I shall not object to this request.

Mr. KELLEY. Reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Tennessee what has become of the recent speeches of the President that were going to be printed as a document?

Mr. MANN. They have been printed. They have just come out.

Mr. FOSTER. They were printed as a document some time ago.

Mr. MANN. No; very recently.

Mr. FOSTER. A couple of weeks ago, at least.

Mr. MANN. I got them on my table two or three days ago, and I get these things as soon as they are printed.

Mr. GARRETT. Is there to be any objection, I will withdraw the request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has reserved a point of order against the paragraph from lines 3 to 19, inclusive. If the gentleman will permit me to anticipate him, I suspect that his point of order goes to the last two lines.

Mr. MANN. In reference to the deficiency appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. I am going to move to strike out that proviso. When the committee put it in the bill it was thought that the bill might become a law very much sooner than now appears likely. I think the proviso is not necessary now, because the probabilities are that this bill will not become a law before the last of May or the first of June, and, if the gentleman will permit me, I will move to strike out those lines.

Mr. MANN. And reduce the amount?

Mr. LEVER. No; not reduce the amount, because they can very well use the money, anyhow.

Mr. MANN. I should think if they put in \$75,000 for this year, which they are not going to use, they ought to be willing to take the ordinary increase for next year. I have no objection to making such appropriations as this division can properly use, because they are doing exceedingly good work.

Mr. LEVER. Let me say to the gentleman that the proviso was not in the original estimates of the department sent to the committee.

Mr. MANN. I understand that.

Mr. LEVER. But the Secretary later called attention in a letter to the desirability of having this \$75,000 available for use in preparation for the wise expenditure of the appropriation

provided for in the item, and the committee, acting upon that request, gave that amount.

Mr. MANN. I am calling this to the attention of the House partly for the purpose of informing the Secretary. The Secretary ought to know that the proper way to get a deficiency appropriation is by making an estimate which goes to the Committee on Appropriations.

We have already passed three deficiency appropriation bills. They might have had this item in one of those, had the money, and had it partly spent by this time, if they knew enough to follow the regular procedure. It is in the hope that they will learn that I am making these few remarks. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEVER. I am glad that the gentleman is doing it, because I think it will unload my bill in the future. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, on page 13, line 17, after the colon, the following:

And provided further, That of the total amount appropriated by this paragraph \$75,000 shall be immediately available.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 13, line 17, after the word "industry," strike out the rest of the paragraph.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to say that I am in thorough sympathy, as is the gentleman from Illinois, with the work that they are doing; but I want to ask, Has the chairman of the committee any idea or estimate of when this work will be completed?

Mr. LEVER. I am glad the gentleman from Indiana has asked the question. We provide in the appropriation for the eradication of the cattle tick an increase of \$194,000 in round numbers. The amount provided is \$632,400, of which \$50,000 is to be used for another purpose. The States cooperate with the Federal Government in this work and have appropriated during the past year about \$950,000, and it is the estimate of the department that with this appropriation and with the States continuing to cooperate, as they are doing now, this work ought to be completed in six or seven years.

Mr. COX. I wish the gentleman would explain how the \$50,000 item is expended.

Mr. LEVER. I shall be glad to do that. When an area is cleared of tick, it is the hope and purpose of the department to go in with special men and stimulate the live-stock industry. I think I can best illustrate the method and character of this work by reading a telegram as to what is being done in South Carolina, in counties which have been freed of the cattle tick. Within the last two or three weeks we have begun to establish central creameries for the manufacture of butter. Men go out and collect the cream from the farms and bring it to the creamery, and the individual is credited with a certain amount. We have established four such creameries in South Carolina. They have made a wonderful progress and are doing a great work. The action of the Department of Agriculture is to supervise it in cooperation with the States Relations Service. Here is a telegram which I received from Dr. Long:

CLEMSON COLLEGE, S. C., April 3, 1916.

Hon. A. F. LEVER, Washington, D. C.:

Four creameries organized in South Carolina within last 12 months—one at Rockhill, Spartanburg, Darlington, Clemson College. Clemson College creamery is now receiving cream from 900 cows; has paid out in last year to farmers over \$40,000. Darlington creamery, just started three months ago, receiving cream from 550 cows; has paid out in last two months \$5,000 to farmers for cream. The four creameries will pay out \$250,000 to the farmers within the next 12 months. All butter manufactured under the State brand, known as the Palmetto State, and marketed through one agency, who has agreed to give 1 cent per pound over the market for output of all creameries. He gives bond to protect the payments for butter. Haven't exact figures on the Spartanburg and Rockhill creameries. Patrons at Clemson creamery, 246; Darlington, 139.

W. W. LONG.

Now, that is one type of work they are doing in the tick-free area. Another type of work is this: In the last year we have been feeding cattle in certain counties in the State under the direction of men stationed there. We have established three or four stock sale yards. We had a sale a few days ago at Rockhill. These cattle are fed under the direction of the department, and people take their stock there and buyers come from other States to purchase the cattle. Probably there will be 500 or 1,000 steers marketed on a sales day. It is the first time in the history of this country that the seller of the article and the buyer of the article, in this case cattle, are brought together before the cattle are moved from possession of the individual who owns them. They are going to undertake to establish some cheese factories in the mountain districts of South Carolina and North Carolina, in the tick-free area. The statement before the committee is that they have established two or three in North Carolina, and they have done remarkably well.

They have one at Cove Creek, up in North Carolina, and the report is that the milk would not have brought the farmers more than \$300 without the factory, but that they have received for the cheese more than \$1,500, and that a large part was clear gain. That is in the mountain country, where the farmers can not get their products to market on account of the bad roads. They have gone there and established a few demonstration cheese factories, and the testimony before the committee is to the effect that the work in the mountain sections has been an inspiration.

Mr. COX. It looks to me as if they were doing a good work.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina how establishing a creamery affects the reduction of the cattle tick.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman has not read the paragraph.

Mr. DILLON. I understood that that was the question of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. COX. This relates to the country after the tick has gone.

Mr. LEVER. Fifty thousand dollars of this appropriation is to be used in the character of work that I have described, and the balance is for the eradication of the tick.

Mr. DILLON. Can the gentleman tell the committee what is being done in the elimination of the cattle tick. The item has been in the bill a great many years, and I would like to know when it is to be completed.

Mr. LEVER. I answered that question a few moments ago. Since the work has been begun an area containing more than 4,000,000 cattle has been relieved from quarantine. The total area still under quarantine is 453,761 square miles, 274,780 square miles having been freed of ticks and released. During the past year 49,639 square miles were freed and released. So that since the work began we have freed about 30 per cent of the area, leaving about 60 per cent yet to be completed.

Mr. DILLON. When this work was first commenced there was a quarantine that took in the entire section?

Mr. LEVER. There is still such a quarantine except where it has been lifted by this work.

Mr. DILLON. And through the process of work you have eliminated portions of the section?

Mr. LEVER. Exactly. The gentleman understands, of course, that the existence of a quarantine against these cattle reduces the market value of the cattle anywhere from \$3 to \$6 a head on each steer sold?

Mr. COX. That is, it will lower their price?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Is that confined to the Southern States?

Mr. LEVER. This applies to the Southern States entirely. The tick can not live in the Northern States.

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

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. I want to ask the gentleman what is meant by this States "relation service"? Does the State put up a like amount with the Government in this work?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman understands that we have a bureau in the department known as the States relation service, which does demonstration work, which is contributed to both by the Federal and the State Governments. The work under this \$50,000 appropriation is done in cooperation with that service.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the State put up a like amount—\$50,000?

Mr. LEVER. The States will put up next year more money for this entire work than the Federal Government will appropriate.

Mr. BOOHER. Individuals build a creamery, and then the Government goes down there and spends \$50,000 in the creamery and cheese-making establishments in order to make a profitable business out of it for the owners of the concern?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no.

Mr. BOOHER. Does the department get any part of the profits?

Mr. LEVER. Of course not; and they ought not to have any part of them.

Mr. BOOHER. Does the gentleman think they ought to go down there and do the work and spend \$50,000 for the benefit of individuals or corporations?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman knows that we are spending in this bill millions and millions of dollars for doing just this sort of thing, namely, to teach the people, and that is what this item is for. The Government, of course, does not establish a creamery, it does not furnish the horse and wagon, it does not furnish the milk cans and the like of that. All it does is to go into a community and organize the farmers to do this work themselves.

Mr. BOOHER. They have dairy building companies, cheese building companies, all over the country that do that. They go out and construct a building and instruct the farmers how to sell their milk and how to make cheese and butter.

Mr. LEVER. That is probably true, but there might be a situation in the gentleman's State like this: Somebody might discover that you could grow cotton of certain kind in the gentleman's district.

Mr. BOOHER. They do raise a good deal of cotton in the lower part of Missouri.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; but it might be found that they could grow a certain kind in the gentleman's district, but that it would take a good deal of teaching and encouraging to get the people to go into the cotton-raising business, and that is the situation in reference to this work.

Mr. BOOHER. In other words, it is to encourage the people to sell their cream and milk for cheese and butter?

Mr. LEVER. That is right. It is teaching the better method to the farmers.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 7, strike out the word "for" and the words "breeding purposes" in line 8.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, my reason for offering this amendment is that in a similar provision made in this bill a year or two ago—

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I am willing to accept that amendment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I wish to say only a word about it, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The provision contained those words, and the officials in the department, while obeying the letter of the law, abused the spirit of it. They went out and bought animals for every purpose in the world except for breeding purposes.

I have not been in favor of this provision relating to the \$50,000. I can understand very well how the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] should ask the questions he has, and I appreciate the fact that he was not satisfied with the answers given by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]. All the work that is contemplated, all the work that is to be done, all that has been done with this kind of appropriation, is the simplest, commonest kind of work that can be done by anybody without any instruction or assistance whatever, and if any assistance were needed it is ready at hand in those very communities and in that very part of the country, from the county agents employed there in almost every county, to pay whom the Federal Government has expended millions of dollars and for their payment in the future appropriations have been provided carrying millions of dollars. In my humble judgment there is no need whatever for the employment of these men. It seems to me absolutely ridiculous to send one man into a county to assist farmers in the ordinary farm work, which should be the preparation of their soil, the selection of their seed, the cultivation of their crops, the harvesting of the crops, and so on, and it is ridiculous to send a man into that county to teach a man how to buy a bull or how to breed and get young stock or how to feed his cows—things that an ordinary farmer ought to know.

If he does not know it, there is the county agent, paid out of Federal money, who can tell him, and if the agent is not competent to give this simple information he ought to be discharged. This is just a sample, Mr. Chairman, of the manner in which the Federal money is spent, for this, that, and the other particular work, doing things for the farmers that they ought to do and are abundantly able to do for themselves.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Would the gentleman do away with all of this demonstration work?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. No; I think that much of this demonstration work is very valuable, indeed; but when Federal money has been provided for the employment of an expert agent to go into the county he ought to know enough to tell the farmers there how to feed a bunch of cattle.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then, what is it the gentleman would dispense with? I did not quite understand.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I would continue—of course we must continue—the appropriation under the Lever Act, a law prepared

by and the passage of which was secured by the very able gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, a law which when it matures will provide \$4,580,000 a year, and all but \$480,000 of that must be duplicated by the States before the States can receive a dollar from the Federal Treasury, or nearly if not quite \$9,000,000 annually.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. May I proceed for five minutes more in order to answer questions?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has submitted an amended unanimous-consent proposition; that is, that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto end in 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

Mr. COX. I understood the gentleman to say a moment ago that part of this \$50,000 had been expended to buy all kinds of animals, except for breeding purposes. Now, how has it been expended in the way of buying animals? What has been purchased with it?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I said money similarly appropriated. I do not know how the money has been spent in the matter of buying animals in this tick-eradication area, but there was a similar appropriation made to assist the farmers in the State of Louisiana, where the sugar-cane industry was ruined by the Underwood tariff law, and a large amount of money was appropriated to send agents down there to teach the farmers something about farming, and the provision was put in the bill that no part of the money should be used for buying animals for breeding purposes, but they used a lot of that money for buying animals for other purposes. They did not violate the law; none of it was used to buy animals for breeding purposes, but such use was in violation of the spirit of the law.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman know whether or not any part of this fund has been so expended?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do not know, but I know it has been in the hands of the people who violated the spirit of the other law, and my amendment was offered for the purpose—

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman's purpose is to prevent the absolute purchase of any animals?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Let the agents, if they must, go down there. If we must send one man to teach them how to put in oats and another how to put in wheat and another how to take cream to a creamery and another how to breed animals, and so on, let us provide the money and send the men down there for all those things. That is ridiculous enough, but it seems to me we ought to stop at buying animals for them to raise and experiment on. If I could have my way, I would strike out all of that; but I have told this story before and the House would not strike it out. I made my effort in the committee, and the committee refused to strike it out, and I am simply telling my story again and calling attention to a few words I think may possibly lead to misuse of money if they remain. I hope the amendment I have offered will be adopted.

Mr. KING and Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I shall probably vote for this item, because it has been carefully thought out by the committee; but the remarks made by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] induce me to make this comment upon the item: It seems to be in the nature of those discussed the other day during the consideration of the river and harbor bill, which were denominated by some of our brethren of the House as of the "pork-barrel" variety. Here we have an item which proposes to dedicate to the farmer for the eradication of the cattle tick \$632,400 at one fell swoop, a very large and imposing sum of money, for improving the health and comfort of the cattle of the land.

Now we ought to do all we can to make the cattle more comfortable than they are. We ought to do a little more than we do, perhaps, toward the employment of experts and extra clerks and traveling agents of the Government to find out and record just where the tick strikes the cow, and just why it is that the cow kicks. All this we ought to know, and we ought to know it and understand it to a scientific nicety, even if it does cost \$632,400.

Mr. McARTHUR. Does not the gentleman know that the cattle tick is a very serious disease and has caused widespread loss in many sections of the country?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I assume that. And so is the mosquito a very great annoyance to the human animal, but we have never been able to get a dollar in this bill for the eradication of the mosquito. It prevails to just as alarming an extent as does the cattle tick, and its influence is far more widespread both as to cattle and to human beings.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, who raised this interesting question.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman has forgotten that one of the reasons given by the engineers for the improvement of the Cold Spring Inlet in New Jersey was that the mosquitoes would be eradicated.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That may be, and still—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And if that was put in the river and harbor bill for killing the mosquitoes, there ought to be no kick on this.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that whereas we spent \$50,000,000 for improving the rivers and harbors and removing the mosquitoes of Michigan, we have not spent anything for the eradication of the mosquito along the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman? I have something important to say.

The CHAIRMAN. Two minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is complaining about \$632,000 for the eradication of the cattle tick. Does the gentleman remember that is only about one-fourth of the gold that this House has provided for gargling the mouth of the Delaware creek in the river and harbor bill?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Bread cast upon the waters will return manifold, and every dollar—

Mr. SLOAN. I do not think there will be any room in the Delaware River after you get all that appropriation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. One dollar spent on the Delaware River means \$20 returned in revenue. But, gentlemen, while you spend \$632,400 for the elimination of the cattle tick that is so annoying to the herd, let me call to the attention of the House the fact that that abominable rivers and harbors bill that was so cut up and caricatured the other day, to save some money for the cattle tick and other things, appropriated for Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island—all of New England—about one-half for all their rivers and harbors, that we are now appropriating for the eradication of the cattle tick. It is a most interesting commentary upon the wise deliberation and the fair and discriminating judgment of this House, that when it comes to the importance of the rivers and harbors of New England, carrying 50,000,000 tons of commerce, we can give them a total of \$385,000 only; but when we take up the important subject of the eradication of the southern cattle tick we find it easy to appropriate \$632,400.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have no more time.

Mr. SULLOWAY. I notice you have not. What you said about New Hampshire is not so.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. New Hampshire is a part of New England, but New Hampshire did not receive consideration in the rivers and harbors bill; that is right.

Mr. KING. I would like to make an inquiry of the chairman of the committee. Of course, I know nothing about the subject of the cattle tick, but I do know a little about the question of the foot-and-mouth disease. I saw that in the city of Chicago during the epidemic the packers maintained two alleys there, one known as "free alley" and one as "quarantine alley," and every animal that came from a restricted area, even though there was no disease covering the whole area, and even though that animal was just as good as one coming across the line, the packers put it in quarantine alley and bid it in for 20 per cent less than animals coming from another county.

Mr. LEVER. At six or ten dollars a head.

Mr. KING. At six to ten dollars a head. Does the gentleman know whether a cattle-tick area, or alley, is maintained by the packers in the city of Chicago or not?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know that to be a fact. I do know this to be a fact, however, that every animal coming from a tick-infested area is set off in pens labeled "quarantine."

Mr. KING. And if an animal has only been infected with cattle tick a little while and happens to get into quarantine, is

he worth less for meat purposes and hides, and does he not get into the same refrigerator, and is he not sold to a consumer for the same price as a well animal?

Mr. LEVER. It may be true, but it actually costs, in the working out of that system you have in Chicago, \$6 to \$10 a head.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee is voting under a misapprehension. I am perfectly willing for the amendment to be adopted, to strike out the words "for breeding purposes."

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has already acted upon it, and that action will stand, unless the gentleman wants to ask unanimous consent to return to it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I have made my remarks; I think it ought to be stricken out; but if the House thinks otherwise, let it go.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for investigations and experiments in dairy industry, cooperative investigations of the dairy industry in the various States, inspection of renovated-butter factories and markets, \$272,470.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. POUL. I make this motion, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to have published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interview with the Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, published in the New York World of Sunday, March 26.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an interview with the Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, published in the New York World. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do this, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture a question with reference to this paragraph that he was speaking of a short time ago, concerning experiments with creameries. Is that to be done with the money appropriated under the previous paragraph or under the money appropriated by this paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. The work I spoke of a moment ago would be done with the money appropriated under the previous paragraph. The work under the item that the gentleman is now referring to would be pursued where the tick is not prevalent, anywhere in the United States.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman mean to say that the money appropriated by this previous paragraph is used in establishing and promoting dairies?

Mr. LEVER. No. I meant to say what I did say a moment ago, if the gentleman was listening.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will say to the gentleman that I was listening. The gentleman was talking about the establishment of dairies and creameries.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that I was saying that only as an illustration of the character of the work being done under the item above in the encouragement and promotion of live-stock growing in those areas from which the tick had been eradicated. They do other work. They encourage the growing of hogs and of horses and of other kinds of live stock. I used that creamery work as a pat illustration.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I understand the gentleman now. But in the connection in which he used it before I misunderstood him.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Now, I want to go a little further in reference to this paragraph. Under this paragraph, are investigations carried on like those with reference to dairying and creameries, referred to a short time ago?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know as to dairying, except as I have seen notices of it in the newspapers; but the work under this item is to encourage the dairy industry in the United States and to promote it as much as possible; and in connection with their work, of course, they study the conditions of the creameries and the dairies throughout the country. Now, whether or

not this report to which the gentleman refers was made under this particular item, I confess I am unable to say.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. My question was asked simply with a view to a further inquiry, and that was whether the gentleman could inform me as to how extensive this investigation was. This report, as the gentleman will remember, made a very serious attack against conditions prevailing in our creameries.

Mr. LEVER. I recall it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Alleging that the conditions were very insanitary, and that the manner of carrying on the dairies was very insanitary, and that the milk that was conveyed to the creameries was in such a condition that it was likely to spread disease.

Mr. LEVER. As I recall, the newspaper statements referred to were made six or eight years ago?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am not able to state accurately.

Mr. LEVER. It is safe to say, without refreshing my memory on it, that there has not been made in recent years any very comprehensive investigation of the dairy industry of this country with a view to getting the facts which are alleged in this report.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then the gentleman will agree with me that that report does not fairly represent the conditions prevailing in the various creameries, as a rule, at the present time?

Mr. LEVER. I am not familiar with that report, but I do not hesitate to say this, that I do not believe that any report emanating from any bureau of the Government should attack a great industry unless that department has been especially authorized to make a specific investigation with a view of developing a certain line of facts. Now, I imagine that the report to which the gentleman refers was made incidentally to something else and not as the main purpose of the investigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes further.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I quite agree with the gentleman. I objected seriously to this report, because I thought it did not reflect the true conditions.

Mr. LEVER. May I say also to the gentleman that if we are to have an investigation of the dairy industry—and I do not know whether we ought to have one or not, because I have not looked into it—I feel that we should select from the greatest experts on the subject in this country men who will be especially charged with making an investigation. I do not believe that an investigation of that tremendous scope and importance to an industry ought to be carried on by any single bureau of this Government.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I agree with the gentleman there also. And I will say in that connection that I have received a number of petitions based on this report asking that a comprehensive investigation be made of the dairying and creamery industries. I come from a district which has a large number of cooperative creameries in it. I know that the report which I have referred to does not fairly represent the conditions that prevail with reference to those creameries, and such a report is very injurious to a very important industry.

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

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. KING. Has the gentleman any information as to whether or not that report was made in the interest of the packing industry or the slaughtering industry?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not know that it was, but I have a strong suspicion.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is easily buncoed.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will refer to the hearing the other day before the Committee on Rules he will find that the attorney that appeared before that committee let the cat out of the bag and showed clearly that the investigation was made at the instigation of the packing industry of the country.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is about what I anticipated would be discovered. The packing interests are connected very closely with the great central creameries that collect their cream from a long distance; and that, as I believe, is mainly responsible for the bad condition of any butter or cream that gets to market, because it is carried so far, without any sanitary precautions, that it naturally becomes fermented or injured in hot weather.

Mr. HAUGEN. And, let me say to the gentleman, if he will refer to the hearings before the committee he will also find that

the cottonseed industry of the South is owned and controlled by large interests, such as the packing houses, and if he will investigate a little further he will find that cottonseed oil enters into the production of oleomargarine.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has again expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. May I have one minute more?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I ask that the gentleman may have one minute more in order that he may finish his statement, which is very interesting and informing.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the time of the gentleman will be extended one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman will also find on investigation that, according to the statement made, I believe by Mr. Brund, or some one who appeared before the committee, the cotton seed kills hogs and that cottonseed oil enters into the production of oleomargarine. Cotton seed kills cattle also if fed in overdoses.

And here we are confronted with the proposition to strike down the very industry that has made this country what it is in order to save a few pounds of cotton seed to the South, in the interest of concerns which, if the statement made before the committee is true, are owned and controlled by the packing houses, and this is for the purpose of saving the cottonseed industry, to make it possible to feed the cottonseed oil to the babies and the people of this country—that which kills hogs and cattle.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am greatly obliged to my friend for his statement.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to get unanimous consent to limit the debate on this paragraph.

Mr. SLOAN. I would like 10 minutes.

Mr. RUBEX. I would like a little time myself.

Mr. HEFLIN. I would like 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, 10 minutes to go to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN], 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], and 5 minutes to be divided between the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEX] and myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the time to be divided as he has indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McARTHUR. I should like to ask the gentleman one question, not to be taken out of the time. Will the gentleman state the amount of the financial loss to this country by reason of the cattle tick during the year 1915?

Mr. LEVER. It is variously estimated at an amount ranging from \$40,000,000 to \$60,000,000 annually.

Mr. McARTHUR. Is it not also true that the cattle tick is in the nature of a grubworm that works under the hide?

Mr. LEVER. No; that is not a fact. The cattle tick is more in the nature of an ordinary tick, except that it carries infection—carries the Texas fever.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to discuss this question at a later date, but the discussion having been precipitated as it has and having gone thus far, I desire to say that in the report of the Bureau of Animal Industry for 1912 a broad and sweeping charge was made against the dairy and creamery interests of this country. In my opinion the charges made were not warranted by the facts then existing or the scope of the investigation. The report assailed the product of the dairies and creameries of this country on the basis of a lack of cleanliness, sanitation, and wholesomeness.

Little attention was paid to that charge until quite recently, when the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] presented to this House a resolution asking for the appointment of five Members of this body to investigate the conditions of our dairies and creameries. Copies of this resolution were sent broadcast throughout the United States to health officers, women's clubs, and various other organizations. In this resolution were subtle statements that would seem to indicate that our dairies and creameries are not sanitary and that their products are not wholesome. On April 11, 1916, a hearing was had on that resolution before the Rules Committee of this House. I challenge the attention of Members to the evidence there presented. I trust it will soon be published.

I do not care at this time to say anything about the controversial features already sprung in this debate as to other industries interested in assailing the dairy interests. The question is not whether there is a quarrel between the oleo interests, the packing interests, or whatever they may be, and the dairy interests of this country. As citizens of this country and Representatives from the dairy States such as my own, we are in-

interested in producing a wholesome product for the consumption of the American people.

In the evidence presented gentlemen will find the basis of the charge to be as follows: Some time during 1912, in a period of just a few weeks, two or three young men were sent out by the Bureau of Animal Industry to investigate the dairy and creamery interests of this country. The investigation covered 144 creameries and cream-buying stations. We were unable to ascertain how many stations were creameries and how many were the ordinary cream-buying stations. There are 6,000 creameries in the United States and there are upward of 40,000 cream stations.

These 144 units, whatever they were, were confined to only 6 States out of the 48. Yet, on the examination of those 144 units, whatever they were, confined to six States, where creameries and stations were condemned—in part, in some cases because the buildings were not painted and did not have proper walks around them, and for other trivial reasons as well as some stronger ones—the conclusion was drawn that "94.5 per cent of the creameries are insanitary to a greater or less degree." That statement is no more definite yet as damaging to the reputation of this great industry as was the old statement made of a woman that "she was no better than she should be." Damaging, yes; but who can answer it?

The ratio of those examined to those which must rest under this sweeping charge is 144 to 46,000, or about one-third of 1 per cent. On that basis, figuring the sun spots in their relation to the whole surface of the great orb of day, would have discredited "Old Sol" as a reliable luminary centuries ago.

Again, after examining 1,554 lots of cream out of the millions of lots handled every week in the United States, the report said, "61.5 per cent of the cream used is dirty or decomposed, or both." This relates to all cream handled in creameries. Using a similarly narrow basis, one would travel through any State of this Union, close his eyes until he looked in on the penitentiary, and then condemn the citizenship of that State indiscriminately.

I do not suppose there is a perfect creamery in the United States or the world, any more than there is a perfect House of Representatives, however nearly this one approximates it. Yet the creamery, in so far as it lacks attainment of perfection, is "more or less insanitary." By the introduction of the Linthicum resolution, presented to this House and scattered broadcast throughout the United States, the dairy and creamery interests of the country have been subjected to a very serious blackwash.

Before the Rules Committee, after a mass of evidence had been presented by the proponents of the resolution, somewhat voluminous but not very convincing, Mr. Creasy, of Pennsylvania, who is secretary of the National Dairy Union, made a clear and concise statement. Prof. McKay, who is secretary of the American Association of Creamery Butter Manufacturers of the United States, and who, by the way, is the best-posted man on butter, cream, milk, and all dairy products in the United States, as well as the best-posted man in the United States as to the dairy and creamery conditions in the other dairy countries of the world, made a complete and succinct statement, which shows that there is no food industry in the United States or in the world that has gone forward so fast in the last few years in purifying its products and perfecting its methods than the dairy and creamery interests of the country. Seventy-five per cent of all of the dairy and creamery products that go into interstate commerce is pasteurized, and proper pasteurization is being followed out by all good creameries of the United States. The bad creameries throughout the country are being rapidly eliminated.

It can be further shown that in every dairy State of this Union they have wholesome dairy and creamery laws providing for the inspection and supervision of the dairies and the creameries. There is invested in them, or in nearly all of them, the power to suppress unsanitary plants whether they be cream station, a dairy, or creamery.

Further than that, it was shown by Mr. Creasy that it is the policy of the dairy people of this country to develop dairy interests along lines of health—pure food—and that tangible evidence can be presented of the general purity of the dairy and creamery products of the country.

If the amount of appropriation here named—\$272,000—is expected to cover a fair investigation of the dairy and creamery interests in this country and to put the stamp of approval or disapproval on them, it would better not be in this bill. The evidence presented by the Bureau of Animal Industry, the members present during that hearing, as well as others, that to enter upon an investigation of the 6,000 creameries and 40,000

cream stations in the United States and the million of dairies would require millions of dollars. The creamery and dairy interests of the country, I understand, do not oppose an investigation which would be full, complete, and fair.

The following is the statement made by Dr. George L. McKay, together with copies of letters presented by him to the Rules Committee:

STATEMENT OF DR. G. L. MCKAY.

I am secretary of the American Association of Creamery Butter Manufacturers. I have prepared a short statement here concerning our members and I have several documents here, but I do not propose to take up your time in reading them to you, but I will merely submit them. I have letters here from two of the leading dairy scientists of this country on this question, Dr. Russell, of the University of Wisconsin, and Dr. Harding, of the University of Illinois. I have letters then from different food commissioners of the country, giving the sanitary conditions of the creameries as they exist in their States. They do not correspond with the reports given out by the Department of Agriculture. I will read this statement; it is very short:

"As the secretary of the American Association of Creamery Butter Manufacturers, I deem it wise to make a statement at this time in behalf of the purity and cleanliness of the American butter. I have spent the greater part of my life in dairy educational work. For 17 years I was at the head of the department of dairying at Iowa State College. In 1901 I was sent abroad to study dairy problems by the Department of Agriculture at Washington, D. C. A similar trip was made in 1913 in behalf of the association, which I represent. Therefore I am very familiar with dairy conditions in the leading dairies of the world.

"The American Association of Creamery Butter Manufacturers is an educational organization and was brought about for the purpose of improving the quality of the American butter. Approximately our members made about one-fourth or one-fifth of the creamery butter manufactured in the United States. Our creamery men all pasteurize their cream for butter making with the exception of one. Inspection of our creameries is made by my assistant and myself. Prof. Bouska, my assistant, is a trained chemist and bacteriologist. After taking his college degree in this country he spent some time studying abroad, so he is eminently fitted for his work and is thoroughly posted on up-to-date sanitary methods as related to food products.

"His reports in connection with my own, covering the entire creamery situation of our members, indicate that there are not more than 2 per cent of our creameries lacking in real up-to-date sanitary equipments. In the 2 per cent referred to everything is kept scrupulously clean, but the construction of the buildings and the equipment are not as modern as they should be. Many of our creameries are superior to any found in other countries, and I can say without hesitancy that the butter manufactured by our members is as pure, if not purer, than that produced in any other country. This is due to the sanitary methods used in manufacturing and the efficiency of pasteurization as practiced by our members. Samples taken from the average run of butter produced in some of our leading creameries and examined at Wisconsin, Purdue, and Cornell Universities, showed an efficiency in pasteurization, as 99½ per cent of the germs found usually in milk and cream were destroyed. The butter thus examined showed up absolutely pure. Therefore the report emanating from the Department of Agriculture in 1912 can in no way apply to the creameries of the members of our association.

"I am pleased to be able to make such a favorable report. From my own general observation, I would say that the creamery business of the United States, from a sanitary standpoint, is conducted on a very high plane. Creameries of the United States may not all have walks around the buildings or all be painted, as indicated by the questions sent out by the Department of Agriculture. If creameries have good drainage, and vats, churns, pipes, and all equipments that come in contact with cream and butter are kept clean, the creamery certainly should be classified as sanitary regardless of absence of paint and walks. The word 'sanitary' is a misnomer as it relates to butter made from pasteurized cream. Butter made from properly pasteurized cream excludes the possibility of it carrying disease germs. So it is unquestionably a practically neutral health proposition.

"G. L. McKay, Secretary."

I have letters here which it will not be necessary for me to read, from the different dairy commissioners, from Iowa, where they say there is less than 3 per cent of the dairies that are insanitary, and I have letters from Missouri, from Kansas, from Indiana, and from Wisconsin.

"In answer to your communication of April 4 will say, in a brief way, that the conditions described in Congressman LINTHICUM'S resolution are not prevalent in the State of Wisconsin. There may be some isolated cases of the conditions he mentions, but under the Wisconsin law the entire cheese and butter industry is under State supervision as to its cleanliness and sanitary conditions. The most difficult problem confronting us at the present time is the delivery of good raw material to the creameries, which, however, is well taken care of by this department.

"Geo. J. Weigle, Commissioner."

INDIANA STATE BOARD OF HEALTH,
DEPARTMENT OF FOOD AND DRUGS,
Indianapolis, March 21, 1916.

GEORGE L. MCKAY,
Secretary American Association Creamery Butter Manufacturers,
2037 Continental and Commercial Bank, Chicago, Ill.

MY DEAR PROF. MCKAY: My inspector, Mr. Bruner, has been making a careful study of Indiana dairy and creamery conditions, and the reports up to date have just been tabulated. They show that creameries manufactured last year 8,486,881 pounds of butter; 96.7 per cent of this butter was made from pasteurized cream. The only plants that do not pasteurize are the small ones.

Out of 17 large milk plants, selling last year 3,802,416 gallons of milk, 98.6 per cent was pasteurized.

Ninety-four and five-tenths per cent of the ice cream was made from pasteurized cream.

Eighteen cream stations shipped their products in every instance to plants which pasteurized. One plant was condemned and closed and the proprietor was prosecuted and convicted for insanitary conditions.

The score on 101 dairy-products plants is as follows:

Creameries: Excellent, 1; good, 16; fair, 11; poor, 1.
Ice-cream factories: Good, 18; fair, 16; poor, 4.

Milk depots: Excellent, 1; good, 7; fair, 8; bad, 1.
 Cream stations: Fair, 17; poor, 1.
 The milk depot scored "bad" was prosecuted and put out of business.
 The plants scored "fair" were generally well kept from a sanitary viewpoint, but were deficient in lighting or ventilation, were overcrowded, or not well-equipped with machinery, or did not pasteurize the raw material.
 I inclose a copy of a syndicated story recently sent out by me.
 Very truly, yours,

H. E. BARNARD,
State Commissioner of Food and Drugs.
 "BUTTER IS STILL GOOD FOOD."

"The papers are full of stories about bad butter. A resolution has been introduced in Congress which details with great minuteness the insanitary condition of the creameries of the country. If we were so foolish as to believe all we read, it would take a mighty courage to eat a slice of bread and butter. The real fact is that much more good butter is being made than bad butter. The Government report which so severely criticizes the conditions under which butter is made was issued in 1912, and since that time the butter industry has been wonderfully improved."

"The food inspectors in Indiana, which is an important dairy State, have just reported a survey of the dairy industry. They found that 96.7 per cent of the butter was made from pasteurized cream, and so was a real food and not a disease carrier. They found that 94.5 per cent of the ice cream was made from pasteurized cream and milk, and that the only plants that did not pasteurize were the little local plants, which were able to get fresh raw material direct from the dairy. They found that 98.6 per cent of the milk supply was pasteurized, that the only plants which did not sell pasteurized milk were small local plants. But they found one plant in such unsatisfactory condition that it was condemned and closed and the proprietor arrested and convicted for making unsanitary and unwholesome food."

"What is true of Indiana dairy products is true of the dairy products of other States. The milk situation and the butter business is not ideal. It never will be. The business is too large and is carried on by too many untrained men ever to be ideal. But it is improving constantly, and it is foolish to fear disease whenever one sits down to the table and reaches for the butter dish or cream pitcher. The fear of food is a hundred times more injurious than the food itself."

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS,
 COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND
 AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION,
 April 6, 1916.

Mr. GEORGE L. MCKAY,
*Continental & Commercial Bank Building,
 Chicago, Ill.*

MY DEAR MCKAY: While the word "sanitary" is often used in a very strange sense, and is sometimes used apparently without any sense at all, I have understood that thoughtful people use it with reference to those features which to some appreciable extent affect the health of the individual or of the community.

We can perhaps better appreciate the possible sanitary significance of butter if we consider in detail the various elements which make up butter and cream.

In addition to the water, which is present in varying amount but has no sanitary significance, the fat is perhaps the most outstanding element of composition. As you know, the fat undergoes very little, if any, chemical change either in cream or in butter until it is very old. The rancidity which ultimately develops is an important matter from the commercial point of view, but has no sanitary significance, partly because the products of rancidity are not known to exert any unfavorable influence upon health and largely because the products are so obvious and unpleasant that the rancid butter is not readily consumed.

The sugar is, of course, readily attacked by germ life and broken down, forming mainly acid, which, again, is quite obvious and has important commercial relations, but, so far as I am aware, is entirely without health significance in connection with butter, though the butter-milk is generally recognized as a nutritious and to some extent a therapeutic drink.

The remaining elements of the cream and butter may be conveniently grouped under the head of curd. The decomposition which this nitrogenous material suffers in the case of cream and butter gives rise to many compounds, some of which have pronounced flavors or odors.

In extreme cases such cream or butter is referred to in common speech as "rotten." The decomposition which is going on compares very closely in character, though is rarely as extensive, as that taking place in the ripening of Limburger cheese and other of the soft cheeses. While these changes very sharply affect our sense and to many people are quite disagreeable, thereby having important economic bearings, I am not aware that we have any evidence to indicate that the health of the consumer is in any way impaired by the consumption of such material. Personally I am rather fond of Limburger cheese, while I do not like the flavor of bad cream, largely, I believe, because of the admixture of fatty decomposition products which are quite offensive.

If this analysis of the situation is correct, and I believe it is substantially so, we have then no occasion for applying the term "sanitary" to the decomposition products occurring in butter as the result of bacterial attack on the fat, sugar, or curd, and these taken together make up what we know as butter.

Butter, therefore, would be of no sanitary significance whatever, except in the very general significance which results from its usefulness as a food, but for the fact that it may become the mechanical carrier of disease germs. These may enter at any time between the production of the milk and the consumption of the butter. Careful studies have shown that raw cream very commonly carries the germs of bovine tuberculosis and occasionally may carry the germs of typhoid fever, scarlet fever, diphtheria, septic sore throat, and less frequently the germs of a number of other minor diseases.

The science and practice of butter making has fully developed the fact that by properly pasteurizing the cream, or the milk before the cream is removed, many of these germs which may have found their way into the milk or cream will be completely destroyed without impairing the value of the cream for butter making. As you know, this process is being carried out in practice upon a large scale, so that practically all of the butter made in the State of Illinois is now so handled. Butter, therefore, made from properly pasteurized cream can be looked upon as not open to any objection from the standpoint of sanitation except for the possibility of contamination from human

beings carrying these germs between the time at which the cream is pasteurized and the time at which the butter is consumed by the individual. While such butter is not absolutely and entirely safe because of the possibility of its being contaminated by the one or two men who have been in contact with it to a slight extent during the churning and packing process and the grocery clerk who has retailed it, it is in this respect practically on a par with any food product which is later to be consumed without being prepared for consumption by the process of cooking. Until the public shall have reached the point where it desires butter which has been boiled just before being served it will not be possible to furnish it with a more sanitary product than our properly pasteurized butter is now.

Yours, truly,

H. A. HARDING.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
 COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND
 AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION,
 Madison, April 6, 1916.

Prof. G. L. MCKAY,
*Secretary American Association
 Creamery Butter Manufacturers, Chicago, Ill.*

MY DEAR PROF. MCKAY: In reply to your letter asking in regard to the transmission of disease by butter made from cream that has been thoroughly pasteurized, I would say that most of the work that has been done in the study of pasteurization has been along the lines of market milk.

It has been shown beyond all doubt that the method of pasteurization, which is most widely used at the present time in the treatment of market milk, destroys all of the pathogenic organisms which may be present in the milk. The process used consists in the heating of the milk to a temperature of 145° F. for a period of 20 to 30 minutes. Experiments conducted both under laboratory conditions and under practical conditions have shown the efficiency of this process.

It is generally admitted that a higher temperature for a much shorter period of time is practically as efficient as the use of the lower temperature for a longer period of time. If the milk or cream is brought to a temperature of 170°, even for a very short period, it is believed that the vitality of any disease-producing organisms it may contain will be destroyed. Thus, if butter is made from cream that has been treated by either of these processes, it should be perfectly free from living pathogenic organisms.

There are no data, so far as I am aware, to show that butter has ever been concerned in the distribution of typhoid fever or of diphtheria even when the butter is made from unpasteurized cream. If the milk contained tubercle bacilli, it is quite certain that they would be found in the butter and that they would not be destroyed by the ordinary process of butter making, namely, the souring of the cream and the salting of the butter. It is possible that butter made from raw cream might be instrumental in producing tuberculosis in man, but it is certain that its importance in this regard is very small indeed, especially when compared with that of milk itself.

The general condition of creameries with reference to cleanliness would probably have very little, if any, influence upon the healthfulness of the butter. This, however, is no reason why our creameries should not be kept in as cleanly a condition as possible, because the aesthetic side of foods is of very considerable commercial importance.

Yours, very truly,

H. L. RUSSELL.

THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
 DAIRY AND FOOD DIVISION,
 Columbus, Ohio, March 22, 1916.

Mr. GEORGE L. MCKAY,
 2037 Continental & Commercial Bank Building, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: I have before me your favor of the 17th inclosing copy of the request of J. CHARLES LINTHICUM relative to sanitary conditions of creameries.

I note that they claim 94½ per cent of the creameries of the country are unsanitary to a greater or less degree. By getting this 94½ per cent they have taken in, it seems to me, a very large scope, while I believe from reports we have received from our inspectors making investigations of the creameries in Ohio, that 75 per cent will pass the requirements of the State law.

If an inspector goes into a creamery when they are running full force there are undoubtedly some minor things that may not look as sanitary as they ought to be, but they can not be avoided considering the amount of work they are doing.

I do not believe that the conditions in Ohio will show that 61½ per cent of the cream used is unclean or decomposed. It seems to me that this report certainly has been exaggerated very much, unless conditions are a great deal worse in other localities and other States than they are here in Ohio.

A statement of this nature going out to the public is certainly very detrimental to the honest creamery man who is endeavoring to put a clean, wholesome product on the market. I can not understand the motive of this unless there is some move back of it to discredit the creamery work in order to give the oleomargarine people a better hold and make larger sales of their goods.

It seems to me that the creamery men of the country should pass resolutions giving the true conditions as found and present them to this committee.

Any service I can render will be gladly given.

Very respectfully,

T. L. CALVERT,
Chief of Division.

KANSAS STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE,
 Manhattan, Kans., April 5, 1916.

Mr. GEORGE L. MCKAY,
 Suite 2037 Continental & Commercial Bank Building, Chicago.

MY DEAR MCKAY: Yours of the 4th just received.

I am pleased to say at this time that 95 per cent of the creameries in this State score first. I am inclosing herewith a copy of the score card used in grading the creameries. We consider that a plant scoring 85 per cent or better, is a first-grade creamery.

I might add that 90 per cent of the butter manufactured in Kansas is handled in creameries scoring above 93 per cent.

I have just completed gathering data on the creameries, and am pleased to state of the creamery butter manufactured within the State of Kansas 98 per cent is made from pasteurized cream.

We have 85 creameries operating within the State. Seventeen of the smallest ones do not pasteurize, while the remaining 68 pasteurize all cream and milk used in the manufacture of butter.

If you desire any further data relative to this work, I shall be greatly pleased to forward same. The above data can be substantiated by names and figures if necessary.

With kind personal regards, I am,
Very truly, yours,

GEO. S. HINE,
State Dairy Commissioner.

MICHIGAN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE,
East Lansing, Mich., March 24, 1916.

G. L. MCKAY,
Secretary American Association Creamery Butter Manufacturers,
2037 Continental & Commercial Bank Building, Chicago, Ill.

MY DEAR SECRETARY MCKAY: Recently there has been brought to my attention a statement written in 1912 to the effect that approximately 95 per cent of the creameries of this country are insanitary, that approximately two-thirds of the cream used in the manufacture of butter is either unclean or decomposed, or both, and that three-fourths of the cream used in the manufacture of butter is not pasteurized.

I am unable to speak with authority on this subject for conditions existing outside of the State of Michigan. I have, however, been engaged in the dairy business in the State of Michigan for the past 12 years, and have come in contact with all creamery conditions as they have existed and are existing at the present time. The statement as published could never have been considered as applying to the State of Michigan. It is so far removed from the actual conditions in vogue, even in 1912, that anyone at all acquainted with Michigan creameries could not have considered it in a serious manner.

The first two statements as to the condition of creameries and the cream itself are certainly gross misrepresentations. As to the matter of pasteurization, may say that the amount of cream pasteurized is increasing every year. A large portion of that used in the State of Michigan is being pasteurized at the present time, and I look to see the practice universal in the comparatively near future.

Yours, very truly,

A. C. ANDERSON,
Professor of Dairy Husbandry.

STATE OF IOWA,
DAIRY AND FOOD COMMISSION,
Des Moines, April 7, 1916.

HON. G. L. MCKAY,
Chicago, Ill.

MY DEAR MR. MCKAY: We have yours of the 4th and are pleased to be able to advise you that we are certain that not 3 per cent of the creameries in Iowa are not in a sanitary condition.

Practically every creamery in the State is inspected by assistant commissioners as often as every six months, and in many instances more frequently than that.

Where the buildings are old and dilapidated and can not be kept in good shape they have been condemned and new ones have replaced them. This is why there are possibly 3 per cent of them that are not in good shape now. Many of this small per cent will be rebuilt within the next year.

Wherever we have found that they are not in a sanitary condition, notice has been given, and on the second call inspections have been made, and in some instances penalty assessed. This is where we have found people that, through carelessness or negligence, have not cleaned up.

We know that practically all of the centralizers are in good condition, as we give them the same attention that we do the small creameries.

Yours, truly,

W. B. BARNEY,
Commissioner.

The following is the statement made by Mr. Creasy:

STATEMENT OF MR. WILLIAM T. CREASY, SECRETARY OF THE NATIONAL DAIRY UNION.

Mr. CREASY. As the secretary of the National Dairy Union, I do not come here to object to or resist the passage of a resolution which will have the purpose of ascertaining important facts relative to the production and handling of American dairy and creamery products in a wholesome and sanitary manner. Nor do I, in behalf of those whom I represent, object to the appointment of a committee from the membership of the House not antagonistic to the producers of this country. We would be gratified if members of this committee were men who knew something of the problems of dairy production, handling, and marketing. Especially will we not object if this investigation is made so broad, searching, and comprehensive that this, in many respects the most important industry of the country, be disclosed not only in its actual conditions but its standing among the similar industries in other nations of the earth. Further, we would be pleased if this investigation would show the relative care, sanitation, and wholesomeness of this industry's products in comparison with those of other industries whose representatives are assailing ours.

We are convinced from the enterprise and energy being exercised by a large portion of the dairy industries that there has been accomplished during the last five or six years a great advancement and improvement in sanitation and wholesomeness of the dairy products from the point of first production through the handling, distribution, and marketing of the final product, so that to those not antagonistic or prejudiced an investigation would be entirely unnecessary were it not for the following two important facts:

First, there appears in the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture for the year 1912, contributed by the Bureau of Animal Industry, at page 334, the following remarkable statement:

[From Report of the Bureau of Animal Industry, 1912.]

"CREAM INVESTIGATIONS AND THE NEED OF CREAMERY INSPECTION.

"Investigations have been made of the sanitary conditions of creameries and cream-buying stations, also of the quality of the cream received and the methods used in its manufacture into butter, and the conditions under which cream is produced and prepared for market.

"A special examination of 144 creameries and cream-buying stations, located in six different States, showed that only eight, or about 5.5 per cent, were absolutely satisfactory from a sanitary standpoint.

"An examination of 1,554 lots of cream, after being delivered to the creameries and cream-buying stations, showed 113, or 7.3 per cent, to be of first grade; 484, or 31.1 per cent, of second grade; and 957, or 61.5 per cent, of third grade. The third grade consists of cream that is

dirty, decomposed, or very sour. High acidity in ordinary cream indicates either age or bad conditions surrounding its production, handling, or storage.

"An inquiry covering 715 creameries, located in six States, showed that only 196, or 27.4 per cent, pasteurize their cream, while 519, or 72.6 per cent, do not pasteurize.

"The results of these investigations may not represent with absolute accuracy the creamery industry as a whole, but they are certainly not far out of the way. While some creameries are in good sanitary condition, receive good cream, practice pasteurization and other approved methods, and turn out a high-grade product, the number of such creameries is very small. Our investigations reveal the fact that 94.5 per cent of the creameries are insanitary to a greater or less degree; that 61.5 per cent of the cream used is dirty or decomposed, or both; and that 72.6 per cent of the cream is not pasteurized, but is made into butter to be consumed in a raw state. In other words, millions of gallons of cream that has been allowed to stand in the barn, in the cellar, or in the woodshed until it is sour or decomposed is sent to the creamery, and without even being pasteurized is made into butter. Butter is usually consumed in the raw state and may carry pathogenic organisms for a long period of time, but aside from the danger of pathogenic infection consumers should not be expected to eat a product from an insanitary place and made from material that is unclean and decomposed.

"We have been studying this subject for some years and are fully convinced that the welfare of the public, as well as of the dairy industry, demands that something be done to correct these unwholesome conditions. The best remedy is believed to be a system of inspection such as is recommended in an earlier part of this report under the heading 'Needed legislation.'

Remarkable for two reasons—first, the very narrow and limited basis of fact; second, the broad sweep and unwarranted conclusion. Your attention is called to the fact that the investigation was confined to 6 States out of 48—to 144 creameries and cream-buying stations, there being now 6,000 creameries and probably 40,000 cream-buying stations in the United States. The man who saw a swallow and declared it was summer had nothing on the remarkable author of this extraordinary report. There was an examination of 1,554 lots of cream, said by the department to have covered a period of three months, which, compared with the many millions of commercial lots of dairy products handled in that period, gives the investigation all the stability of an inverted cone.

The second extraordinary fact referred to is the comprehensive and elastic conclusion drawn where it says: "Our investigations reveal the fact that 94.5 per cent of the creameries are insanitary to a greater or less degree." That conclusion might be drawn as against any line of industries, because it says to a greater or less degree. If we assume the maximum, let us inquire: Greater than what? Greater than 99 per cent or greater than 1 per cent? Less? Less than what? Less than 1 per cent or less than 50 per cent? To scientific minds this statement means nothing definite. To the average mind, given in all the solemnity of a Government report, it is liable to be considered appalling.

The second extraordinary fact is the resolution, almost sensational in its terms, which has not only been filed in the ordinary way in Congress but has been scattered broadcast throughout the country, and wherever sent has served to reflect upon the purity and wholesomeness of the dairy products produced and handled in this country.

It is to meet these two extraordinary and prejudicial documents alone that the investigation should be entered upon.

I am convinced that if this committee will grant an adjournment of this hearing for a period of about 30 days witnesses will be produced from different States and communities of the country who will establish the following facts:

First, That in dairy States of the Union there are, many of recent origin, but all working at this time, effective laws governing the supervision and inspection of dairies and creameries, and in practically every case the laws are being effectively enforced.

Second, We will show that of the commercial dairy products more than 60 per cent are pasteurized, and that pasteurization is steadily increasing in every part of the country.

Third, That the large majority of dairy and creamery products which enter into interstate commerce we believe amounting to 75 per cent is pasteurized.

Fourth, We are convinced that no industry in this country having to do with the production and handling of human food has made an advancement in purity and sanitation equal to that of dairy and creamery products during the last five years.

Fifth, That the state of purity and wholesomeness of commercial creamery and dairy products in this country is further advanced than almost any country of the world.

Sixth, We expect to show, to some extent at least, the antagonism and unwarranted attacks made by other industries upon this industry, which involves to the producers of this country a billion dollars per year, and an industry upon which the continued fertility of our now fertile soils and the renewal of our depleted soils in this country largely depends.

Seventh, We will at this time, as I merely suggest now, show that this is an industry to which there should be directed the most far-seeing statesmanship for the purpose of conserving and upbuilding rather than injuring and destroying.

To this end, and calling your attention to the fact that here in the National Capital, on the 5th and 6th of May next, there will be gathered representatives from the industries of dairy products from throughout the States of the Union, men informed and skilled in their professions, who will be ready to appear before this committee and give testimony, I ask that further hearing hereon be suspended until a convenient date, from the 5th to the 10th of May.

In conclusion will say that yesterday, April 9, we asked the chief of the dairy division for a list of the 144 creameries mentioned in the report. This was refused, for the reason that the information is considered of a confidential nature. On further inquiry at this department it was stated that the investigation, which found 94.5 per cent of the 144 creameries insanitary, was ordered in April, 1912, and completed July 1, 1912, the work being done by two inspectors in three months. Hence, it follows that five inspectors could examine these same creameries in less than a month, and this would show the conditions of these creameries at the present time. This would give the committee and the public much-needed information which would be of great value in carrying on the investigation. We believe the Dairy Division will do this and can have the information for this committee at its next hearing, of from May 5 to 10.

The dairy and creamery industry of this country amounts to nearly \$1,000,000,000. It is perhaps the most vital of all the industries touching the future productivity of our soil. It is important to the hundred million consumers:

First, that their wants be supplied.

Second, that the products be wholesome and palatable.

The dairy and creamery products of my own State annually aggregate about \$40,000,000. We have the largest two creameries in the United States, each having its origin in my district. I can speak with some personal knowledge of the progress of the dairy and creamery interests of our State, which solved the credit system of our farmers and did more than any other factor in reducing the farmers' transactions to a cash basis. More than 20 years ago, when in the State senate, I introduced and pressed to passage one of the earliest and most effective oleomargarine laws. Since which time, not only in the development of the industry, but in the legislation enacted, and the enforcement thereof, following, Nebraska has been one of the foremost States of the Union.

To these ends dairy and creamery organizations are impressing upon and demanding of their members up-to-date methods of producing, grading, transportation, and marketing. The legislatures of the several States have been passing rigid supervision laws, with ample powers conferred upon the law enforcing officers to check abuses and terminate objectionable practices.

Pasteurization is increasing from year to year and is enforced generally in city and State. What dangers there may be are becoming understood and are being rapidly reduced to a minimum. Unless Congress sees fit to enter upon a complete and searching investigation with a purpose of following it up with a general investigation of creamery, dairy, and farm, which would mean several millions of dollars expended every year and the employment of many thousand men, affirmative action should not be taken upon this resolution. The mere dallying with the subject would retard advancement. Upon the other hand, proper and complete investigation and supervisory action thereafter would be welcomed by the producers of the country.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am the friend of the dairy interests, and this side is the friend of the great dairy interests in this country, and I am of the opinion that there are a few on that side besides my good friend from Iowa who are the friends of the dairy interests. The gentleman who has just spoken, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN], is a friend of the dairy interests, and has been very fair in his speech.

I agree with him that if any dairy concern in this country is not run upon a sanitary plan, if it is run in an uncleanly way and a way that will spread tuberculosis among helpless children in this country and unprotected adults, I think the Government ought to see to it that it is run upon wholesome lines, and I think the food-supplying concerns that will not invite and stand rigid inspection are not the right kind, and they need looking after.

But, Mr. Chairman, what I rose particularly to speak about was the misinformation that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] gave to the House a moment ago. He was talking about cottonseed oil killing hogs and cattle. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. He meant cottonseed meal and not cottonseed oil. If cottonseed meal is fed too long to a hog it is not good for him, and the reason is that cottonseed meal is such a rich food that it is not good to feed the hog regularly; but if you take the hog off of this food for 10 days or so and then put him back again, it will fatten him better than anything in the world except corn meal. If you will mix grain with cottonseed meal it can be used indefinitely. Cottonseed oil is one of the most wholesome foods in the world.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Can anybody afford to feed hogs on cottonseed oil?

Mr. HEFLIN. Not at the present price. Cottonseed oil is good for human beings. It is 73 cents a gallon now. Cottonseed oil is made into cottolene, and that is lard used in the making of biscuits, and I have eaten them. They are as white as snow, and make just as good biscuits as can be made in the world. Cottonseed oil is a fine and wholesome food, and there is great demand for it as food in various forms.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. I want to ask the gentleman if cottonseed oil or cottolene can be used as well as lard in making a substitute for butter?

Mr. HEFLIN. Cottolene is used as lard, but cottonseed oil is used in the manufacture of oleomargarine, and that is used sometimes in place of butter, and if people in this country desire to eat oleomargarine in preference to eating butter, it is a free country and they are entitled to do so. The gentleman would not have Congress pass an act to say to me that if I prefer oleomargarine to butter I shall not exercise my right and gratify my taste.

Mr. CANNON. I think no such law has been enacted. It is true, I think, that a quarter of a cent a pound tax is placed on the white oleomargarine, and if it is colored to a pale yellow it is 10 cents a pound.

Mr. HEFLIN. Ten cents a pound on the yellow and a quarter of a cent a pound on the white. If people want to eat that, let them eat it. Every man to his own taste in this matter. I am not in favor of permitting people to sell oleomargarine for butter, but knowing oleomargarine to be a good and wholesome food, I am opposed to any unjust restrictions being placed around its use just as I am opposed to any unjust restrictions being placed around the sale of butter as a food product in this country. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of injecting the oleomargarine question into this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that the committee has fixed the time for debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto by unanimous consent.

Mr. HAUGEN. And all the time has been consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes remain, in the control of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], and the Chair understands he was to yield that to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY].

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes of the time to the gentleman from Iowa and the balance of it to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of injecting this oleomargarine question into the discussion. I have no quarrel with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. I concede that everyone has the right to manufacture oleomargarine and everyone has the right to eat it. What we object to is that they are selling it for butter, that which it is not. As long as they sell it for what it is, we have no quarrel with them, but, according to official reports, some 6,000 dealers sold some 63,000,000 pounds out of a total product of 83,000,000 pounds, in violation of the laws of 31 States. I will not detain the House longer, but simply ask unanimous consent to insert extracts from the hearing in support of what I stated a moment ago relative to cottonseed meal.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman does not mean to state that they are selling oleomargarine and calling it butter? They are selling oleomargarine that is colored yellow, something like butter.

Mr. HAUGEN. The Government report shows that 63,000,000 pounds out of a product of 83,000,000 pounds were sold in violation of the laws of 31 States, and that led up to the legislation that we have.

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

The matter referred to by Mr. HAUGEN is as follows:

Mr. ROMMEL. The man who is feeding his hogs on a ration in which there is some cottonseed meal is likely to go out into the pen in the morning and find one or more hogs dead. We have found in our study that there is never a case where a hog dies from cottonseed-meal poisoning where there have not been symptoms; but they have been so slight that the average farmer would overlook them.

The CHAIRMAN. Symptoms of what?

Mr. ROMMEL. Of cottonseed poisoning. A pig never dies from cottonseed-meal poisoning unless he has previously shown signs of sickness; but they may be such signs as only a careful observer would notice. That, of course, makes it out of the question to feed cottonseed meal to hogs. If you are going to have some of your hogs die on your hands it will knock out your profits.

Then, the disease may take another form. The pig may become sick and may not die for a long time. In cases like that a change of feed will effect a cure. In these chronic cases, the first indication of sickness is the roughness of the coat of the hog; the coat gets harsh, and the hair begins to curl up, and the pig is plainly unthrifty. By and by he begins to stagger in the hind legs, and possibly there may be a little characteristic thumping of the flanks. Anyone who knows the disease of little pigs called "thumps" will recognize that; it is the same thing; it is a rapid, characteristic movement of the diaphragm that causes the flanks to thump. The pig may go along in this way for a long time and become emaciated and eventually may die.

In those acute cases resulting in death that I have witnessed there is no sign whatever of paralysis. The pig may show no signs of being sick, except indications that would be noticed on keen observation. He is seized with a very sudden attack; there is marked shortness of breath; the pig is in great pain and squeals, and, if the attack does not pass off, he may die in 28 to 30 minutes. Death results from cardiac failure and suffocation.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is that due to an overdose, or is there safety in giving that feed to hogs in a limited quantity?

Mr. ROMMEL. I have not found it so.

Mr. STEELE. You would not recommend it as feed for hogs?

Mr. ROMMEL. No, sir.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, may we have an expert on cotton seed for a few minutes? I am more interested in that subject than anything that comes before the committee. Have you an expert here who has knowledge of the cottonseed industry, Mr. Brand?

Mr. BRAND. He is not here, but we have one who has knowledge of it, who has spent his whole life in that work.

Mr. HAUGEN. Has he any information as to the owners and operators of the cottonseed industry of the South?

Mr. BRAND. We have a great deal of information on that subject.

Mr. HAUGEN. Have you any knowledge in the matter?

Mr. BRAND. I would say that information is knowledge. We have very complete records of the apparent ownership of certain cottonseed industries. I suppose Mr. HAUGEN is looking back of that subject to those who were reputed to be interested in the cottonseed industry of the South. I do not think they deny a part of that allegation. I believe they have a large interest in it.

Mr. HAUGEN. To what extent?

Mr. BRAND. I can not tell you. I do not know whether it is a matter of public record.

Mr. HAUGEN. Well, you have some knowledge of it?

Mr. BRAND. No; we have no knowledge of the exact ownership of that industry. A few big corporations, like the Pennsylvania Railroad and the United States Steel Corporation, publish the exact distribution of their stock and control, but there are only a few of them, and we have no method of forcing that sort of information from the people.

Mr. HAUGEN. But I understood you to say that a large amount of stock is owned or controlled by the packing houses?

Mr. BRAND. I said that the packing-house interests admit a very large interest in these concerns whose products they use in the manufacture of their products.

Mr. HAUGEN. You have some one who has given that matter some attention?

Mr. BRAND. We have a specialist, but he is not here, as it was not expected that he would be called.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to enter into this controversy this afternoon in regard to oleomargarine, but I do want to say this: There is a resolution pending before the Committee on Rules, asking for the appointment of a committee of this House to investigate the dairy industry. I do not object to the introduction of the resolution, but there is a preamble to that resolution to which I do object. That preamble characterizes the dairy industry of this country in a way that is wholly without foundation. It quotes from a report of the Bureau of Animal Industry made in 1912, and that report ought never to have been made. It was made after an investigation, they say, which embraced only 6 States out of the 48, which extended over a few months, and included only 140 creameries. Upon that slight and insignificant investigation the Bureau of Animal Industry based its statement that 95 per cent of the creameries of the country were in an insanitary condition, and that sort of information is made a part of the preamble of a resolution and is sent broadcast over this land. That is the thing to which I object. [Applause.] I desire to take these few minutes to make this statement on the floor of the House, and to give notice that at the proper time, if this resolution should be reported to the House, I shall take the opportunity to present my views at length upon the proposition.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 12717, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ORDER OF MEETING.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday there was reported from the Committee on Patents two bills, one extending the patent of the badge of the Daughters of the American Revolution and one extending the patent of the Daughters of the Confederacy. The latter bill was placed on the House Calendar, whereas the former bill was placed on the Private Calendar. Evidently both bills should go to the same calendar, and I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 4889, the one relating to the badge of the Daughters of the American Revolution, may be transferred from the Private Calendar to the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. I would suggest possibly we might take up and pass both bills, if the gentleman is willing.

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 4889, and then I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 12481, or I might couple the two together. Those are the bills to which the gentleman from Illinois has just referred.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of these two bills. This is not unanimous-consent day, but the Chair will put the motion.

Mr. MANN. I may say the reason for making the request is that the Daughters of the American Revolution meet in the city here—

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the bills reported.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 4889, to permanently renew patent No. 21053, and H. R. 12481, granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of both of these bills? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 4889) to permanently renew patent No. 21053.

Be it enacted, etc., That a certain design patent issued by the United States Patent Office of date September 22, 1891, being patent No. 21053, is hereby permanently renewed and extended, with all the rights and privileges pertaining to the same as of the original patent, being generally known as the badge of the Daughters of the American Revolution, title thereto being hereby vested in the board of management of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution and their successors in office.

The committee amendments were read, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "permanently."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "extended," insert the words "for a period of 14 years from and after the passage of this act."

Page 1, line 11, after the word "Revolution," strike out the words "title thereto being hereby vested in the Board of Management of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution and their successors in office."

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the title of the bill may be amended by striking out the word "permanently" after the word "to" in the first line.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be so amended.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12481) granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Patents be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to grant an extension of patent covering the insignia of the United Daughters of the Confederacy to that organization during and for such period of time as the United Daughters of the Confederacy may be in existence as a national organization.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Strike out all of lines 3 to 8, on page 1, just read, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That a certain design patent issued by the United States Patent Office of date November 8, 1898, being patent No. 29611, is hereby renewed and extended for a period of 14 years from and after the passage of this act, with all the rights and privileges pertaining to the same as of the original patent, being generally known as the insignia of the United Daughters of the Confederacy."

The SPEAKER. This amendment just read is in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

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

On motion of Mr. OGLESBY, a motion to reconsider the votes by which the two bills were passed was laid on the table.

PENSIONS.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 14484) and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14484) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14484) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Thomas Klugh, late of Company B, Eighty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leonidas C. Kilgore, late of Company A, Fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John T. Hetherlin, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Malinda Cannon, widow of Isaac W. Cannon, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Albert Peterson, late of Company H, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Richardson, late of Company G, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha V. Baker, widow of William P. Baker, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Samantha E. Clark, widow of John F. Clark, late of Company F, Fifty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Perry Brimberry, late of Company C, Forty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Pauline R. Wolf, former widow of Hermann Rohde, late of Battery F, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles F. Anderson, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Orlando C. Limbocker, late of Company E, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mariah W. Smith, former widow of Robert J. Wilson, late of Company K, Two hundred and seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary A. Cardinal, widow of Joseph Cardinal, late of Company G, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles Beavers, late of Company D, Ninety-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Malona J. Jones, widow of Marquis D. Jones, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Beal, widow of Charles B. Beal, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lewis Holley, late of Company I, Sixteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Jane Strong, widow of Maston C. Strong, late of Company G, Fifty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James Farmer, late of Company I, Thirty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander Draper, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Lamere, widow of William M. Lamere, late of Company A, One hundred and sixty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edward F. Phelps, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi Coon, late of Company E, Fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Cain, late of Company L, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick D. Owen, late of Company H, Forty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Tralove, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles A. Edwards, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harriet C. Gillespie, former widow of William T. Stevenson, late commissary sergeant, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania

Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Elmira L. Stiles, widow of Mortimer Stiles, late of Company B, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Henry Mey, late of Company C, Twenty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Bibbs, alias Albert Markham, late of Company G, One hundred and eighth Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Katherine Glaser, widow of Mathias Glaser, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Franklin T. Randall, late of Company K, One hundred and seventy-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Savilla Milligan, widow of Beverly W. Milligan, late of Company B, Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Fay Milligan, helpless and dependent child of said Beverly W. Milligan, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Savilla Milligan the name of said Fay Milligan shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Savilla Milligan.

The name of William H. Hudson, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary M. Duffy, former widow of Lawson Duffy, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Woodman S. Sample, late of Company E, Sixty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Horatio R. Hutchinson, late of Company F, One hundred and seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Blachly, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Sloan, late of Company A, Forty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Matilda Buffham, widow of George Buffham, late of Company F, Thirty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Rebecca Phipps, widow of John Phipps, late of Company A, Thirty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Dryden, late of Company H, One hundred and eighty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adeline Temple, widow of Joseph Temple, late of Company D, Sixty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Helen Conrad, widow of Otto Conrad, late a landsman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Fannie A. McNear, widow of Thomas McNear, late of Company E, First Battalion, Maine Sharpshooters, and Company E, Twentieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of America J. Austin, former widow of Theoren Austin, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William L. Ford, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William R. Williams, late of Companies D and E, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Collins Washburn, late of Battery F, First Ohio Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward A. Davenport, late first lieutenant and commissary Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Hallman, late of Company M, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Melinda Hubert, widow of Nelson Hubert, late of Company D, Third Regiment Massachusetts Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Lucy A. Hopkins, widow of Thomas H. Hopkins, late of Companies A and K, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William Muer, late of Company H, Forty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Hasty, late of Company F, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Morrow, late of Company H, One hundred and fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Silas Hunley, late of Company C, Second Regiment West Virginia Veteran Infantry, and Company K, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adeline Lampman, widow of Isaac Lampman, late of Company G, Ninety-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Maquet, late of Company F, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Helen M. Lind, widow of Robert J. Lind, late of Company A, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Samantha J. Wood, widow of David R. Wood, late of Company C, Nineteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary F. Wilkinson, widow of William Wilkinson, late of Company E, Third Regiment Massachusetts Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Myra A. Putnam, widow of John F. Putnam, late commissary sergeant Seventeenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna M. Kesselring, widow of Adam Kesselring, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John W. Flook, late of Company H, Twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Caulk, widow of Jacob Caulk, late of Company B, First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles Copenspire, late of Company K, One hundred and sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel V. Hamilton, late of Company B, Thirty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Johnson, late of Company K, Sixty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abashabs Nolen, widow of Reuben Nolen, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Bangs, widow of William C. Bangs, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry R. Thomas, late of Company I, One hundred and ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Noble Bryant, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. McReynolds, late of Company H, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Vley Baldrige, widow of John Baldrige, late of Company A, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Esther A. Webb, widow of Frank B. Webb, late of Company M, Third Regiment, and Company C, Eleventh Regiment, Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Gardner, widow of Aaron B. Gardner, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Nathan D. Gardner, helpless and dependent child of said Aaron B. Gardner, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Catherine Gardner the name of said Nathan D. Gardner shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Catherine Gardner.

The name of Julia A. Slaybaugh, former widow of Levi Slaybaugh, late of Company I, Seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Wilson H. McKinney, late of Company A, Thirty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Triplett, late of Company A, Sixty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert A. Freeman, late of Company H, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin Johnson, late of Company G, Thirty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna S. Duffner, widow of William Duffner, late of Company H, Twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joseph A. Hollingsworth, late of Company D, One hundred and seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi H. Colburn, late a seaman, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ammi D. Seabury, late of Company E, Seventeenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Benjamin, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joel Alduffer, late of Company A, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Luke, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hugh M. Parkinson, late of Company H, Fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jane Curry, widow of John F. Curry, late of Company K, Second Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary T. Green, former widow of Thaddeus Albert, late of Company F, Eighty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ferdinand Mittelstaedt, late of Company H, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Gurney E. Hall, helpless and dependent child of Elijah P. Hall, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Kate A. Bowers, widow of John M. Bowers, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Milligan, widow of James G. Milligan, late of Company D, Twenty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John M. Barkly, late of Company G, One hundred and ninety-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emma Richards, helpless and dependent child of George W. Richards, sr., late of Company B, Eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William H. Palmer, late of Company B, Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Kerr, late of Company I, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna C. Shaffer, former widow of Peter Shaffer, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Addie D. Garvin, widow of John M. Garvin, late of Company C, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Andrew J. Craig, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles E. Kemp, late of Company F, Fifty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Augusta Anderson, widow of Frank W. Anderson, late of Companies I and D, Ninth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Brennan, widow of John P. Brennan, late captain of the hold, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Sexton, late of Company D, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jane A. Dickinson, widow of William M. Dickinson, late of Company M, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Benjamin, former widow of Henry Ellison, late of Company D, One hundred and seventy-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Abby J. Cadwell, widow of Frank L. Cadwell, late of Company E, Twentieth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, Second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Denges, former widow of George Denges, late of Company E, Seventy-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Carey, late of Company B, Seventeenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Walsh, late of Company A, Battalion Nineteen, Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Johanna Burke, former widow of Patrick Stanley, late of Companies G and K, Thirty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William A. Jones, late of Company C, Two hundred and ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Azariah Rankin, late of Companies H and C, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Sixth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dora Huffman, helpless and dependent child of Henry Huffman, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joseph C. Yutzky, late of Company C, Fifty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Crippen, widow of Joseph M. Crippen, late of Company I, First Regiment United States Infantry, and Company K, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anderson Scott, late of Company K, Third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$22.50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walter J. Wall, late of Fourth Independent Company, Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Blodgett, widow of Joseph C. Blodgett, late of Company E, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Francis A. Baxter, late of Company I, First Regiment Missouri State Militia Infantry, and Company A, Fourteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Ellard, widow of Dennis Ellard, late of Company B, First Battalion, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Albert Sanders, late of Company C, Seventy-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jonathan M. Glatfelter, late of Company H, Two hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah H. Matheny, widow of Nathaniel B. Matheny, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles Claudius Early, late of Company D, Forty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Bigelow, late of Company E, Thirty-second Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Alf, late of Company A, Twenty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elias C. Decker, late of Company G, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment, and Company B, One hundred and seventy-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Vansickle, late of Company B, One hundred and eighty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Henry A. Kline, late of Company K, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Melvina A. Horner, widow of John R. Horner, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Jane Clark, widow of Morgan Clark, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jonathan B. Davis, alias John B. Davis, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Zigler, late of Company K, One hundred and seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George B. Cock, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, Fifth Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph E. Wierman, late of Company I, One hundred and twenty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cornelia N. Cliffe, widow of James A. Cliffe, late of Company L, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Homer Day, late of Company H, One hundred and seventieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Adair, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cynthia J. A. Grant, widow of Patrick Grant, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James T. Inmon, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thornton A. Merrifield, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Flood, late of Company D, Ninety-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter M. Simon, late of Company K, Twenty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Honora Gallagher, widow of Charles Gallagher, late of Company E, Thirty-seventh Regiment New York State Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriet M. Badger, widow of Bracket H. Badger, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment New York State Militia Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frank H. Converse, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eli Cotton, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Pearce, late of Company G, Two hundred and sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elisha Morton, late of Company K, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hanson Harmon, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hollingsworth Gipe, late of Company C, First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret J. Burbridge, widow of John J. Burbridge, late of Company C, Third Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amos J. Moore, late of Company H, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Larimer, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bathsheba Newman, widow of Egbert Newman, late of Company D, Seventy-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James M. Pritchett, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Ebert, late of Company A, One hundred and fourteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Reynolds, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Orilla F. Porter, widow of Milo Porter, late of Companies F and E, Sixteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William F. Harrold, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Ryan, widow of John Ryan, late of Company K, One hundred and eighty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Elbridge Jacobs, late of Company G, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louise H. Crombie, widow of Abner B. Crombie, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie C. Duncan, widow of Sebastian Duncan, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha Brewer, widow of Ebenezer Brewer, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary E. Jahn, widow of Charles F. Jahn, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jemima Clevenger, former widow of Henry Richardson, late of Company M, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Rhoda Villers, widow of Alva Villers, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Bridgeforth, late of Company D, One hundred and eleventh Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cecilla McCullough, helpless and dependent child of Daniel McCullough, late of Companies H and A, One hundred and ninety-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Clara May Armstrong, helpless and dependent child of Cassius M. Armstrong, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Humelbaugh, widow of William F. Humelbaugh, late of Company F, Two hundred and seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Sadie Humelbaugh, helpless and dependent child of said William F. Humelbaugh, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Elizabeth Humelbaugh, the name of said Sadie Humelbaugh shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Elizabeth Humelbaugh.

The name of Patrick Gillin, late of Company C, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Fuller, late of Company I, First Regiment Michigan Sharpshooters, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mariett Geer, widow of Samuel E. Geer, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Dill, late of Company H, Ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hubert W. Mealing, late of Company F, First Regiment New York Engineers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Combs, widow of William W. Combs, late of Company G, Twenty-second Regiment, and Company A, Seventh Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jacob H. Wierman, late of Company B, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adelbert Price, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Arthur Robinson, late of Company H, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Kitty E. Farr, former widow of Charles McCoy, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Maria L. Phillips, former widow of Nathaniel Edwards, late of Company F, Twenty-second Regiment, and Company D, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Woliver, former widow of Selah Baxter, late of Company G, Twenty-sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Michael Burke, late of Company H, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Myra Bethia Young, widow of James A. Young, late of Company D, Second Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Josephine Sibley, widow of Solomon Sibley, late of Company D, Second Battalion, District of Columbia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Celia F. Congdon, widow of George B. Congdon, late major and additional paymaster, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara A. Stott, widow of William W. Stott, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John G. W. Book, late of Company E, One hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julia A. Keach, widow of James M. Keach, late of Company G, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Amanda B. Keach, helpless and dependent child of said James M. Keach, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Julia A. Keach the name of said Amanda B. Keach shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Julia A. Keach.

The name of John C. Swaney, late of Company G, Thirty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard W. Walker, late of Company G, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josephine Nolot, helpless and dependent child of Claud F. Nolot, late of Company E, Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Helen L. Chadwick, widow of John M. Chadwick, late of Company E, Twenty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William Wood, late of Company B, Fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Harding, late of Company A, One hundred and eighty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel B. Turner, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Perry Black, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bernard O'Reilly, late of United States Marine Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas M. Johnson, late assistant surgeon, Twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Sillett, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret E. Cullers, widow of Jacob M. Cullers, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George F. Richardson, late of Company A, Eighty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Black, late of Fourth Independent Company Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Courtney, late of Company K, Fifty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Hardy, widow of James G. W. Hardy, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Rebecca Hoge, widow of George W. Hoge, late of Company H, Twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah R. Sanks, widow of George W. Sanks, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella Heminger, helpless and dependent child of James M. Heminger, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Davis S. Milligen, late of Company B, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marietta L. Adams, widow of Edgar A. Adams, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. McCann, widow of Francis McCann, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Rhode Island Infantry, and First Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$32 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Francis E. McCann, helpless and dependent child of said Francis McCann, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Sarah E. McCann the name of said Francis E. McCann shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Sarah E. McCann.

The name of Angeline Jackson, widow of Cyrus A. Jackson, late of Company H, Thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is

now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Sarah E. Jackson, helpless and dependent child of said Cyrus A. Jackson, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Angeline Jackson, the name of said Sarah E. Jackson shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the death of said Angeline Jackson.

The name of Annie Morrison, widow of James Morrison, late a seaman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 795. Thomas Klugh.	H. R. 8890. John M. Barkly.
H. R. 979. Leonidas C. Kilgore.	H. R. 8899. Emma Richards.
H. R. 1262. John T. Hetherlin.	H. R. 9001. William H. Palmer.
H. R. 1265. Malinda Cannon.	H. R. 9012. Robert Kerr.
H. R. 1301. Albert Peterson.	H. R. 9024. Anna C. Shaffer.
H. R. 1328. Benjamin F. Richardson.	H. R. 9081. Addie D. Garvin.
H. R. 1359. Martha V. Baker.	H. R. 9193. Andrew J. Craig.
H. R. 1369. Samantha E. Clark.	H. R. 9252. Charles B. Kemp.
H. R. 1478. Perry Brimberry.	H. R. 9362. Augusta Anderson.
H. R. 1595. Pauline R. Wolf.	H. R. 9371. Catherine Brennan.
H. R. 1615. Charles F. Anderson.	H. R. 9390. Francis M. Sexton.
H. R. 1676. Orlando C. Limbocker.	H. R. 9473. Jane A. Dickinson.
H. R. 1708. Mariab W. Smith.	H. R. 9499. Sarah E. Benjamin.
H. R. 1767. Mary A. Cardinal.	H. R. 9495. Abby J. Cadwell.
H. R. 1786. Charles Beavers.	H. R. 9632. Elizabeth Denges.
H. R. 1862. Malona J. Jones.	H. R. 9773. John Carey.
H. R. 1900. Mary E. Beal.	H. R. 9737. Edward Walsh.
H. R. 2112. Lewis Holley.	H. R. 9777. Johanna Burke.
H. R. 2256. Mary Jane Strong.	H. R. 9957. William A. Jones.
H. R. 2283. James Farmer.	H. R. 10077. Azariah Rankin.
H. R. 2527. Alexander Draper.	H. R. 10272. Dora Huffman.
H. R. 2571. Elizabeth Lamere.	H. R. 10283. Joseph C. Yutzy.
H. R. 2589. Edward F. Phelps.	H. R. 10284. Eliza Crippen.
H. R. 2667. Levi Coon.	H. R. 10326. Anderson Scott.
H. R. 2733. Francis M. Cain.	H. R. 10347. Walter J. Wall.
H. R. 2792. Frederick D. Owen.	H. R. 10534. Mary A. Blodgett.
H. R. 2873. William Trulove.	H. R. 10554. Francis A. Baxter.
H. R. 2895. Charles A. Edwards.	H. R. 10630. Eliza Eliard.
H. R. 3301. Harriet C. Gillespie.	H. R. 10680. Albert Sanders.
H. R. 3748. Elmira L. Stiles.	H. R. 10716. Jonathan M. Glatfeiter.
H. R. 3825. Henry Mey.	H. R. 10733. Sarah H. Matheny.
H. R. 3923. William A. Bibbs.	H. R. 10777. Charles Claudius Early.
H. R. 4062. Katherine Glaser.	H. R. 10964. John W. Bigelow.
H. R. 4075. Franklin T. Randall.	H. R. 10975. George W. Ait.
H. R. 4210. Savilla Milligan.	H. R. 10976. Elias C. Decker.
H. R. 4325. William H. Hudson.	H. R. 10995. George Vansickle.
H. R. 4385. Mary M. Duffy.	H. R. 11021. Henry A. Kline.
H. R. 4412. Woodman S. Sample.	H. R. 11024. Melvina A. Horner.
H. R. 4496. Horatio R. Hutchinson.	H. R. 11040. Sarah Jane Clark.
H. R. 4511. William W. Blachly.	H. R. 11054. Jonathan B. Davis.
H. R. 4598. Isaac Sloan.	H. R. 11061. George W. Zigler.
H. R. 4617. Matilda Buffham.	H. R. 11210. George B. Cock.
H. R. 4854. Rebecca Phipps.	H. R. 11294. Joseph E. Weirman.
H. R. 4924. Joseph Dryden.	H. R. 11303. Cornelia N. Cliffe.
H. R. 4976. Adeline Temple.	H. R. 11407. Homer Day.
H. R. 4977. Helen Conrad.	H. R. 11462. John Adair.
H. R. 5036. Fannie A. McNear.	H. R. 11517. Cynthia J. A. Grant.
H. R. 5039. America J. Austin.	H. R. 11554. James T. Immon.
H. R. 5069. William L. Ford.	H. R. 11581. Thornton A. Merrifield.
H. R. 5098. William R. Williams.	H. R. 11577. John Flood.
H. R. 5109. Collins Washburn.	H. R. 11668. Peter M. Simon.
H. R. 5391. Edward A. Davenport.	H. R. 11691. Honora Gallagher.
H. R. 5462. Henry Hallman.	H. R. 11736. Harriet M. Badger.
H. R. 5494. Melinda Hubert.	H. R. 11746. Frank H. Converse.
H. R. 5647. Lucy A. Hopkins.	H. R. 11761. Eli Cotton.
H. R. 5694. William Muer.	H. R. 11908. John G. Pearce.
H. R. 5750. Charles Hasty.	H. R. 11938. Elisha Morton.
H. R. 5890. Samuel Morrow.	H. R. 12016. Hanson Harmon.
H. R. 5909. Silas Hunley.	H. R. 12082. Hollingsworth Gipe.
H. R. 5915. Adeline Lampman.	H. R. 12138. Margaret J. Burbridge.
H. R. 5998. John Maguet.	H. R. 12160. Amos J. Moore.
H. R. 6111. Helen M. Lind.	H. R. 12171. James H. Larimer.
H. R. 6132. Samantha J. Wood.	H. R. 12220. Bathsheba Newman.
H. R. 6148. Mary F. Wilkinson.	H. R. 12225. James M. Pritchett.
H. R. 6278. Myra A. Putnam.	H. R. 12246. John Ebert.
H. R. 6279. Anna M. Kesselring.	H. R. 12273. James Reynolds.
H. R. 6326. John W. Flook.	H. R. 12296. Orilla F. Porter.
H. R. 6392. Mary A. Caulk.	H. R. 12329. William F. Harrold.
H. R. 6395. Charles Copenspire.	H. R. 12335. Mary A. Ryan.
H. R. 6401. Daniel V. Hamilton.	H. R. 12346. Elbridge Jacobs.
H. R. 6605. James Johnson.	H. R. 12350. Louise H. Crombie.
H. R. 6622. Abashabe Nolen.	H. R. 12450. Annie C. Duncan.
H. R. 6663. Catherine Bangs.	H. R. 12518. Martha Brewer.
H. R. 6989. Henry R. Thomas.	H. R. 12562. Mary E. Jahn.
H. R. 7000. Noble Bryant.	H. R. 12665. Jemima Clevenger.
H. R. 7150. John R. McReynolds.	H. R. 12690. Rhoda Villers.
H. R. 7207. Vicy Baldrige.	H. R. 12754. Samuel Bridgeforth.
H. R. 7338. Esther A. Webb.	H. R. 12783. Cecelia McCullough.
H. R. 7392. Catherine Gardner.	H. R. 12801. Clara May Armstrong.
H. R. 7464. Julia A. Slaybaugh.	H. R. 12802. Elizabeth Humelbaugh.
H. R. 7489. Wilson H. McKinney.	H. R. 12804. Patrick Gillin.
H. R. 7494. Benjamin F. Triplett.	H. R. 12817. John Fuller.
H. R. 7514. Albert A. Freeman.	H. R. 12822. Mariett Geer.
H. R. 7667. Martin Johnson.	H. R. 12845. John Dill.
H. R. 7943. Anna S. Duffner.	H. R. 12863. Hubert W. Mealing.
H. R. 8101. Joseph A. Hollingsworth.	H. R. 12867. Elizabeth Combs.
H. R. 8103. Levi H. Colburn.	H. R. 12878. Jacob H. Wierman.
H. R. 8135. Ammi D. Seabury.	H. R. 12907. Adelbert Price.
H. R. 8158. William Benjamin.	H. R. 12934. Arthur Robinson.
H. R. 8170. Joel Aldaffer.	H. R. 12982. Kitty E. Jarr.
H. R. 8186. David Luke.	H. R. 12990. Mariah L. Phillips.
H. R. 8216. Hugh M. Parkinson.	H. R. 13009. Elizabeth Woliver.
H. R. 8337. Jane Curry.	H. R. 13031. Michael Burke.
H. R. 8373. Mary T. Green.	H. R. 13089. Myra Bethia Young.
H. R. 8399. Ferdinand Mittelstaedt.	H. R. 13095. Josephine Sibley.
H. R. 8428. Gurney E. Hall.	H. R. 13123. Celia F. Congdon.
H. R. 8772. Kate A. Bowers.	H. R. 13144. Clara A. Stott.
H. R. 8879. Sarah J. Milligan.	H. R. 13156. John G. W. Book.
	H. R. 13159. Julia A. Keach.
	H. R. 13175. John C. Swaney.

H. R. 13207. Richard W. Walker.
H. R. 13238. Josephine Nolot.
H. R. 13258. Helen L. Chadwick.
H. R. 13297. William Wood.
H. R. 13307. George W. Harding.
H. R. 13313. Samuel B. Turner.
H. R. 13396. Perry Back.
H. R. 13411. Bernard O'Reilly.
H. R. 13467. Thomas M. Johnson.
H. R. 13494. James Sillett.
H. R. 13558. Margaret E. Cullers.
H. R. 13573. George F. Richardson.

H. R. 13639. John Black.
H. R. 13640. John Courtney.
H. R. 13660. Sarah E. Hardy.
H. R. 13700. Rebecca Hoge.
H. R. 13701. Sarah R. Sanks.
H. R. 13808. Ella Heminger.
H. R. 13876. David S. Milliken.
H. R. 13970. Marietta L. Adams.
H. R. 14055. Sarah E. McCann.
H. R. 14091. Angeline Jackson.
H. R. 14235. Annie Morrison.

During the reading of the bill the following occurred:

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a committee amendment. I move to amend, page 12, line 2, by striking out "\$12" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$20."

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

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment.

On page 12, line 3, the spelling of the name "Maquet" is "Maguet." I move to substitute the letter "g" for the letter "q."

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

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUBEY). The gentleman from Georgia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, line 24, strike out "\$12" and insert "\$20." (Pension of Orilla F. Porter.)

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I have no complaint whatever to make of the Committee on Invalid Pensions. They have a rule that in first granting a pension to a widow they will not grant more than \$12 a month. I talked with the acting chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], before I offered this amendment. He did not feel authorized to accept it, but I want to lay the facts before the House. This widow married the soldier in 1863, and therefore she is a war widow. She lived with the soldier until the spring of 1892, and in June, 1892, obtained a divorce from him. In October of the same year the widow remarried the soldier and lived with him up to his death, in 1911. The soldier was drawing a pension at the time of his death of thirty-odd dollars. Upon his death the widow applied to the Pension Office for a pension, and the Office, under the strict letter of the law, rejected her, holding that she was a widow of the marriage of 1892, subsequent to the act of 1890, and was not entitled to a pension.

This woman is 78 years old. She is feeble. She has no property and is dependent on her neighbors for support. At best she has but a short while to live. I apprehend if it was not for the rule of the committee the committee would have been glad to have granted this pension at \$20 a month.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the committee will agree to the amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. CRISP. I thank the committee.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER (after having resumed the chair). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill H. R. 14576 and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14576) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and the widows of such soldiers and sailors.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Mary E. Bacon, widow of Harvey S. Bacon, late of Company K, Fifty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Alexander M. Rainey, late of Companies E, Second, and D, First, Recruiting Battalion, Second Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, in Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of August Johns, late of Company H, Second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary Gould, widow of George K. Gould, late of Company M, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the two minor children of the said George K. Gould until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Harry J. Symonds, late of Company K, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Watson, late of Company D, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Emily Gerardin, widow of Benjamin M. Gerardin, late first lieutenant and adjutant, Fourth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William P. Walpole, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank C. Lamp, late of Troop I, Fifth United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Dwyer, widow of Morgan Dwyer, late of Company F, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John F. W. Kuchenbecker, late of Company G, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Sankey Gray, late of Company L, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Philip Bernhard, late of Troop H, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ellen Kearns, widow of Thomas Kearns, late of Company I, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John N. Parker, late of Company C, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John C. Clark, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of R. Roy Hamby, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Harvey C. Van Meter, late of Company F, Thirty-second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The name of Samuel Tygret, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank R. Porter, late of Troop A, Eleventh Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julia M. Hill, widow of Frank M. Hill, late of Company H, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the two minor children of the said Frank M. Hill until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Martin H. Gavin, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Powell, widow of David J. Powell, late of Company I, Forty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Nora E. Singleton, widow of Lewis C. Singleton, late of the Signal Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ambrose A. Clarke, late of Company I, Third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank B. Pauley, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary McKelvey, widow of William S. McKelvey, late of Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the four minor children of said William S. McKelvey until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Thomas F. Muldoon, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Alice T. McClaughry, widow of John G. McClaughry, late adjutant and first lieutenant, Third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the two minor children of the said John G. McClaughry until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Christ Nelson, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eliza L. Norwood, widow of William W. Norwood, late of Company I, Third Regiment United States Dragoons, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Roach, late of Company A, Forty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Lena Griffie, widow of Andrew Griffie, late of Company G, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the three minor children of the said Andrew Griffie until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Oscar Smith, late of Astor Battery, United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of John E. Seeger, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John W. Stroup, late of Company I, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Fred Windgoetter, late of Company A, Second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Dana, late of Companies M. G. and A, Fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Melvin P. Campbell, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Henry W. Akers, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Hiram Colwell, late of Troop M, Twelfth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank E. Dorman, late of Fourth Company United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Fred Reidy, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Patrick J. Hyde, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clara B. Lowe, widow of Bert Lowe, late of Company K, Second Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Andy H. Fritz, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Moses A. Reimert, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Martin O'Loughlin, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of John McMahon, late of Company E, Twenty-fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Fred Porter, late of Company C, Thirty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George H. Cope, late of Company D, First Battalion United States Engineers, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles P. Dovell, late of Company E, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walker Anderson, late of Troop A, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edmund Gerber, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dallas F. Jarvis, late of Troop G, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard W. Lewis, late of Company L, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Charlotte Poe, widow of Isaiah Poe, late of Capt. William Johnson's company, Missouri Militia, War of 1812, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jonah E. Hill, late of Company M, Forty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Harris D. Williamson, late of Company A, Second Regiment Virginia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thomas J. Reynolds, late of Troop D, First Regiment Ohio Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick M. Hohmann, late of Company M, Twenty-first United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank H. Campbell, late of the band, First Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Samuel B. McPheeters, late of the Medical Reserve Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank B. Norris, late of Company C, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Della A. Daubenspeck, widow of Lloyd M. Daubenspeck, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the four minor children of the said Lloyd M. Daubenspeck until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Hugh J. Gallagher, late of United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Ryan, widow of William J. Ryan, late captain and commissary of subsistence, United States Volunteers, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John J. Brogan, late of Company A, Signal Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Minnie Riffe, widow of Charles F. Riffe, late of Company K, Forty-fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Bridget E. Williams, widow of Thomas Williams, late of Company B, First Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank E. Hill, late of Company H, Thirty-eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Buckley, widow of John Buckley, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thomas G. McEwan, late of Battery G, Sixth Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John E. Lauer, late of Troop C, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Lamb, late of Capt. Tracy's Company B, Battalion California Volunteers, Indian Wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William B. Clouse, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joseph D. Donellen, late of Company D, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wiley A. Cadenhead, late of Company H, First Alabama Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Jesse J. Barnwell, late of the U. S. S. *Bancroft*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Howard W. Bingham (insane), late of Company G, Signal Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month. Pay to duly appointed guardian.

The name of Clara B. Hatfield, widow of Richard C. Hatfield, late of Company K, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William G. McCoy, Jr., late of Company C, Third Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Archie F. Pejano, late of Troop C, First Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Bessie G. Bloodgood, widow of Edwin Bloodgood, late of Company C, First Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the six minor children of said Edwin E. Bloodgood until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Louise Crane, widow of Richard E. Crane, late of Company M, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of one minor child of the said Richard E. Crane until he reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Phillip Klaus, late of Company C, Third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Alphozine Bastian, dependent mother of Eli Bastian, late of Company D, Thirty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Louis F. Moebus, late chief musician, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William A. Bannister, late of Company A, First Regiment Texas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Peter McVay, late of Company K, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Martha W. Hubbell, widow of William B. Hubbell, late of Company C, First Regiment Tennessee Mounted Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Matilda Delisle, widow of Joseph Delisle, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James O. Cotman, late of Company H, Twenty-fifth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Warren Whiteman, late of Company L, Thirteenth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Barbara Henderson, widow of John B. Henderson, late of Troop F, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Susie Elgretta Henderson, helpless and dependent child of said John B. Henderson, the \$12 additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Barbara Henderson the name of said Susie Elgretta Henderson shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the limitations and provisions of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the death of said Barbara Henderson; and also \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child, Edith G. Henderson, of said John B. Henderson shall be paid to the widow until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Henry Juvenile, late of Troop M, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary Green, widow of William W. Green, late of Capt. Duncan's company of Ohio Mounted Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ralph H. Bryant, late of the United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Commons, widow of Benjamin L. Commons, late of Company G, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War

with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John C. Koepflinger, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Adolph Dirmeyer, late of Company B, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Roy Tow, late third-class electrician, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Salsbury, late of Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Julia E. Jones, widow of James L. Jones, late of Company C, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 804. Mary E. Bacon.	H. R. 9368. Walter Anderson.
H. R. 850. Alexander M. Rainey.	H. R. 9457. Edmund Gerber.
H. R. 1237. August Johns.	H. R. 9519. Dallas F. Jarvis.
H. R. 1380. Mary Gould.	H. R. 9568. Richard W. Lewis.
H. R. 1511. Harry J. Symonds.	H. R. 9641. Charlotte Poe.
H. R. 1514. James E. Watson.	H. R. 9762. Jonah E. Hill.
H. R. 1529. Emily Gerardin.	H. R. 9841. Harris D. Williamson.
H. R. 1645. William P. Walpole.	H. R. 10046. Thomas J. Reynolds.
H. R. 1647. Frank C. Lamp.	H. R. 10072. Frederick M. Hohmann.
H. R. 1657. Saray Dwyer.	H. R. 10166. Frank H. Campbell.
H. R. 1770. John F. W. Kuchenbecker.	H. R. 10276. Samuel B. McPheeters.
H. R. 2320. Sankey Gray.	H. R. 10432. Frank B. Norris.
H. R. 2559. Philip Bernhard.	H. R. 10609. Della A. Daubenspeck.
H. R. 2574. Ellen Kearns.	H. R. 10708. Hugh J. Gallagher.
H. R. 2583. John N. Parker.	H. R. 10732. Mary C. Ryan.
H. R. 2666. John C. Clark.	H. R. 10744. John J. Brogan.
H. R. 2716. R. Roy Hamdy.	H. R. 10819. Minnie Riddle.
H. R. 2771. Harvey C. Van Meter.	H. R. 10873. Bridget E. Williams.
H. R. 2786. Samuel Tygret.	H. R. 10882. Frank E. Hill.
H. R. 2877. Frank R. Porter.	H. R. 11022. Mary Buckley.
H. R. 3013. Julia M. Hill.	H. R. 11045. Thomas G. McEwan.
H. R. 3161. Martin H. Gavin.	H. R. 11214. John B. Lauer.
H. R. 3162. Mary A. Powell.	H. R. 11285. Francis M. Lamb.
H. R. 3768. Nora E. Singleton.	H. R. 11374. William B. Clouse.
H. R. 3769. Ambrose A. Clarke.	H. R. 11441. Joseph D. Donellen.
H. R. 3777. Frank B. Pauley.	H. R. 11451. Wiley A. Cadenhead.
H. R. 3913. Mary McKelvey.	H. R. 11576. Jesse J. Barnwell.
H. R. 4525. Thomas F. Muldoon.	H. R. 11732. Howard W. Bingham.
H. R. 4614. Alice T. McLaughry.	H. R. 11735. Clara B. Hatfield.
H. R. 5010. Christ Nelson.	H. R. 11760. William G. McCoy, jr.
H. R. 5076. Eliza L. Norwood.	H. R. 11812. Archie F. Pejano.
H. R. 5522. Joseph Roach.	H. R. 11856. Bessie G. Bloodgood.
H. R. 5907. Lena Griffie.	H. R. 11898. Louise Crane.
H. R. 5965. Oscar Smith.	H. R. 11906. Phillip Klaus.
H. R. 5967. John E. Seeger.	H. R. 12453. Alphonzine Bastian.
H. R. 6120. John W. Stroup.	H. R. 12510. Louis F. Moebus.
H. R. 6144. Fred Windgatter.	H. R. 12514. William A. Bannister.
H. R. 6300. Henry Dana.	H. R. 12596. Peter McVay.
H. R. 6628. Melvin P. Campbell.	H. R. 12694. Martha W. Hubbell.
H. R. 6965. Henry W. Akers.	H. R. 12738. Matilda Delisle.
H. R. 6967. Hyram Colwell.	H. R. 12809. James O. Cotman.
H. R. 7874. Frank E. Dorman.	H. R. 12945. Warren Whiteman.
H. R. 8147. Fred Reidy.	H. P. 12970. Barbara Henderson.
H. R. 8155. Patrick J. Hyde.	H. R. 13194. Henry Juvenile.
H. R. 8156. Clara B. Howe.	H. R. 13236. Mary Green.
H. R. 8193. Andy H. Fritzt.	H. R. 13241. Ralph H. Bryant.
H. R. 8394. Moses a. Reimert.	H. R. 13397. Elizabeth Commons.
H. R. 8396. Martin O'Loughlin.	H. R. 13414. John C. Koepflinger.
H. R. 8581. John McMahon.	H. R. 13657. Adolph Dirmeyer.
H. R. 8753. Fred Porter.	H. R. 13742. Roy Tow.
H. R. 9176. George H. Cope.	H. R. 13960. William H. Salsbury.
H. R. 9297. Charles P. Dovell.	H. R. 14056. Julia E. Jones.

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

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

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

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution authorizing the Librarian of Congress to return to Williamsburg Lodge, No. 6, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Virginia, the original manuscript of the record of the proceedings of said lodge.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, April 15, 1916, at 11 o'clock a. m.

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. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4876) to provide for an increase in the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 543), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COADY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13419) authorizing the sale of the lighthouse reservation at Scituate, Mass., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 545), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEWALT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12282) to establish a Coast Guard station on the coast of Louisiana in the vicinity of Barataria Bay, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 546), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6903) providing for the establishment of life-saving stations on Tybee Island, coast of Chatham County; on Warsaw Island, coast of Chatham County; on Osabaw Island, coast of Bryan County; on St. Catherines Island, coast of Liberty County; on Blackbeard Island and on Sapelo Island, coast of McIntosh County, all in the State of Georgia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 547), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COADY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13233) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to exchange lands belonging to the United States at the mouth of Crum River, Pa., for other lands adjacent thereto, for the purpose of removing thereto the Schooner Ledge Range Front Light, so that it may be on the range of the channel of the Delaware River, and further authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to remove said range light from its present location to the property acquired by the exchange, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 548), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GANDY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6430) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a court of private land claims and to provide for the settlement of private land claims in certain States and Territories," approved March 3, 1891, and the acts amendatory thereto, approved February 21, 1893, June 27, 1898, and February 26, 1909, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 549), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 3560) to validate a certain title whereon the purchase money has been paid on a private sale by order of the United States district court for the middle district of Pennsylvania, at No. 83, June term, 1910, sitting in bankruptcy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 542), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GANDY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10869) for the relief of the Mission Farm Co., Peter Volondra, and others, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 550), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11350) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Ivers; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13058) granting a pension to Henry Humphries; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13678) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Porter; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 14615) authorizing the establishment of a plant at or near Dubuque, Iowa, for the manufacture of munitions and implements of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 14616) for the relief of settlers who purchased land under the act of February 20, 1904; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 14617) to make April 13 of each and every year a public holiday in the District of Columbia, to be known as Jefferson Day; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 14618) to create the grade of aviator in the Signal Corps of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 14619) to provide for the development and operation by the United States Government of water power under its control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 14620) to extend the provisions of section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the sale of isolated tracts of the public domain, to ceded Chippewa Indian lands in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 14621) appropriating money for the improvement of the Mississippi River and the Dubuque ice harbor at Dubuque, Iowa; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOOD: A bill (H. R. 14622) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Clinton, Sampson County, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14623) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Morehead City, Carteret County, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 14624) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Sheldon, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14625) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Storm Lake, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14626) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Spencer, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE: A bill (H. R. 14627) to prohibit the issuance of licenses, permits, revenue stamps, or receipts for special taxes authorizing, licensing, or permitting the sale of spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors in certain cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: Resolution (H. Res. 201) directing the Committee on Printing to inquire into the sale by private parties of the document entitled "Messages and Papers of the Presidents," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SANFORD: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) authorizing the printing and binding of additional copies of Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States for the use of Members of the Sixty-fourth Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. McLEMORE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 199) opposing the withdrawal of the United States troops from Mexico and authorizing and directing the President to send such reinforcement as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of the expedition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 200) proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to authorize uniform laws on the subject of marriage and divorce, and to provide penalties for enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 201) proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to authorize uniform laws on the subject of marriage and divorce, and to provide penalties for enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 14628) granting a pension to Oliver W. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 14629) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Bearden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 14630) to quiet title in certain citizens to certain lands lying within the meander line on the St. Francis River, and being parts of lots and tracts of land lying in Craighead County, Ark.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DIES: A bill (H. R. 14631) for the relief of J. B. Fleming; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14632) for the relief of R. L. Jennings; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 14633) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Ransier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 14634) granting an increase of pension to Simeon A. Freer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 14635) granting a pension to Alexander Seals; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 14636) granting an increase of pension to Jesse B. Rich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 14637) granting a pension to George W. Carroll; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HEATON: A bill (H. R. 14638) granting a pension to Michael P. Foley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 14639) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William H. Dooley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 14640) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Marsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 14641) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Kissinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 14642) granting a pension to Eliza J. Conover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 14643) granting an increase of pension to Frank C. Andrews; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAGEE: A bill (H. R. 14644) providing for refund to the Haberle-Crystal Spring Brewing Co. of a sum paid in excess of a certain special excise tax; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 14645) for the relief of the legal representative of P. H. Aylett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14646) granting a pension to Harvey M. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 14647) to amend the military record of James P. Kirby; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 14648) granting a pension to J. Horace Keeter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14649) granting a pension to Thomas M. Baswell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14650) granting a pension to George E. Turpin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14651) granting a pension to William O. Stover; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14652) granting a pension to Joseph L. Rollins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14653) granting a pension to Fred. H. Penland; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14654) granting a pension to Thomas H. Emory; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 14655) granting an increase of pension to William Girdler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14656) granting an increase of pension to Pius W. Wanner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 14657) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Corcoran; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 14658) granting an increase of pension to John H. Peck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 14659) granting an increase of pension to Otis Hull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14660) for the relief of Mrs. Martha J. Couchman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 14661) to correct the military record of Edward Carter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: A bill (H. R. 14662) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Fleming; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY: Protest of F. B. McFeaters, E. F. Griffith, H. Stanley Pringle, J. T. Higgins, J. H. Layman, R. H. Wisinger, A. W. Dolaway, Charles S. Moore, Thomas G. Ford, John Hourli, J. L. Woodside, W. H. Miller, Joshua Bracker, C. E. Griffith, C. L. Irwin, Samuel Page, Fred Beals, C. D. Blyler, Elmer Lantz, D. C. Dryuca, A. W. Eichelberger, William Grove, Ashbury F. Grove, Joe A. Beers, W. H. Ulerick, and William R. Ullery, all of Johnstown, Pa., against the passage of House bills 491 and 6468, denying admission to the mails to certain publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions from the following citizens of Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware, favoring the speedy enactment of House bill 13281, amending the tariff so as to admit free the products of any American country which will admit our products free: C. M. Hoose, Glenside, Pa.; J. K. Mandenbare, 926 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Geer Wise, 926 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; J. MacDougall, 926 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; J. Nelson Farrell, Sixth and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.; J. H. Warner, Sixth and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.; M. G. Brown, Sixth and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.; Frederic E. Beldin, Burlington, N. J.; George H. Garland, Camden, N. J.; Frank O. Donaldson, Sixth and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.; Howard Ackerman, Drexel Hill, Pa.; Deyton P. Clark, 530 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; H. L. Ashinfelter, Sixth and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.; Fredrick W. Powel, Glenside, Pa.; William G. Hought, 408 Midland Avenue, Wayne; William M. Callahan, Haddon Heights, N. J.; Samuel Milliken, The Newport, Philadelphia, Pa.; Hon. L. Ross, Arden, N. J.; Edward Spranger, Grantwood, N. J.; William R. McKnight, Philadelphia, Pa.; Charles Horn, Philadelphia, Pa.; William R. Emsley, Camden, N. J.; Charles Schrahs, 2035 Moscher Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Joseph Clark, 1517 West Lehigh Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. William Meyerson, 718 North Eighth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; William C. Mickle, 222 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; William J. Harden, 1915 South Twenty-first Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; John Fullerton, 1302 Spring Garden, Philadelphia, Pa.; John J. Kane, 1926 South Twenty-first Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; David R. Emsley, 2407 North Fifth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Timothy J. Connelly, 2045 South Croskey Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Antonio Bastida, 111 Broadway, New York City; J. P. Hansen, 70 West Sixteenth Street, Whitestown; G. J. Mullan, 151 South Pearl Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; F. E. Mayer, 3739 North Franklin Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; John W. Dix, 1422 North Allison Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; James A. Robinson, 1214 Spring Garden, Philadelphia, Pa.; Oliver McKnight, 213 St. Marks Square, Philadelphia, Pa.; Louis Kramer, 510 Shirley Street, Wilmington, Del.; William J. Schaeffer, 2218 Brown Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; William E. Smith, 2749 Earl Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; John Johnston, 5417 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Richard C. Lambus, Camden, N. J.; J. B. C. Chamberlain, Philadelphia, Pa.; L. W. Marks, Continental Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa.; High F. Miemew, 1737 North Fifth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Thomas Barnes, 1815 Fabut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Max Vecek, 218 North Fourth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Charles D. Ryan, Spring Mondt, Pa.; L. Ryan, Ardinon, Pa.; Mike Cook, 113 Kinnelworth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; John William Wright, 604 Fourth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; John Goldsmith, 1524 South Ninth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Charles Richeal, 4439 Thompson Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; S. A. Gallagher, 1411 South Porter Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; George H. Litz, 1221 West Third Street, Wilmington, Del.; R. G. Brown, 30 Landsale Avenue; Lorene W. Uinghny, 221 North Cornell Street; George Logace, 1105 Oak Street; William H. Whiteside, 223 Woodlawn Avenue; F. W. Barnes, 317 West Twenty-sixth Street; Peter Orth, 41 East Twenty-second Street; George J. Jacobs, 2003 West Sixth Street; R. L. Rosin, 915 West Fourth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; G. B. Baylis, 2 Concord Avenue; William H. Haley, 1004 West

Eighth Street; John E. Riley, 419 North Franklin Street; Jacob Ostin, Madison Street; Samuel Wallace, 627 East Seventh Street, Wilmington, Del.; John Deisley, 17 East Fourth Street; Jefferson Whitman, Newark, Del.; W. W. Henry, 1021 Lancaster Avenue, Wilmington, Del.; F. E. Cheffins, Newport, Del.; John J. Henry, 927 Lancaster Avenue, Wilmington, Del.; William Fredrick, Marshall Avenue; William F. Haney, 823 West Second Street, Wilmington, Del.; George Boder, 300 Madison Street, Wilmington, Del.; John F. Grant, 129 Monroe Street; Clarence Campbell, 223 Totnal Avenue; Charles G. Waterman, 1631 West Eighth Street; Benjamin F. Price, 1123 West Fourth Street; John Wallsworth, 905 Monroe Street, Wilmington, Del.; Murat Z. Johnson, 5915 Carpenter Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; John G. Whiteside, 137 Harvey Street, Germantown, Pa.; M. C. Pronan, Sixth and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.; E. W. Tomlinson, 512 Arthur Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Charles G. Rule, 4835 Baltimore Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.; F. A. Reddy, 235 North Hobart Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; C. J. Hebley, Prospect Park, Pa.; Laurence L. Stevens, 4638 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; and David S. Roodruff, 5029 Walton Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of Illinois, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DILL: Petition of Mr. E. F. Knapp and other citizens of Park Rapids and Colville, Wash., protesting against the passage of House bills 6468 and 491; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition against House bills 491, 6468, and 652, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Mr. E. F. Knapp and other residents of Park Rapids, Wash., protesting against the passage of House bill 652; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of I. O. Brown, of Spokane, Wash., and others, protesting against the passage of House bills 491 and 6468; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of E. Fuller and other citizens of Colville, Wash., protesting against the passage of House bill 652, for Sunday closing in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of G. A. Hollinger, of North Bergen, N. J., against passage of House bill 13048, to create a juvenile court in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ELSTON: Memorial of Richmond Chamber of Commerce, favoring location of new naval academy at Richmond, Cal.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of La Crosse Board of Trade, favoring the establishment of a United States shipping board; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of Fifth Avenue Association on National Defense, favoring adequate national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Anti-imperialist League, Boston, Mass., favoring passage of the Philippine bill; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of citizens of Waltonville, Mount Vernon, Bluford, and Mount Carmel, Ill., in support of House bills 270 and 712; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Arminia Wilson and others, favoring House bill 463, to increase widows' pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER: Memorial of Major How Post, Woman's Relief Corps, of Haverhill, Mass., favoring passage of widows' pension bill, known as the Ashbrook pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition in connection with House bill 13918 and other legislation for the disposal of the Oregon & California Railroad land-grant matter; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, against compulsory Sunday observance day in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petitions of J. W. Goodwin and 97 other residents of San Diego; of I. C. Davis and 23 others, of Escondido; of D. C. Mendenhall, San Diego; of Mrs. Ed. Steele, San Diego; of Mrs. Mary Wilkerson, San Diego; and 1 other of San Diego, all in the State of California, protesting against House bills 6468 and 491, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of I. C. Davis and 17 residents of Escondido; of Mrs. Mary Wilkerson and 1 other resident of San Diego; of Mrs. R. Haddon, San Diego; of D. C. Mendenhall, San Diego; of Mrs. H. E. Highle, San Diego; and of Mrs. E. Brown, San Diego, all in the State of California, protesting against Senate bill 645, to provide for the closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday, or any other like religious measure; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of George W. Vogler, of Ocean Beach, Cal., protesting against House bill 8348, making Columbus Day a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of San Diego Chamber of Commerce, Ed. F. Stahl, executive secretary, San Diego, Cal., favoring House bill 5806, providing for opening up the nearest ample supply of high-grade coal for the use of our Navy and merchant marine in southwestern Pacific waters; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, petition of the United Commercial Travelers of America, A. E. Clark, secretary, San Diego, Cal., favoring inspection of creameries; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Robert P. Reagan, A. H. Gould, E. Zenkner, Helen Zenkner, Gustav Kranz, Franklin P. Jacobus, G. A. Eaton, Marie S. Eaton, and Henry Lohman, all of San Diego, Cal., favoring strict neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial of the Fifth Avenue Association on National Defense, urging prompt action on national defense as recommended by the General Board of the Navy and the General Staff of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, opposing the enactment into law of House bill 10405, grain grades act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of J. C. Batement and 7 other citizens of Hope, Mich., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: Petition of citizens of Dixon, Ill., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAGEE (by request): Petition of R. N. Wallace and others, of Syracuse, N. Y., against House bill 13048, to create a juvenile court in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of 51 citizens of Ottawa, Kent, and Muskegon Counties, Mich., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: Resolution adopted by the Ladies' Literary Society of Napoleon, Henry County, Ohio, favoring a movement to take the administration of Indian affairs out of politics and establish a nonpartisan commission for the administration of Indian affairs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania: Petitions of 252 citizens of Seneca, 25 people of Oil City, 60 people of Oil City, 1,027 people of Oil City, Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Oil City, 40 people of Oil City, 12 people of Oil City, 50 people of Oil City, and 50 people of Oil City, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 620 people of Warren, Pa., opposing passage of House bill 6468; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NEELY: Petition of citizens of Ohio County, W. Va., protesting against House bills 491 and 6468; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petition of Woman's Club, Lodi, Cal., favoring bill for national park service and appropriation for Yosemite National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of citizens of Standish, Cal., against passage of compulsory Sunday-observance bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fernando, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of First Methodist Episcopal Sunday School of Pasadena, Cal., favoring prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of 43 citizens of Portland, Oreg., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STINESS: Petitions of 70 people of Portsmouth and 850 people of Providence, R. I., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Fearless Club, of Providence, R. I., favoring the bills in the interest of superannuated employees in the

Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Rhode Island Chapter, American Institute of Architects, favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution 92, regarding site for a central power plant in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of Washington Park Yacht Club, of Providence, R. I., protesting pending bills regulating the operation of motor boats; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: Petition of 43 citizens of Spencer, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, April 15, 1916.

(Legislative day of Friday, April 14, 1916.)

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 4889) to permanently renew patent No. 21053 with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 12481. An act granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy;

H. R. 14484. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 14576. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) authorizing the Librarian of Congress to return to Williamsburg Lodge, No. 6, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Virginia, the original manuscript of the record of the proceedings of said lodge, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 8351. An act to accept a deed of gift or conveyance from the Lincoln Farm Association, a corporation, to the United States of America, of land near the town of Hodgenville, county of Larue, State of Kentucky, embracing the homestead of Abraham Lincoln and the log cabin in which he was born, together with the memorial hall inclosing the same; and, further, to accept an assignment or transfer of an endowment fund of \$50,000 in relation thereto, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Library.

H. R. 12481. An act granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Patents.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 14484. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 14576. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

Mr. CLAPP. I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4889) to permanently renew patent No. 21053.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The amendments were, in line 6, to strike out "permanently"; in line 7, after "extended," to insert "for a period of 14 years from and after the passage of this act"; in line 9, after "Revolution," to strike out all down to and including "office," in line 12; and to amend the title so as to read "An act to renew patent No. 21053."