

Also, petition of citizens of Timnath, Fort Collins, and Loveland, Larimer County, and Fort Morgan, Colo., against passage of bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, April 8, 1916.

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 30, 1916.)

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Secretary call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Jones	Pittman	Sutherland
Brady	Kenyon	Poindexter	Swanson
Chamberlain	Kern	Ransdell	Taggart
Clapp	Lane	Reed	Thomas
Clarke, Ark.	Lodge	Robinson	Thompson
Cummins	McCumber	Saulsbury	Tillman
Curtis	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Vardaman
Dillingham	Myers	Sheppard	Warren
du Pont	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	Weeks
Gaillinger	Norris	Smith, S. C.	Williams
Husting	Overman	Smoot	
Johnson, Me.	Owen	Sterling	
Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Stone	

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] on official business. He is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY].

I also desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] on account of illness. These announcements will stand for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is not present. The Secretary will furnish the Sergeant at Arms with a list of absentees and that officer is directed to request their attendance.

Mr. HARDWICK entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

POTOMAC POWER PLANT.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. President, I have a communication from the Indianapolis Board of Trade, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the communication was read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, as follows:

THE INDIANAPOLIS BOARD OF TRADE,
Indianapolis, Ind., April 6, 1916.

HON. THOMAS TAGGART,

DEAR SIR: In accordance with action taken by the governing committee of the Indianapolis Board of Trade, I am inclosing copy of resolution relative to the Government power plant at Washington, adopted by the committee at its regular monthly meeting, Monday evening, April 3, 1916.

Yours, very truly,

WM. H. HOWARD, Secretary.

The governing committee of the Indianapolis Board of Trade, at its regular monthly meeting, April 3, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the Park Commission plans for the future development of Washington resulting from the careful study of the many plans and able suggestions offered to the Government from time to time are based on the plan laid out over 100 years ago by Washington and Jefferson; and

"Whereas these plans offer to the Nation's Capital a tangible, economical system for the location of its public buildings, bridges, statutory, highways, neighborhood parks, and a practical solution for connecting Potomac Park, National Zoological Park, Rock Creek Park, Soldiers' Home Park, and the Eastern Branch Park, the Arsenal, the Mall, and Arlington through a system of smaller parks, drives, and bridges; and

"Whereas the Park Commission plans have been indorsed by two Presidents, by the Government-appointed Fine Arts Council, the National Commission of Fine Arts, the Lincoln Memorial Commission, and by many local, national, and foreign, business, civic, municipal, architectural, labor, scientific, patriotic, and landscape societies; and

"Whereas the location of a Government power plant near the center of the park system composed of East Potomac Park, Riverside Park, Arlington, and the Mall—this building and site has been condemned as unsightly and marring the Park Commission plans by the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the location has been proved uneconomical by eminent electrical and mechanical engineers—will interfere with the development of the river front, and the building and smokestacks will detract from the dignity of the buildings, monuments, and parks, and be destructive of the beauty of the parks: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the governing committee of the Indianapolis Board of Trade approve the Park Commission plans and earnestly urge upon Congress the importance of enacting a law directing that the development of Washington be according to these plans under the advice of the National Commission of Fine Arts; and be it

"Resolved, That we urge upon the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States that they reconsider the location of the Government power plant on the site selected; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be mailed to the President, our representatives in both branches of Congress, our local newspapers, and to Glenn Brown, chairman of the Committee of One Hundred on the Development of Washington, 806 Seventeenth Street NW, Washington, D. C."

GEO. H. EVANS, President.

Attest:

WM. H. HOWARD, Secretary.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, requested the Senate to return to the House the bill (H. R. 10384) to regulate the immigration of aliens and the residence of aliens in the United States.

IMMIGRATION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the request of the House of Representatives for the return of the bill (H. R. 10384) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States. The Committee on Immigration will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and the request of the House of Representatives will be complied with.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President, in connection with the recent debate on that portion of the bill now before us which referred to the Federal volunteers, and incidentally to the military training camps, I present a letter from the secretary of the Military Training Camps Association, together with a copy of a letter to the governing committee of that association from the Secretary of War, which, as throwing light on the whole question, which was so long debated, I ask may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read, unless there is objection. The Chair hears none.

The Secretary read as follows:

NEW YORK CITY, April 6, 1916.

HON. HENRY A. DU PONT,

United States Senate, the Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In connection with the debate on the Federal volunteer provision (sec. 56) of the Chamberlain bill, questions have been raised as to the precise extent and character of the Federal training-camp movement. We wish the Senate to have full and authentic information as to the scope and present status of the camps, and respectfully present the following facts.

Camps announced for 1916 by the commanders of the four military departments are as follows:

EASTERN DEPARTMENT.

Fort Oglethorpe, Ga.: Three camps—May 3 to August 8.

Plattsburg, N. Y.: Five camps—June 3 to October 5.

CENTRAL DEPARTMENT.

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indianapolis, Ind.: Three camps—July 5 to October 5.

SOUTHERN DEPARTMENT.

San Antonio, Tex.: One camp—June 12 to July 8.

Galveston, Tex.: One camp—June 5 to July 1.

WESTERN DEPARTMENT.

Monterey, Cal.: One camp—July 10 to August 5.

Salt Lake City, Utah: July.

American Lake, Wash.: July.

Recruiting for these camps has hardly yet been started, but already 3,503 men have actually signed for the Plattsburg camps and considerable numbers (exact figures not at hand) for the other camps. Plattsburg enrollments are coming in at the rate of over 100 per day; and as enrollments for all camps will greatly increase later in the season, we can safely estimate a minimum final enrollment as follows:

Eastern department camps.....	15,000
Central department camps.....	7,000
Southern department camps.....	2,000
Western department camps.....	6,000

Total..... 30,000

We are informed that requests for camps are being made by various States and communities, especially in the Central West, which the War Department can not grant because of a lack of officers and troops.

The Military Training Camps Association is national in scope, and maintains various offices and local committees at a number of points in all sections of the country. It is directed by a governing committee of 50, including representative citizens who have attended the camps and a number of university presidents.

The camps have always had the approval and support of the War Department, but never any legislative recognition or support. The men have paid their own expenses, including transportation and uniforms, the total amounting to an average of at least \$60 per man. The enrollments for the 1916 camps are being made on the same basis, due to lack of any Federal legislation.

The great employers, such as the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., the Western Union Telegraph Co., and the United States Steel Corporation, have offered their cooperation and will grant four weeks' vacation for their employees to attend.

A recent letter from the Secretary of War, indicating his full approval of the training-camp movement, is inclosed. We shall be glad to furnish any further information desired by any Senator.

We have no quarrel with the National Guard. Many of our most active men are National Guardsmen.

We wish only to be given authority to continue our work, in which thousands of men, from coast to coast, are interested.

Yours, respectfully,

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, MILITARY TRAINING CAMPS
ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
By GRANVILLE CLARK, Secretary.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1916.

To the Governing Committee of the Military Training Camps Association of the United States.

GENTLEMEN: I heartily approve and indorse the valuable and patriotic service that is being rendered to the country by the Army training camps for civilians.

I believe in the work of these camps, not only from the military point of view but as of value to the Nation educationally in promoting discipline, order, and good citizenship. The camps are exactly in line with the sound policy of reliance upon a citizenry trained to arms as our main safeguard for defense.

I appreciate highly the service rendered by the university presidents and civilian committees who are forwarding this movement.

These camps were originated by the War Department in 1913 for the training of students, and have been since extended for the benefit of other citizens with gratifying results.

You may rest assured that in continuing your work of developing and promoting these camps on a national scale you will have the continued cooperation and support of the War Department.

Yours, most sincerely,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, in connection with the communication tendered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] there is an observation I wish to make with a view of clarifying what appears to be some obscure or certainly confused situation.

The vast number of telegrams which have come into this body indicate that in certain sections of the country there has been expressed the conviction that the Senate on one side or the other is opposing these training camps. I should like to have it clear that there has been no issue in the Senate as to these training camps, and on neither side of the Senate has there been expressed any opposition whatever, and no vote and no debate on either side of the Senate has involved the question.

Since there seems to be a mistaken idea throughout all parts of the country that section 56 involves that question, it is well to have it clear now that up to the present time, I think all Senators on both sides will agree, there has been no opposition whatever expressed to the camps, but every expression of encouragement.

SCIENCE OF HOME ECONOMICS.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in accordance with the notice I gave last evening, I desire to address the Senate for a few moments.

Mr. President, the Senate has been considering for some days past the question of increasing the Army of the United States for the better protection of our country, and I am now going to make a few brief remarks on a bill introduced by me on March 25 providing for an increased annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations, to be used in researches and experiments in home economics and regulating the expenditure thereof, the purpose of which is to better prepare the girls and mothers of our country for the life duties of practically all of them. For the past four years I have been endeavoring to secure favorable action by the Senate on bills of similar import, and sincerely trust that at this session of Congress legislation along the lines outlined in the bill will be enacted into law.

As each year passes the necessity for such legislation becomes more and more apparent. I hope I can have the attention of the Senate for a short time while I give some of the reasons why I have been pressing such legislation and why I believe favorable action should be taken on my bill and at the same time, if possible, on the bill now upon the calendar in which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] and many of us are so deeply interested. Similar bills introduced by me have in the past received the hearty approval of the Department of Agriculture, also the support of hundreds of the leading educators, both men and women, of our country, and of a very great number of women's organizations. I have the letters of indorsement, but will not burden the Record with them. A letter signed by Hon. B. T. Galloway, then Acting Secretary of Agriculture, dated February 14, 1914, addressed to Senator GORE, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, in answer to a request that a report be made on Senate bill 280, contains this statement:

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your recent letter, together with Senate bill 280, providing for an increased annual appropriation for agricul-

tural experiment stations, to be used in researches in home economics, etc. I note your request that a report be made on this bill.

The bill would provide for the experimental study in the agricultural experiment stations of home economics, including both domestic science and domestic art problems; i. e., it would provide for the experimental study of the nature and use in the home of food materials, wool, cotton, and other agricultural products which the housekeeper uses to feed, clothe, and otherwise care for her family and home. It is with such problems that home economics is concerned. The teaching of home economics has already been organized in the agricultural and other colleges and in numerous schools throughout the United States. In recent years the extension movement has been organized on a large scale, and this includes the dissemination and demonstration of information on home economics. The Congress has just passed a bill granting money to all the States for extension work in home economics as well as agriculture. This independent movement for instructions and demonstration in home economics can not be developed properly unless there are back of it agencies for investigation, through which tested, reliable, and new knowledge on the subject may be constantly acquired. There would, therefore, appear to be need for experimental inquiries in home economics at the present time.

The bill S. 280, as drawn, follows practically the language used in the act of March 16, 1906, commonly known as the Adams Act. Since the passage of the Adams Act there has been a material change in public sentiment with regard to the relation of the Federal Government and the States in so far as concerns educational and similar work.

The Hoke Smith-Lever bill, above referred to, lays down a principle which, it seems, should be given due weight in considering any further legislation affecting the agricultural colleges and the State experiment stations. It is a principle involving the equal sharing by the States and the Federal Government of the expenses of the work. We believe this principle should be adopted in connection with the bill under consideration. We believe, furthermore, that the appropriation, if made, should begin with a moderate sum and be cumulative, just as is the case with the Hoke Smith-Lever bill. I have submitted this proposition to some of the leading experiment-stations workers and they for the most part approve the plan. Their comments are submitted herewith as Exhibit A.

It is our view that it would be unwise at this time to make so large an appropriation as \$10,000 to each State. Research in home economics opens a new field. The work, therefore, should be begun in a conservative way. We are of the opinion that \$2,500 would suffice to inaugurate this work, with an additional \$2,500 thereafter for three years, provided the States appropriate an equal amount. In any event, each station would receive \$2,500 from the Federal Government and \$2,500 each year for three consecutive years, provided the States meet the appropriation until the total from the Federal Government would equal \$10,000. Thereafter the appropriation would be \$10,000 annually. Some further changes are made in the bill to make it conform in general to the plan worked out in the Hoke Smith-Lever measure. All these amendments we have brought together in the form of a new bill, which is submitted as Exhibit B. There is also submitted, as Exhibit C, Senate bill No. 280, with the amendments proposed inserted, in order that the committee may see exactly what changes have been made.

I shall be pleased to furnish any additional information if such is required.

Exhibit A, referred to in the letter of the Acting Secretary, consists of letters addressed to him by Hon. Charles E. Thorne, director of the Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station; Hon. F. B. Mumford, dean and director of the College of Agriculture and Experiment Station of the University of Missouri; Hon. A. F. Woods, dean and director of the department of agriculture of the University of Minnesota; and Hon. H. J. Waters, president of the Kansas State Agricultural College, which I ask to have incorporated in the Record at the end of my remarks without reading.

It is generally acknowledged that upon our splendid system of popular education, as much as any other single influence, rests the greatness and glory of our Nation. Notwithstanding the splendid results of our school system, it still falls short of present-day requirements. We should not forget that it is less than 100 years since it was a debatable question in New England whether the State was justified in teaching more than "readin', writin', and cipherin'," and whether it was worth while at all to educate the girls. The change has been gradual; every advance has met with opposition. I predict the day will come when every child in America, rich or poor, will be required by law to have an education and training necessary for a life of usefulness and good citizenship. Our girls must be so educated in order to insure successful homes, which are the basis of all powerful and self-sustaining nations.

The education furnished by our agricultural colleges should be that which will make for the highest and most useful citizenship and best fit the individual for the duties and responsibilities of life that must be met and assumed. As much attention should be given to the preparation and education of the girl as the boy; as much demonstration work taken to the home as is carried to the farm. In order that this may be accomplished our agricultural experiment stations must have the appropriation provided for in my bill so that the necessary researches and experiments can be carried on and the acquired information taken by the demonstrators provided for in the recent Smith-Lever bill.

The question as to whether "it is worth while to educate girls" has been answered unequivocally in the affirmative. In this twentieth century the woman is no longer a mere drudge, a convenience, a something to satisfy the wishes and demands of the man. To-day, in America at least, we find her as counselor and partner, as God intended her to be.

In our struggle for liberty and higher national ideals woman has been our inspiration in the past and is our hope for the future. No matter what woman's aims, her hopes, or ambitions may be, or what avocations she may decide to enter, it will always remain for her to find her greatest reward and happiness as a successful home maker. The most unselfish and holy duties in our existence have been committed by our Heavenly Father to the wife and mother. What shall we think of a person or a people so ignorant or so parsimonious that would deny her any opportunity to fit herself for this special calling? Not only is the individual benefited by an education but the Nation is immensely profited by every one of its citizens receiving a sensible and practical education. Such an education means to a nation better citizenship, unquestioned loyalty, and temporal development. To the individual it means increased chances in obtaining positions of responsibility and power; self-independence; a broader view and conception of life; loftier ideals; greater usefulness to one's self; and greater appreciation for the wonders and beauties of nature. No school, college, or university that fails to fit the individual for the duties and responsibilities of life, that fails to teach morality, thrift, and industry can, in my opinion, be classed as successful. I believe in and am an advocate of vocational education for our boys and a complete home economics' course for our girls. Let the student come in contact with the actual affairs of life as well as the theories. Direct their hands and eyes as well as their minds. Teach them not to be idle, "for he that is idle shall not eat the bread, nor wear the garments of the laborer." Impress upon them all that work is honorable.

The household is a unit of social progress. It implies marriage, family, and the home. Household science is so closely related to sociology or human experience in social living that sociologists often make the statement that household science is but an application of their ideals. The home ought to and by right should be the place in which the soul can develop and grow. Contentions, ignorance, wastefulness, idleness, and a lack of harmony retard that development and growth and blunt the finer sensibilities of every inmate of the household. Home economics inspires an interest in home life and daily duties. It stimulates economy, industry, neatness, individuality, and self-control. Knowing this to be true, I hope that nothing will be left undone in providing an opportunity for all American girls of every walk of life to study the real things of life—the fascinating problems of home economics.

I am one who believes that much of the world's poverty, misery, drunkenness, and disease come from poorly prepared food. It is a crime, and is wicked in the sight of God to have the products of the farm made next to useless by poor cooking. Tens of thousands of homes are ruined by helpless and ignorant housekeepers, and the American garbage can is the fattest in all the world. No one questions the fact that the food consumption per capita in America is larger than that of any other country in the world and nearly twice that of thrifty France. The way to lessen these evils is to provide an annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations to be used in researches and experiments in home economics; and if this step is taken by Congress it will not be many years until the same system is established throughout our entire school system. Our present plan of education will be changed, or perhaps I had better say extended, and when that blessed day arrives our schools, colleges, and universities will studiously employ themselves in carrying civilization with all its blessings downward to the girls of the home and the boys and men of the farm. In saying this I do not wish to be understood as meaning there will be a lowering of standards of scholarship, culture, discipline, or research in our future system of education. Such a thing is unthinkable; it can not be, as every course of study will be dedicated to the better preparation of students for the higher and nobler duties of life. Such an education will not only develop a more contented, healthy, loyal, and home-loving people, but it will prevent billions of dollars of waste that is worse than loss to the American homes to-day. I shall briefly refer to some facts we are all familiar with to demonstrate what I mean. It is a well-known fact that the aggregate value of farm products for the year 1913 was placed at \$10,000,000,000 by our Department of Agriculture. The approximate cash income of the farmers of the United States, even in ordinary times, is known to be at least \$5,000,000,000. It is hardly possible for the ordinary mind to grasp the full meaning of \$10,000,000,000, but comparisons are sometimes easier to understand, so I will say that the value of the farm products of the United States in 1913 was twice as great as their value in 1899 and over a billion and a half dollars greater than they were in the year 1909. These figures tell the story as forcibly as it is possible to do of the advancing cost of living, for the volume

of increase of farm crops since 1899 has not kept pace with the increase of values. Any action on the part of organizations or State legislatures, any legislation by Congress that will assist the people in acquiring a knowledge that will prevent the destruction or waste of products of the farm or factory will be the greatest blessing that can be conferred upon the American home and Nation.

We must not forget that the influences that affect the family to a degree affect the Nation. In my opinion, waste and extravagance in their thousand forms are among the curses of the age, and no people upon the face of the earth is so guilty of both of these evils as our own American people. The people of the United States—I bar no class—have been living at a higher and higher standard for the last 15 years. The time has arrived when further advances in the mode of living must cease, and it is really desirous from every point of view for a retrenchment; but I recognize that a return to the old methods of economizing is hardly possible. I know it is a difficult matter for a family either to begin or to determine just where or how to begin to economize. It is so much easier to add comforts to home life than eliminate them. Extravagance and waste, which devour so much of the substance of the people, have much to do with the cost that is severely felt; that is, the cost to people of small means, who find it hard to get on in comfort with such incomes as they possess.

There is a fundamental principle of economics, so simple that it ought to be easily understood, and yet its significance is almost unheeded. It is this: Everything that goes to support life and to satisfy human wants must be continually produced for that purpose by human effort through the employment of capital and labor from the resources of nature. There is only what is thus produced to live upon; that is the supply. It is a question of how much is consumed in living, and it can not be more than the production, at least for any length of time. If products are squandered or wasted or thrown away after they are ready for consumption, the supply will be diminished, while the demand remains the same, and the cost of living will be higher than it would otherwise be. These are not questions of abstract theory, but are elementary facts within the comprehension of any ordinary man. We need to be reminded that whatever goes to waste and extravagance, which is reckoned in terms of money, is not a mere throwing away of dollars or depleting of bank accounts or getting away with inherited or accumulated property. It is using up the fruits of labor, which is going on from day to day. This is exceeding the supply of products and turning from the form of necessities and comforts to those of luxuries. It is largely the voluntary cost of high living that causes the involuntary cost of low living.

In a very short investigation and from sources I have every confidence in, I find that domestic science is not taught in a single one of the following colleges for women: Wellesley, at Wellesley, Mass.; Bryn Mawr, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; Vassar, at Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Mount Holyoke, at South Hadley, Mass.; Smith's, at Northampton, Mass.; and Swarthmore, coeducational, at Swarthmore, Pa. In nearly all of these schools four years of preparatory Latin are positively required. A permit to substitute four years of German for three years of Latin is denied. Perhaps it can be expressed better by saying that these colleges consider proficiency in a dead language of more importance than proficiency in a modern language.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator may be accurate in the list of colleges he has given where household economics are not taught, but it is a fact that I think is undeniable that in the preparatory schools from which the girls go to these colleges they do have training in economics.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true, Mr. President, in almost every State in the Union, but only to a limited degree.

This simply means that our leading schools for girls do not teach the one thing that every girl should be taught, namely, how to manage a home. I am in full sympathy with the splendid work accomplished by our magnificent schools for girls. I believe in the refining influences they exert upon their students. I am an advocate of the highest education possible for woman, but I do believe no woman's education is complete until she knows how to and could, if required, manage a home successfully.

I know you often hear it said college women will not have to do their own work; but will be able, if single or married, to keep household servants. This implies that washing dishes, sweeping and dusting, and cleaning are all there is to house-

keeping. Never was there a greater mistake. Even where the financial condition of the family will allow paying the present high wages, competent servants are few and hard to find. The best servants are those trained by a woman capable of showing them how everything should be done in a well-managed home. The wife of a man with a limited income can make a home happier in proportion to her ability to make the most of every cent she receives and prepare the food for the family in the most tasty and wholesome way. The wife of a wealthy man has even greater opportunities for making the home ideal, but whether it is a home of affluence or poverty it is of the greatest importance that the wife should be capable of properly performing or directing her own household affairs. We can not deny that untold numbers of wives and mothers in this country spend their time and energy in the preparation of the meals for the family without the least knowledge of the nutritive value of the food selected. How humiliating it must be to a wife and how discouraging to a husband to have good, fresh, wholesome food-stuffs made into the most indigestible dishes, and perhaps half the time absolutely ruined by poor cooking.

A few years ago in a bulletin issued in the course of home economics in the University of Wisconsin this statement was made:

More than ten billions are spent in the United States annually for food, shelter, and clothing; that 90 per cent of this vast sum is spent by women who have no adequate knowledge of money values.

It is pointed out that in any other avocation of life the persons interested with such expenditures would be required to pass through a rigid system of training. The State is taxed to provide instructions in the principles governing the production of raw material and the manufacture of those raw materials into the finished product. Woman should be trained to use this material so that there will be the least possible waste of time or money and the best results obtained.

The day will come when it will be unpopular for a young girl to boast that she does not know the first thing about house-keeping; that she doubts whether she could boil water without scorching it; and that she never sewed a stitch in her life. If I am mistaken in this prediction, God have mercy on our future American homes! The mothers of any of these same girls would never consent, and I approve of their position, to the marriage of her daughter to a man without preparation or capacity for making a living and providing a home for her; yet she would not think it improper on her part to let that daughter marry a good, honest, hard-working man with absolutely no knowledge of how to take care of a home.

The alarming increase in divorce, in wrecked homes, in increased doctor bills, is due to ignorance of woman's highest responsibilities. The press and magazines of the country are filled with articles advocating legislation for the better education of our boys. Plans for improving our present educational system are being constantly suggested and adopted. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is often found the expressions of Members of Congress along the same line, the greater part of which I most heartily approve; but we seldom see or hear one word in advocacy of the better preparation and education of our girls. In my opinion, it is just as important that woman should be properly educated as that man should be.

I had the pleasure of spending an evening a short time ago with a very dear friend of mine, a man who has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in general educational work. He remarked that if he was beginning life anew he would interest himself more in the education of girls than of boys, because the mother is the most potent force in the establishment of the highest character of the home.

Let us never forget that good housekeepers have much to do with making ideal and happy homes. I deprecate the growing tendency among the middle and well-to-do class of our girls of classifying domestic work with that done by the most ignorant servants. Home economics in its truest sense stands for culture, science, and art, and requires the broadest kind of general education. There are more real advantages to a people and greater blessings to a home gained through a knowledge of the fundamental principles of home economics than through any other kind of education for woman. Show me the woman who takes a personal interest in the preparation of the food for the home and is not dependent upon a servant to tell her how it should be cooked or served, takes an interest in her flowers and is not afraid to dig in the dirt, and I will show you a woman that is happy and a good wife.

The addition of home economics in the truest form to our educational system must come and will come as soon as it is properly understood by Congress. Increased production from the soil and the problem of properly feeding our ever-increasing numbers will tax the abilities of our statesmen. The passage

of the Smith-Lever bill has assisted the farmers of our country; the passage of Senate bill 5273 will be of untold value to American homes. The Smith-Lever bill provides for the demonstration work; my bill provides for conducting original or confirmatory researches or experiments bearing directly upon home economics, including both domestic science and domestic art, and disseminating the results.

Miss Clement, of New York, highly educated in the culinary art, says:

The wife who can not cook or superintend the housekeeping takes her husband's pay envelope on false pretenses. She does not know her business. When a couple marry, the girl expects her husband to hand her over most of his salary, and he, in turn, expects that her management of that money will make it go as far as possible. It is his business to earn the money. It is hers to spend it. Surely one part is as important as the other. Correct feeding is becoming a science and we are awakening to the fact that it is as important to combine food properly for the adult as it is for the baby. No woman need think that she is too intellectual to bother with cooking. Cooking is a science as well as an art, and one can go on learning forever. The bride who has a good foundation of culinary knowledge and takes an interest in cooking will find no end of possibilities to it. Right in her own kitchen she can join the great movement to reduce the high cost of living. She can use up every scrap of left-over material. It is the clever cook alone who can make left-over food tasty and never waste anything. The smaller the income the more intelligence it takes on the part of the bride to manage her share of the domestic partnership, and the more she needs to study and plan her daily bills of fare. A man comes home after a hard day's work and sees the same old things served, sometimes purchased from a pastry shop just before dinner. If he is easy-going he says nothing, but after a while he grows grouchy. There are more grouches caused by bad cooking than by bad luck.

Every housewife should know the simple food principles underlying their cookery. Knowing this she can give to the family the proper kind of food, prepared in the best way to produce strength, health, and contentment. She raises the standard of the home and the effect can not be other than happier homes which mean better men and women, true and loyal American citizens. I can not understand why girls of the working classes are ashamed to confess and rather pride themselves upon their ignorance of the simplest form of cooking. Then, after marriage they bewail their fate if their husbands, tormented by dyspepsia, seek relief at the restaurant or in many cases in strong drink. I have often heard it said and I believe it "that few men abandon or get a divorce from a woman who is a good cook." A great painter was once asked how he mixed his paints. He answered "I mix them with brains." In order to be a successful cook a girl must mix her food with brains. The love of the home, the field, and the garden brings true happiness to a greater number of the human family than the knowledge of dead languages or accumulated wealth. If you would be truly cultivated associate with plants and flowers, with babies and home folks.

The servant-girl problem is one that is always with us and will be until home economics becomes as much a part of our educational system as the studies in the higher grades of our district schools. Lively discussions have taken place by intelligent women with a view of solving this problem for the benefit of the housekeeper who is sorely tried with incompetent help. I desire to say in passing that in my opinion much of the complaint of incompetency can be traced to the incompetent housewife, but I sympathize with both parties—the woman who hired and paid for work that was done unsatisfactorily and being at the mercy of the girl who did not know how to do her work, and also the girl who was obliged "to work out" to make her living, and, try as she would, she could not give satisfaction, being human, having high aspirations that were born in her, and still feeling that she was an underling and in many cases looked upon with contempt. A perfect system of education is the only way to correct this widespread, unfortunate, and destructive system.

There is nothing in this world of more importance than the daily supply of food. The family meal should consist of a reasonable variety, must be regularly provided, and ought to be suitably and properly cooked. This standard must be attained in order to reach the highest degree of happiness and contentment. Every girl should be taught what to eat, how to eat, and how to cook. In order for us to live we must eat, and the question of healthful and nutritious food is a very important one of life. Providence designed eating to be no inconsiderable part of our daily requirements. An old lady about to pass to her future reward was asked while on her deathbed by her pastor which of all the divine mercies she was most thankful for at such a time, and she replied: "Well, I have always enjoyed my victuals." Home economics teaches all that is necessary to know about the sanitation of the home, the absolute need of cleanliness in every part of the home, in the cellar, the garret, and particularly every corner of the home. It shows the value of ventilation, light, and warmth, and the best methods of securing them. It points the way to make the home and all

its surroundings tasteful, comfortable, healthful. Every girl should be taught to cut, fit, and, with her own hands, make the ordinary clothing commonly used in the family. If I had a dozen daughters and was able to give each of them a million dollars the day of her marriage, I would still want each one to know how to cook, make her own clothes, and, in fact, be a superior housekeeper. It is far better for the child that a father be a worthless nonentity than the mother. Girls should educate and prepare themselves for the higher duties of life.

Mr. Robert J. Shores, essayist, once known to me as Bob Shores, the reporter, in his new book entitled "New Brooms" capably presents, by a pretended cook, a world of philosophy on the subject in the following brief passage:

I do not believe, as many seem to believe, that every man or woman who can juggle a skillet or wield an egg beater is a cook. Merely to follow a formula in a cookery book does not make one a cook any more than compounding a prescription makes one a physician. Cooking is an art as well as a science. The violinist can not express his personality in the strains of his instrument more fully than can the cook in his cooking. The favorite dishes of a race are characteristic of that race. The Spaniard, like his chili con carne and his tamale, is hot, peppery, and economical. The Frenchman, like his many concoctions, is full of spice, imagination, and extravagance. The Italian is indolent and averse to exertion, as is evidenced by his macaroni and spaghetti. The Englishman is red and hearty like his roast beef. The German is fat and fair like his sausages. The Russian is odd and interesting like his caviar. The American, like his diet, is cosmopolitan.

And as the cooking of a nation or a race is characteristic of that nation or race, so the cooking of an individual is characteristic of that individual. Coarse people do not prepare dainty dishes. * * * If there be the feeblest spark of charity in a man's breast, a good dinner will fan it into flame. A bad dinner, on the other hand, will bring to the surface all that is mean and ignoble in his nature. Indigestion, I surmise, has been the cause of most of the cruelty of men. Viewing history in this light, it is easier to understand the apparently wanton slaughter among barbarians. Fed upon ill-conditioned food, the barbarian is attacked in his most sensitive part—his stomach. * * * It is to be observed that the science of cookery and the progress of civilization advance together. Well-fed men are slow to wrath and easily appeased. At the height of the Roman civilization the Romans became epicures and ceased to be warriors. War has no charms for the man who is at peace with his own stomach.

With the proper management housekeeping ceases to be a drudgery and becomes the highest, broadest, and most ennobling occupation for a woman. It is in no sense circumscribed in effort, energy, or talent. There is no bigger business in the world than home making in the sense that there is none more important, none more essential to the welfare of the race. History teaches us that the dominant nations of this world have attained their strength gradually, reached maturity, became diseased, and died. It is worth while to call attention to the fact that nearly every one of such nations has traveled the same road in attaining greatness and has died from the same cause. Most of the world powers have in their early history been agricultural countries and derived their manhood from the farm and their womanhood from the home. As wealth and power increased, so did the neglect of the farm and the home. Great cities were built and became the centers of commerce, social and political activities. To maintain these activities the best men of the nation were drawn to those centers. Extravagances and excesses became the rule; vice and corruption began to creep in; the home and children considered a burden; patriotism and the race began to weaken; the fertility and products of the soil decreased; the consumption of the cities increased; the cost of living rose higher and higher; discontent became universal; stronger races, living nearer to nature and God's laws, found it easy to capture or destroy the diseased nation. The death is traceable to the decay of the home and the abandonment of the farm. God grant that if the germ of this same disease is finding its way into our national life Congress will do all it can to stop and destroy it; and, in my opinion, the best way to begin it is to instruct and demonstrate to the women of our country the advantages of maintaining a clean, cheerful, and contented home, and our men the independence and profitable avocation of an intelligent farmer.

EXHIBIT A.

OHIO AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION.

WOOSTER, OHIO, February 2, 1914.

Hon. B. T. GALLOWAY,

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have yours of the 29th, and am pleased to learn of the institution of such a measure as that of Senator SMOOT. This measure is a necessary adjunct to the Lever bill. It is a matter of history that the agricultural colleges failed to find themselves until the experiment stations had begun to accumulate a fund of definite information in agricultural science, and it is to be expected that before the colleges of agriculture can effectively furnish the instruction and demonstrations in domestic science required by the Lever bill a similar fund of information must be accumulated through such scientific research as the experiment stations are prepared to conduct.

While it is eminently proper that all work allied to teaching should be conducted by the colleges, it is equally proper that all lines of scientific research and experiment should be conducted by the experiment stations.

As to the amount of the appropriations, I am inclined to agree with you that it would be better to begin with a smaller amount than \$10,000. My own suggestion would be \$2,500 for the first year, with an increase of a like amount each year for three successive years, following somewhat after the plan of the Lever bill in this respect.

I fully agree that the State should be required to meet the national appropriation with a similar sum. The history of the Hatch and Adams Acts shows that many States have been disposed to shift all responsibility for such work on to the National Government, and I do not believe this a good thing for the State or the institution.

I think it would be necessary for the expenditure of this fund to be supervised by the national department, as that of the Hatch and Adams funds are. It will sometimes be difficult to draw the line between work in domestic science and that in general agriculture.

This station is already expending annually nearly or quite as much in work that would properly come under the scope of the proposed bill as that measure contemplates.

Thanking you for the information you have given respecting this measure, I am,

Yours, respectfully,

CHAS. E. THORNE, Director.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI,
Columbia, February 3, 1914.

Dr. B. T. GALLOWAY,

Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. GALLOWAY: I have your letter of January 29 and a copy of bill introduced by Senator SMOOT. The bill is a worthy measure. There is undoubtedly a large need for fundamental investigations in the whole range of subjects included in the general term, "home economics." A fund for investigation in home economics will stimulate the teaching and practical application of this subject as much as investigations in agriculture have stimulated teaching and practical application in agricultural subjects.

I am in favor of making the Federal appropriations conditional upon State appropriations. The people themselves must have a direct interest in public activities, and the surest way to interest them and to win their support and prepare them for taking advantage of the investigations conducted and the teaching offered is to support in whole or in part these activities by direct taxation.

It would seem to me that an initial appropriation of \$5,000 a year, which is conditional upon the appropriation of an equal amount by the States, would be sufficient for a good beginning and could be efficiently administered through the present experiment station organization.

Very truly, yours,

F. B. MUMFORD.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
University Farm, St. Paul, February 6, 1914.

Dr. B. T. GALLOWAY,

Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. GALLOWAY: I am very much interested in the bill introduced by Senator SMOOT (S. 280) to provide for an increased annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations to be used in research in home economics. I think the general idea of the measure is timely and good. There is certainly a need for research work bearing upon home economics. A measure of this kind would stimulate special interest and undoubtedly result in great good. I believe, however, that it would be better to start with an appropriation of \$2,500 from the Government, given on condition of a similar appropriation by the State, and increasing each year until it reaches \$10,000, making a total of \$20,000, including the amount appropriated by the State. The general plan of the Lever bill should, in my opinion, be followed. In section 2 of the measure, line 10, I would cut out the phrase "at least once in six months" in the requirement of publication of bulletins, and I would modify the statement regarding the distribution to "each newspaper" to read "copies should be sent to the various newspapers of the State," as it would hardly be practicable to discover each newspaper. Otherwise I think the measure is a good one.

Thanking you very much for sending me a copy, and with kindest regards, I am,

Very truly, yours,

A. F. WOODS,
Dean and Director.KANSAS STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE,
Manhattan, February 9, 1914.

Dr. B. T. GALLOWAY,

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DR. GALLOWAY: Your letter of January 29, in relation to Senator SMOOT's bill seeking further to endow the experiment stations, came during my absence from the office. I have just had time to go over the matter.

I think the bill is an excellent one and should receive our heartiest support. There are some details that might need attention, but these could be handled in the hearing on the matter. I question the advisability of requiring the States to meet half of the expense, especially following immediately upon the heels of the Lever bill. I believe we could rely upon the States doing their share within a very few years, as they are now doing in supporting the work started under the Hatch fund.

With best wishes, I am,

Very cordially, yours,

H. J. WATERS,
President.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HARDWICK. I move to amend the amendment, in line 17, page 2, by striking out the words "and useful in the manufacture of fertilizers."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On line 17, page 2, it is proposed to strike out the words "and useful in the manufacture of fertilizers."

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I desire to speak on the amendment now before the Senate. It is something of an anticlimax from the highly elevating speech of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to come to the commonplace subject of nitric acid.

I feel it a duty to say a few words concerning the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. The amendment of the Senator from Alabama is not as yet before the Senate, but the two amendments are very closely related and can be discussed together.

I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and voted to report out the bill—now the amendment—of the Senator from South Carolina. I am not altogether satisfied with it, and am not altogether satisfied with the statement in the report that full and complete hearings were had. The matter was rather rushed along—I say this in no spirit of criticism—by the Senator from South Carolina with an enthusiasm and power that would indicate that in times of trouble, if we could multiply the Senator of South Carolina many times, we would not need much of a factory for the production of dynamic force. It was thought that the question should come out for a full discussion upon the floor.

I rather wish that the Senator from South Carolina would not press this amendment at this time, and that the Senator from Alabama would not press his amendment, as amendments to this bill. This bill is for the reorganization of the Army; no other propositions should be attached to it unless necessary.

The question of a plant for the fixation of nitrogen from the atmosphere for the development of fertilizers does not seem to be exactly in harmony with the purpose of this bill, and I think it ought to come up here for a free discussion as an independent proposition. But the Senator from South Carolina has in his good judgment seemed to believe that there was a better opportunity to secure what he believes is necessary and what we all realize is important, some way of developing a sufficient supply of nitric acid in time of war, and so, as I understand it, he insists upon his amendment to this bill being considered now.

I wish to suggest to the Senator from South Carolina that he should change his amendment in one respect at least. As the amendment now stands in the copy before me the Secretary of War is given all this power. I do not like that. I think the War Department through its Board of Army Engineers is absolutely committed to one power site in this country. This measure comes from the Agricultural Committee. It is partially an agricultural proposition. The Secretary of Agriculture would be a very proper party to join with the Secretary of War in this project. I think an amendment to that effect would be in the third degree or I should offer the amendment, but I make the suggestion to the Senator from South Carolina as he can perfect his amendment in that way. I should feel much more like voting for this proposition if the Secretary of Agriculture was included.

Mr. President, if we must come to a choice between the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and that of the Senator from South Carolina I shall feel it my duty to vote for the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina, but do wish that they could be absolutely divorced from this bill, because they do not belong here; and one of the means by which bad legislation is so often accomplished is to place amendments upon bills that while possibly germane ought to be considered as independent propositions.

Again, Mr. President, I have a little doubt in my mind about the success of these various processes. We tried to find out something about it from the War Department and from the Navy Department. I do not believe that the War Department or the Navy Department have as yet made a sufficient investigation to be absolutely certain about these processes. I am not here to dispute the statement of the distinguished Senator from Alabama as to the absolute necessity, as we are at present advised, of taking some steps in any plan of preparedness, for the manufacture of nitric acid. It is a marvelous thing that we can get out of the air what may be essential for the development of this very necessary war material. But I do take some issue with the proposition which seems to be accepted by various Senators, that the processes so far as they have been developed are the best that we can look for or that the last word has been given us by the chemists in regard to this matter. However, I am willing to run some risk on the question, as we must in propositions of this kind. We know not what the future of development along chemical lines may be.

Now, we are met with a statement by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, a few days ago, that section 82 in the House, as the bill was introduced, which is similar to this or

covers the same ground, was defeated by the influence, as I remember the words, of the Powder Trust, the Republican Party, and certain people calling themselves conservationists. I hold no brief for the Powder Trust and have no particular love for the Powder Trust. I have spent some hard weeks of my life in working on briefs against the Powder Trust. I do have some love for the Republican Party, and am sorry to see it coupled up with the Powder Trust even in accusation. But charges like that, of course, are easy to be made; however, coming from such a distinguished source they are entitled to consideration and should be investigated. I trust they may be.

On the other hand, it was freely charged in the House, if I may refer to that, that those supporting section 82 of that bill were influenced by the Water Power Trust or that representatives thereof had been active in its support. So we have ourselves in the situation of the Powder Trust on one hand and the Water Power Trust on the other hand, and if I may be permitted to borrow a phrase of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE], "God pity us under those circumstances." I want to see an investigation of both charges. Possibly when trusts fall out the Government may know the truth.

Now, this comes along here as a preparedness proposition.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LODGE. Simply for a question. The Senator referred to section 82 of the House bill. He means section 82 of the bill as introduced, not as it comes to us?

Mr. KENYON. Section 82 of the bill introduced. I thank the Senator. I think I so stated heretofore.

This comes along now as a proposition for preparedness. Nearly everything that has been introduced here at this session has been something in relation to preparedness. I sometimes wonder where it is going to stop. We spent five weeks on a power-dam bill. It was insisted that it was a question of preparedness. We passed from that to another power-dam bill, and that was a question of preparedness. Now we seem to have another dam proposition. It seems as if we have just one dam bill after another. Everything is under the cloak of preparedness. I think my colleague [Mr. CUMMINS] suggested the other day, paraphrasing the phrase "O Liberty! Liberty! how many crimes are committed in thy name?" by "Preparedness, how many?" Not all crimes by any means; but "preparedness" now seems to be the vehicle to carry everything through Congress.

The child-labor bill is, I think, a good preparedness measure, and likewise a rural-credits bill. I suppose when the river and harbor bill comes along every appropriation for Podunk Creek will be for preparedness, and when the public-buildings bill comes along every appropriation for a public building will be for preparedness.

I have a letter from a citizen who moved away from my State a good many years ago. It is along that line, and I have had it copied and will read it. I will not give the name of the town, but it illustrates how all legislation now apparently is to get ready against the invader whose foot some can almost feel upon our shores and shows a conception of the general situation shared in by many of our countrymen.

DEAR SENATOR: As a former resident of your State, I make bold to write you concerning one feature of preparedness to which Congress does not seem to be paying the attention it should, and that is the question of appropriations for public buildings. I know you have in the past opposed items in the public buildings bill for public buildings in small towns.

Now, my dear Senator, please don't do so any more. We are expecting a public building in our town. Our Member of Congress promised it to us during the campaign and we are entitled to it. Besides, think of what it may mean along the lines of preparedness. The public buildings to be constructed in the future should be constructed as a sort of fort. A round building is just as feasible as a square one for post-office purposes; then, when we are at the front fighting the battles of our country our wives and children can stay in the public building, if it is constructed as a fort, and we will feel that they are safe from foreign invaders.

If you are really a lover of your country do not oppose any appropriations for public buildings. Of course, if you intend to side against your country and sympathize with its foes and be untrue to the flag that means so much to us, then we can not expect any help from you in securing our public building.

Truly yours,

[Laughter.]

I have not given the place or the name. It is as well to omit them.

Mr. President, this question of preparedness in securing nitrogen for nitric acid is, of course, an important one. We are dependent now upon securing saltpeter or sodium nitrate from Chile. Germany has found itself able in this war to develop some plan. I do not believe anyone knows what that plan is and I do believe that that plan ought to be investigated, if it is

possible and if war is not so imminent for us, before we do settle down to any system in this country.

Nor am I so alarmed about the proposition that we must at once secure a plant for the manufacture of nitric acid. Dr. Baekeland, who was before our committee, said that the chemists of this country could become active; that they could through steam development take care of the question in an emergency, and experts of the Navy Department said that they kept enough of the Chilean product for a year of any kind of an ordinary war, whatever that may be.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That was for anything except war.

Mr. KENYON. I understood him to say that it would cover any kind of an ordinary war, but I may be mistaken.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I thought it was for ordinary service outside of war.

Mr. KENYON. The evidence was not taken down, as the Senator remembers, but in any event the Navy Department provides itself with a very large supply of the Chilean product for any cases of emergency. Possibly not enough for a year of war. It would be hard to determine, of course, how much was essential.

I believe in the Government doing this work, and building and operating the plant, because I believe that the Government should make its munitions of war. I voted for the armor-plate bill on that theory. The profits should be taken out of war, and there would be less demand for war in certain quarters.

Now, as to the fertilizer proposition, I am as much interested in that as the Senator from South Carolina. Of course we do not need as much fertilizer in Iowa for our soil as they need in South Carolina. All this nitrogen out of the air or any fertilizer I do not think could make the soil of South Carolina anywhere near as fertile as the soil of Iowa, but at the same time I am anxious that the Southern States, without such good soil, shall have their fertilizer, and I am willing that the Government shall do that, although the more I see of the Government going into business the less enthusiastic I become about the proposition. The Government does not seem to be able to run its own business, to say nothing of going into other businesses. If there is any general indictment that could be drawn against the Government it is the absolute lack of efficiency in carrying on its own affairs. The question of the conservation of our soil is as important a question as the people of this Nation have to face. And so I am inclined to vote for a Government plant to make nitric acid in war and fertilizer in peace.

I know the minute you talk about this you bump up against the Constitution, and I expected that my friend from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] would get up and ask me something about it. I am glad he has not, because I realize there are some constitutional difficulties in the proposition. There are more constitutional difficulties in the proposition than there are in the child-labor bill which my friend from South Carolina has so strongly urged as unconstitutional.

Mr. President, as to whether or not these various processes are a success was discussed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and I can not add anything to that, but I want to put into the RECORD some statements about it simply for information. Mr. Washburn, of whom we have heard a great deal and whose pamphlets drop upon us mornings like the manna of intelligence in our sphere of ignorance, delivered an address before the American Electro-Chemical Society on this subject. It was subjected after his delivering it to a good deal of discussion. I want to place some of those statements in the RECORD without reading all of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

Mr. KENYON. I will read what Mr. Leland L. Summers said:

Personally I do not accept the unqualified statement in regard to the success of the cyanamid process that Mr. Washburn puts forth, because, while it has been successful, I do not think that engineers by any means accept it as the final word in nitrogen fixation.

Then I insert also remarks of Dr. C. W. Bennett on the same subject:

No one denies that the preparation of cyanamid is the cheapest working process for the fixation of nitrogen. Nitrogen from cyanamid, however, is not as cheap as nitrogen from other sources. We must all admit that by-product ammonia can be placed on the market as ammonium sulphate at a profit for very much less, approximately one-fourth the selling price of cyanamid. This industry, as is pointed out in another communication, is increasing steadily in this country and in others, and it will take the development of only a few other by-products to enormously increase the output of by-product ammonia. * * * No process in operation to-day for the fixation of nitrogen, as has been pointed out a number of times, can hope to compete with by-product ammonia. In drawing conclusions we can not compare alone the processes for the fixation of nitrogen, but we must also compare the

price of the product in question prepared from other sources, because the final user does not care whether his ammonia comes from the distillation of coal or from atmospheric nitrogen.

Mr. Summers says in his comprehensive paper on Fixation of Atmospheric Nitrogen:

It would be hopeless to attempt to put this acid (derived from fixation of atmospheric nitrogen) into a product to compete with fertilizer prices, for they are some 50 per cent lower. * * * It is useless to look only to cheap power as a solution of this problem, as the real solution is in the improvement of processes (p. 373).

I insert also the remarks of Dr. L. H. Baekeland:

USELESS EXPENSE IN MARKETING, NOT MANUFACTURING.

We have heard the statement that in many cases it is more expensive to buy fertilizer than to have a low yield per acre. This is very true; and if the price of fertilizer gets too high, a low yield per acre becomes practically unavoidable. Unfortunately, in this country we are almost everywhere confronted with the detrimental economic condition of too many middlemen. * * * The time will come * * * when you will no longer speak about an excess of ammonia production in gas or coke ovens. There will not be such a thing as excess of ammonia. All ammonia will be saved.

During this discussion of Mr. Washburn's paper the secretary of the society, Joseph W. Richards, said:

Mr. Landis, chief technologist of the American Cyanamid Co. (Mr. Washburn's), has said that his company confidently expects radical changes in nitrogen fixation processes in the next 5 or 10 years, and that it is prepared, if necessary, to scrap its whole plant inside of 20 years, thinking there might very possibly be no cyanamid process in use at that time. (P. 405.)

Dr. Summers said:

Dr. Peacock's paper is very much to the point. Undoubtedly you all know that Dr. Peacock is one of the best authorities in America on fertilizer. * * * is thoroughly familiar with everything that has been connected with the use of nitrogen in fertilizers.

As a commercial undertaking nitrogen fixation must remain substantially dormant so long as the ammonia produced as a by-product of coal distillation remains of such relative amount that it is capable of controlling the rewards of capital invested in nitrogen fixation. It may be accepted as a fact that no nitrogen fixation method has as yet been publicly proposed which can produce nitrogen as cheaply as coal by-product of ammonia.

Gen. Crozier, when before the House Committee on Military Affairs, testified that there were two ways of getting nitric acid independently of the outside sources of supply: one by the use of ammonia, which is one of the by-products of coke making, gotten from coke ovens. He could not say the extent to which we could rely on that, but said it was chemically possible to produce it in that way and there was a good deal of the coke-making industry in this country. He did say the best reliance would be upon the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen, which requires a very considerable amount of cheap electric power in order to compete with the imported nitrate. He said that the expense of manufacturing nitric acid by the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen is not prohibitive if we consider even steam power, if water power can not be obtained at all; that anybody would have difficulty in surviving, commercially, in competition with the imported article.

There are two processes, he states, one the arc process and the other known as the cyanamid process. The cyanamid process requires less horsepower than the arc process, but it requires other expenses in addition, so there is a difference of opinion as to which would ultimately be the cheaper.

In view of the right of control of the Federal Government of the sources of water power, it ought to be possible to permit their development by private parties, under such conditions of consent that the Government would be assured of their utilization for military purposes when needed, at a reasonable cost, and as the great bulk of the output of the plants would be for commercial purposes it would not appear that the Government should itself embark in this development and production.

There should be provision made, he says, that if the Government cooperated with private plants the cooperation should be accompanied by the condition that the Government should have sufficient hold on these plants to insure that it could get what it wanted at reasonable prices, both in times of peace and of war.

Some one asked on yesterday about the effect on the atmosphere of the taking of the nitrogen from it. At the hearings of the Agricultural Committee a gentleman from my State, who is a good deal of a mathematician and interested in this subject, was present and asked me to ask Dr. Baekeland that question when he was on the stand. I did so, and the Doctor cast it aside rather flippantly, saying that 1 acre of air would be sufficient for all the nitrogen we would ever desire. My friend when traveling through the South wrote me a letter from Charleston about it. He said:

Being of a somewhat mathematical turn of mind, I thought I would do a little figuring in regard to the amount of nitrogen in the air. It is a well-known fact that at sea level the pressure of the air on the earth's surface is 15 pounds per square inch. That would make 2,160 pounds per square foot or 1.08 tons of 2,000 pounds each. Multiply by 43,560 square feet per acre and we have 47,044.8 tons. Multiply this by 640, the number of acres in a square mile, and we have 30,108,672 tons, the weight of the air on a square mile of the earth's surface. If I remember correctly the air is four-fifths nitrogen and one-fifth oxygen, and they must necessarily be of the same specific gravity or they would not mix and stay mixed in the proper propor-

tion to sustain animal life. By taking four-fifths of the weight of the air we find that there will be 24,086,937.6 tons of nitrogen in the air pressing on the surface of 1 square mile of the earth.

I have not verified the figures, but I know the man as a thoughtful, painstaking man, and the figures are very surprising.

In the Washington Herald a few days ago, as bearing on the question as to whether we have reached anything that is certain about this nitrogen proposition, a little item struck me. In speaking of the battle of Verdun this correspondent says:

These great guns seem to know that back in Germany the scientists have discovered substitutes for gunpowder and nitric acid and they seem to be celebrating their independence of the blockade, for at times hundreds of them resemble nothing so much as troops answering the roll call.

In times of trouble we certainly would not be so absolutely helpless as has been pictured here. American chemistry and American ingenuity would find some way, as Germany has found, to handle the question. I do not say this in any way to indicate that I do not fully realize the necessity of our Government being in condition to command an adequate supply of nitric acid in case of war.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to his colleague?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. CUMMINS. The question I shall now ask is purely for information. It has been stated many times that cheap water power was necessary in order to compete with the Chilean nitrates, but I assume that the nitrogen of the air could be fixed with steam power just the same as with water power. I should like to know if the examination before the committee indicated or developed the kind of machinery or apparatus necessary to take the power and complete the process?

Mr. KENYON. It did not.

Mr. CUMMINS. My question is based on the idea that in time of war, if we should have it speedily, a question of cost would not be so material, and I ask whether we could take steam power anywhere without much delay and prepare for the use of the process?

Mr. KENYON. I am not prepared to answer the Senator, because that fact was not developed before our committee. I rather gather that it would take considerable changes to develop the process.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me to make a brief statement in his time without involving his right to the floor?

Mr. KENYON. I do not want to lose the floor.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That was the reason I put my question in that form. I should like to state that the process by which steam power is used in the extraction of nitrogen is, of course, exactly the same as where water power is used. In the transformation of the energy produced, the nitrogen from the air, the apparatus would be identically the same. Now, if the Senator will allow me, I want to read just a few lines from the two individuals in this country upon whom—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will take occasion to say, reminding the Senator from Iowa of the rule which seems to have been established, that he must be his own judge as to whether or not the Senator from South Carolina is asking a question or is proceeding to a discussion.

Mr. KENYON. I think the rule to which the Chair refers is a very salutary one. I should be glad to have the suggestion of the Senator from South Carolina, but I believe that I would forfeit the floor if I should permit the Senator to speak in my time. If the Senator from South Carolina will put his suggestion in the form of a question, very well.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I would not have the Senator forfeit the floor, but I wished to make the suggestion right at this point, as I was afraid that the Senate might be misled regarding the process. I shall, however, in my own time state it.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, we are confronted with the two amendments. If I vote for the Smith amendment, as I rather expect to if a change is made in it, I shall do so knowing it does not compel the Government, as I understand it, to spend the money. If the Government is not satisfied as to the processes it need not go ahead. The Underwood proposition, it seems to me—though I may be mistaken about it, because the Senator from Alabama says not, and I have the greatest respect for his judgment and ability, of course—but it seems to me that under the amendment of the Senator from Alabama we might just as well write into the amendment that this plant is to be located at one particular place, and that is Muscle Shoals.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator allow me to ask him to tell us why he says that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. KENYON. I am going to try to state just exactly what the Senator from Georgia asks me to do. I want to marshal the evidence on the proposition made. I do not want to misjudge anybody, and have nothing to say about anybody or any reflection to make on anybody.

If Muscle Shoals is the great water power which it is pictured to us to be, it may be entirely true that Muscle Shoals is the proper place for the location of one of the plants. If it is, I have absolutely no objection to the location there; but I want that determined by some board that is not already committed to the proposition, and determined by a board on which there will be some scientists and somebody who has the fertilizer interest at heart as well as the war question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to make a statement for the information of the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator for a question, but I do not want to lose my right to the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. My interruption will take but a moment. I want to state on this floor that there is not a single engineer on this board that ever had anything to do with the Muscle Shoals proposition except one.

Mr. KENYON. And that engineer is the one who has just recently overruled one of the other engineers on the Missouri River proposition, as I understand it—I may be in error on that, however.

Mr. BANKHEAD. His name is Newcomb. I repeat, he is the only one who has ever had anything to do with the proposition.

Mr. KENYON. This amendment recites that this matter shall be handled by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War. They are authorized and directed, first, to hold hearings and conduct negotiations for the purpose of determining upon a suitable air nitrogen process. It must occur to anybody at the inception of reading that amendment, why should this be limited to an investigation of a suitable air process? Why not investigate a steam process or any other process?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. KENYON. I yield for a question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire to ask a question. If steam is used, is it still an air process of obtaining nitrogen, is it not?

Mr. KENYON. It comes out of the air, of course, but this is the air process. It may be that the steam process is covered; perhaps the Senator is correct; I am inclined upon reflection to think he is, but I think it should be broadened a little to cover everything and every process. That is what I am insisting upon first. Of course, the process is out of the air. This amendment provides:

Second, to select a suitable site on a navigable stream in the United States for the construction of the necessary dam, locks, substructure, power house, and hydroelectric equipment.

The Board of Engineers is there given the power to select the site. This amendment provides for only one site. The Smith amendment provides, I think, for four or five different plants, and I say that the Board of Engineers of Rivers and Harbors have committed themselves—perhaps not all of these engineers, but as a board—to the Muscle Shoals project, not as a nitrogen proposition—for that had not been thought of at that time—but as a power proposition in connection with navigation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Does the Senator mean that the Board of Engineers has reached the conclusion that the Muscle Shoals power is the best power east of the Mississippi River?

Mr. KENYON. I will refer to the document in a moment or two and see just what they have decided. The Government gave a land grant of 400,000 acres of land to Alabama to build, as I understand, two canals at Muscle Shoals. We have expended there, as a navigation proposition, something like four million dollars. I understand that of the last lump appropriation \$150,000 was allotted by the engineers for borings at Muscle Shoals, although Mr. Washburn, before our committee, practically stated that the navigation project there was of no use.

The Muscle Shoals development has been in Congress as a river and harbor proposition; it has been in Congress as a military proposition; it has been before committees as a fertilizer proposition. If Muscle Shoals is the proper site for these enterprises, and that is determined by a commission or a board who will take every question into consideration, I am not here to say a word against Muscle Shoals; but if that is the place in contemplation, let us have it so stated in black and white.

Its advocates certainly can not be accused of lack of persistence. I follow my line of evidence along. Mr. Worthington, who is president of the Muscle Shoals Hydroelectric Co. and director of several other companies to which I will refer, is referred to in the Decatur Daily, of Decatur, Ala., of March 9, 1916, and an article which I wish to read winds up with his statement. This is from the paper at Florence:

FLORENCE, ALA., March 9.

That Florentines have unlimited faith in Muscle Shoals development was conclusively proven at a mass meeting held in the courthouse at Florence last night when the circuit court room was taxed to its capacity.

The Muscle Shoals finance committee asked for \$2,500, which was subscribed as fast as the secretaries, H. A. Bradshaw and W. H. Mitchell, could take the names of the contributors. This brought the Florence donation for the furtherance of the Muscle Shoals development up to \$10,000 during the last few months. This money is being used to defray the expenses of those actively engaged in the oversight of the public's interest in this all-important project.

R. T. Simpson, president of the commercial club, introduced Col. C. W. Ashcraft, who said people from one end of this country to the other are talking Muscle Shoals. Instead of impoverishing other sections, as is often the case in big enterprises, our progress in the Muscle Shoals development is the progress of every section of the United States. It stands head and shoulders above everything else in Washington. Many of the important congressional committees are considering it simultaneously.

The speaker complimented the Shields bill and said it removes obstacles that have heretofore existed. He declared our "preparedness" is our salvation. The surveys and plans for Muscle Shoals development are made, and it stands 999 chances out of 1,000 to be selected as the site of a Government nitrate plant.

Mr. N. C. Elting, chairman of the finance committee, said, according to this newspaper article: "I presume every man, woman, and child in Lauderdale county is for preparedness. If all had been prepared, the fearful war now raging would never have been." He said the conditions relative to Muscle Shoals are indeed optimistic. He read the following telegrams from Washington:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 7.

N. C. ELTING, Florence, Ala.:

Will you please extend my thanks and hearty feeling of congratulations and encouragement to the courageous, upstanding, constructive people of Florence, and tell them that the bill introduced in the House by the Military Committee authorizing the development of water power and construction of atmospheric nitrogen nitric-acid plants, and Chairman HAY, in his report on the bill, in part says:

"The committee consider this question of the first importance in the consideration of preparedness for national security." Our efforts supported by the lead of Florence secured the authorization for the proposed development, and if Florence will stand pat, put up and see us through, we will get these plants. The total development with fertilizer plants established to cost \$50,000,000.

J. W. WORTHINGTON.

On March 7 he sent this telegram:

WASHINGTON, March 7, 1916.

N. C. ELTING, Florence, Ala.:

Vote on Shields bill will not be taken until to-morrow and probably not until Thursday. Its passage is conceded.

J. W. WORTHINGTON.

These statements were set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some time ago and as they have not been denied we are warranted in accepting them.

Now, who is Mr. Worthington? The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] yesterday inserted in the RECORD some of the connections of these various people. Mr. Worthington, who sent this dispatch concerning Muscle Shoals, I understand is the president of the Muscle Shoals Hydroelectric Power Co., director of the American Cyanamid Co., director of the Alabama Power Co., director of the Alabama Interstate Power Co., director of the Little River Power Co. The Alabama Traction, Light & Power Co. is the parent of the Muscle Shoals & Alabama Power Co., owning its stock, according to Moody's Manual. Mr. Washburn, who has so kindly appeared before the various committees, is the president of the American Cyanamid Co., of which Mr. Worthington is a director; he is a director of the Muscle Shoals Hydroelectric Co., of which Mr. Worthington is president; a director of the Alabama Light & Power Co. and of the Alabama Traction, Light & Power Co., chairman of the board of the Alabama Power Co., vice president of the Alabama Interstate Power Co., director of the Birmingham, Montgomery & Gulf Power Co., and of the Little River Power Co.—or was until a short time ago, when the matter came up in Congress. It seems that he has recently resigned from a number of these companies.

It is quite evident that he is not a witness with absolutely no self-interest.

Mr. Cooper, who is vice president of the six-million-dollar fertilizer company, known as the Duke Fertilizer Co., is the

general manager of the American Cyanamid Co. The American Cyanamid Co., in their statement of assets, schedule "Founding and propaganda, \$230,589" as a part of their assets. So, we find Mr. Worthington sending a dispatch from Washington that Muscle Shoals stands 999 chances out of 1,000 of getting the nitrate plant; we find Mr. Washburn connected with many kinds of corporations interested in water-power development, and the two, it was charged on the floor of the House, practically control the water power of Alabama through their companies. The report of the Secretary of Agriculture, I think, was to the effect that 87 per cent of the water power of Alabama was controlled by the Alabama Traction, Light & Power Co. We find all this commingling of these interests in this project.

Now, what about Mr. Washburn, and what about the board of engineers being committed to the Muscle Shoals proposition? In 1914 the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army in document No. 20 made a report. The House Committee on Rivers and Harbors had passed a resolution, as I understand, asking for a resurvey of these various propositions. Document No. 20 consists of a letter from Gen. Kingman, of May 18, 1914, to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House. It is in reply to a letter from the chairman, inclosing a copy of the resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of February 24, 1912, requesting the Board of Engineers to review the previous reports or surveys of the Tennessee River. Mr. Worthington, the same gentleman who sends the encouraging dispatch, submitted to the Board of Army Engineers a proposition on the part of the Muscle Shoals Hydroelectric Power Co., signed "J. W. Worthington, President," found on page 76 of this document. This proposition was that Muscle Shoals was to be improved in connection with the Muscle Shoals Hydro-Electric Power Co. at an estimated cost of \$18,701,000. It was a proposition in connection with which the Army Engineers approved of the Government loaning the money, or furnishing it for the benefit of a private institution to be paid back in annual payments running for 100 years.

Out of this, the amount properly chargeable to navigation, they found, was \$8,575,000. The remainder was the amount chargeable to power development. The board advised that this was the proper thing for the United States to do, and just a short time later this same engineer advised that in the case of the Great Falls project out here, in which the whole city of Washington was interested, financial conditions were too close to do anything with it. I shall not take the time to put his statements as to that in the RECORD. Evidently he did not regard Great Falls as comparable with Muscle Shoals.

Evidently the matter of nitric acid had not been thought of so seriously at the time this proposition was up to take care of Muscle Shoals, nor after this, when the question came up in the other branch of Congress of appropriating the \$150,000 which the engineers said in this report ought to be immediately done so that the work should not stop. That question was fought out on the floor of the House and defeated.

I want to read just one or two little things from the report of these Army engineers who fathered this most remarkable attempt of the Government to help a great private company that had a monopoly, that owned the power sites, as I shall show from the evidence, they and their associates now owning all the patents on this process, and before the committee Mr. Washburn said substantially that they did not propose that anybody should ever compete with them.

After its exhaustive study and full discussion of this subject the special board concludes with the recommendation that the United States undertake this improvement in connection with the Muscle Shoals Hydro-Electric Co. under certain conditions specified:

"The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has carefully considered this plan, and is in general accord with the views and recommendations of the special board. The project contemplates primarily the conservation of one of the great natural resources of the Nation by the development of power in large amount and incidentally the improvement for navigation throughout the year of a reach of about 82 miles of the Tennessee River. An expenditure by the United States of \$18,701,000 within a period of five years is contemplated. Of this total \$8,575,000 is estimated as the cost of the portion of the work which properly may be considered as an improvement of navigation."

The Board of Engineers says:

As this is the first project recommended for cooperation of the United States with power interests in river work on a very large scale, the board invites attention to the unusual demands such work will make upon the public funds. The development and utilization of the power of the streams of the United States will require an investment of great sums of money, and to insure the required continuity of action through successive lease periods other large sums must be available from time to time. There is little doubt that such investments are justifiable and wise, and that the utilization of this power of the streams now being wasted will increase prosperity in a measure hard to be determined.

If the United States is to have full control and is to guarantee continuity of operation it is apparent that at times it will be called upon, for longer or shorter periods, not possible of being foredetermined, to make expenditures comparable with the original sums invested by corporations, and that these expenditures will be returned only after considerable delays, perhaps of years. Whether the annual income of the United States is great enough to supply such large sums, and whether justice to the present generation would warrant such a use of income, are economic questions requiring legislative determination.

The first indication of some regard for the income of the United States that has appeared for some time.

And when one of the engineers was not willing that the Government should pay for the overflow, amounting to \$1,700,000, this board overruled him and decided that the Government should pay even for that.

Following out that chain of evidence, the Board of Army Engineers approving this Muscle Shoals project in the past wanting the Government to advance \$18,500,000 on the proposition, and the Mr. Worthington who made that proposition to the Board of Army Engineers that was accepted being the same party now sending the telegram down to his State that Muscle Shoals is to secure this plant, or has 999 chances out of 1,000 to secure it, I think we are progressing along the line of showing that the Board of Army Engineers ought not alone—and that is all I am insisting on—to determine this proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. KENYON. I do, for a question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator state what the \$18,000,000 was to be spent for? What was to be done with that \$18,000,000?

Mr. KENYON. I did state that, but I can state it better, perhaps, from a souvenir that I hold in my hand of "A visit to the Tennessee River" of a number of Congressmen and Senators to view the Muscle Shoals proposition in May of last year. That is set out in this document, which contains a number of very fine pictures of Senators and Members of Congress. Here was the plan recommended by the United States Engineers in Document No. 20:

United States Engineers' estimate of cost of project, exclusive of equipment and power-house superstructures, \$18,701,000.

Power company's cash contribution, \$3,000,000.

Leaving a total of \$15,701,000.

Total amount chargeable to navigation, as estimated by United States Engineers, \$8,575,000.

Investment of the Federal Government chargeable to power, as estimated by United States Engineers, \$7,126,000.

Estimated initial expenditure of the power company—

I do not know that the Senator desires that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not know whether or not that means that the additional \$7,000,000 was to be spent to build the power plant, and that only \$8,000,000 was necessary to construct the dams, and so forth.

Mr. KENYON. I understand it that way—that the \$8,000,000 was for the dam for navigation, and the additional amount, necessary for power. That is, the Board of Army Engineers determined what amount they could properly charge to navigation, which, I assume, would be for the building of a dam, without the power purposes.

Mr. LODGE. They exclude the power project, do they not?

Mr. KENYON. This is exclusive of equipment and power-house superstructures.

Mr. LODGE. Yes. This \$7,000,000 is to be used in the development of power, is it not?

Mr. KENYON. It is.

Mr. LODGE. And not needed for navigation?

Mr. KENYON. Not needed for navigation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I suppose, then, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. KENYON. I yield, for a question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then I will ask the Senator whether it means that the \$8,000,000 would be necessary to build a dam for navigation purposes, and \$7,000,000 more would be necessary if it were fully developed with power?

Mr. KENYON. Exactly, as I understand it, for power purposes; so they divided the total amount between the two, and the \$8,000,000, I assume, might be the proper charge to the Government for purely navigation purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But it was all in the line of construction of dams for creating power, and not machinery for the power plant?

Mr. KENYON. That is true.

In the hearings before the House Committee on Military Affairs—I want to follow up this line of evidence—Mr. Washburn

was there. He was asked as to this matter, and as to his plan. He said:

From the nature of the industry there are very few power sites available to it in the United States.

And he took the instance of Muscle Shoals and developed that, showing it as the cooperative plan. This is found on page 158 of the hearings before the Military Affairs Committee of the House. I will not take the time to read that. Mr. McKENZIE of Illinois asked him this question, which makes it fairly plain:

Let me see if I understand just what you mean. If I understand you, your plan of cooperative work is to take a power site where the Government has constructed a dam for purposes of navigation, or to aid navigation, and the company that would manufacture this product would then erect its structure alongside of this power site, and the Government would permit them to use the power, and they would pay, as I understand you, 3 per cent on the cost of the construction of the dam. In other words, the Government would build the dam and the company would erect a structure for the manufacture of the product, cooperating with the manufacturing concern, and the company would manufacture this product to be used for fertilizer during time of peace, and the Government would have the right to take the entire product during time of war, and that the company should pay annually to the Government 3 per cent on the investment in the dam. Is that correct?

Mr. WASHBURN. Upon the investment of the dam and such hydroelectric equipment as was necessary to put the power upon the switchboard. The Government investment, devoted to power purposes, normally would include the dam; and the power house and its equipment and the power would be paid for by the nitrogen industry at 3 per cent of the cost. That would be an annual tax upon the nitrogen industry.

Mr. McKENZIE also asked him:

After a careful investigation of this whole subject, it is your judgment that this industry can not be successfully developed without some Government assistance in this country?

Mr. WASHBURN. I am very definitely of the opinion that private capital can not take the risk of the necessarily great investment compared with the return on the costs we would have in the United States, and therefore the industry will not be developed in the United States, but in time will be developed elsewhere, and the product will be imported into the United States.

Again, speaking of his plan:

The \$24,000,000 the Government would expend under that plan would be used exclusively for the production of the single product, nitric acid. The \$48,000,000 would be used not only upon some devices which answer the requirements for making nitric acid but would also be used for the payment of the cost of appliances for manufacturing fertilizer.

With regards to Muscle Shoals there is a good deal said, but I will not take the time to read it.

Before the Committee on Agriculture of the House Mr. Washburn spoke of this same general plan, but it should be stated in fairness to him that he said he had no proposition of any kind to make to the Government. He was asked about the patents covering it. The chairman asked him concerning the patents. He said:

They are controlled by one concern under patents.

The CHAIRMAN. Under patents?

Mr. WASHBURN. United States patents and Canadian patents.

The CHAIRMAN. So that any immediate development of the nitrogen industry in this country would be through the Government subsidy to a monopoly controlling the process?

Mr. WASHBURN. I should not call it a subsidy.

He is asked as to who controls this cyanamid process in this country:

Your company?

Yes.

And he is asked these questions at page 925 of the record of the House Committee on Agriculture:

Mr. RUBEY. What is the date of your patent?

Mr. WASHBURN. You mean of the patent?

Mr. RUBEY. Yes.

Mr. WASHBURN. We have not any single patents. We have about a hundred patents.

Mr. RUBEY. And then the next year and the next year you would have additional patents so that the time never would come—

Mr. WASHBURN. We do not propose that it ever shall come when anybody can compete with us if it is within our power.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. KENYON. I do, for a question.

Mr. BORAH. How does he anticipate that he will prevent that competition, if he discloses that?

Mr. KENYON. I will say that it is all controlled by patents, of which I think it is fair to say that Mr. Washburn and his associates control practically all. I have seen a list of patents from the Patent Office. I know he controls some of them, and he was asked here:

Who controls this process in this country, your company?

Yes.

That is, the Cyanamid Co.

Mr. BORAH. I had supposed it was likely by reason of the patents; but that is a monopoly which has been granted to him by the Government already.

Mr. KENYON. It has been granted to him by the Government, and as I understand the Government is powerless to use any of these processes without violation of the patents, just the same as any private individual—or, rather, they might be able to use them and then the patentees would have their recourse in the Court of Claims.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. KENYON. I do, for a question.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I wish to ask the Senator from Iowa if he considers that that is final? I have before me a statement on the exact process about which the question was asked a moment ago, to the effect that the fundamental patents have expired. Various minor modifications and improvements have been patented from time to time during the past 15 years. They are mostly under the control of the Cyanamid Co. They are not absolutely essential, however, to the economical production of powder by this process.

I have received that statement this morning. I wanted to have a thorough investigation, and I received it this morning from Dr. Norton.

Mr. KENYON. As I understand, when the time comes near for the patent to expire, improvements are patented, and the time is extended. That is evidently what the colloquy meant before the Agricultural Committee of the House, when Mr. Washburn said that they did not propose that the time ever should come when anybody would compete with them if it was within their power.

It has been charged that these same parties, for whose company the Board of Engineers have been willing in the past to have the Government loan or invest some \$18,000,000, not only owned the patents on this process, but also controlled the water-power sites around the Muscle Shoals proposition. That question was asked of Mr. Washburn in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate. This Muscle Shoals project bobs up before so many committees that it is difficult to keep track of it.

Senator KENYON. Have other people associated with your company been working on the Shields bill, or on this proposition?

Mr. WASHBURN. Yes; in connection with the Shields bill.

Senator KENYON. And on this proposition, too?

Mr. WASHBURN. Yes.

Senator KENYON. Mr. Worthington?

Mr. WASHBURN. Mr. Worthington has worked in connection with the proposed development at Muscle Shoals primarily, as it originally was in the interest of the Muscle Shoals Hydro-Electric Power Co., which owns certain rights, etc., at Muscle Shoals.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator the date of that hearing.

Mr. KENYON. This hearing was March 16 and 17, 1916.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Very close at hand?

Mr. KENYON. Very close at hand.

Mr. Washburn's plan, which is very similar to the plan set forth in Document 20, has been elucidated by him before the Military Committee of the House, before the Committee on Agriculture of the House, before the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate, and the plan is substantially the same plan, with some variations, as the one the Army engineers reported in favor of. That is why I have said that, in my judgment, the evidence is sufficient to show sufficient basis for the statement made that under the Underwood amendment we might just as well write the location Muscle Shoals.

I should like to see an amendment that would be a sort of halfway between these matters that would provide for a complete investigation of all processes by some competent body not already committed and an investigation of proper sites. I do not want to legislate on something that is simply going to be an assistance to private corporations in this country and no benefit to the rest of the people. I have not meant to say that Muscle Shoals was not a great proposition and possibly the proper place for it. I do not know. This great water power placed there by the Almighty should be used by the Government for the benefit of all and no monopoly permitted to control it.

I want to read from the hearings one or two things. On page 908, House Agriculture Committee, Mr. Washburn stated that the great development had come through using steam power. That is in the German nitrogen plants. On page 910 he spoke of the power site on the Columbia River. I think I should say that his claim was that there are only two proper power sites in this country for this development, one on the Columbia River at Priest Rapids and the other at Muscle Shoals. Dr. Baekeland, before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, said that those power sites in the far West were no better than if the plant were in Iceland, because of the railroad rates in transporting the product.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. JONES. In other words, the qualification in these two amendments with reference to fertilizers would cut out of consideration those plants in the West?

Mr. KENYON. I think so. I think it cuts them out. It does not cut out Niagara Falls, of course. The astounding statement was made there that the water power at Niagara Falls would be sufficient, if used for fertilizers, to increase the wheat crop of this country 3,000,000 bushels per day.

Mr. JONES. What I meant was that the qualification requiring the plant to be developed with a view to getting fertilizer would necessarily exclude the consideration of a plant in a far-western State.

Mr. KENYON. To be perfectly frank with the Senator, I think it does do that practically because of the cost of transportation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I did not hear the question of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. KENYON. He inquired if the fertilizer part of this amendment did not result in practically cutting out the power sites of the West because of the cost of transportation. As I stated, Dr. Baekeland, who seems to be a very eminent authority, said we might as well have the plant in Iceland, that the rates would be less to that country than to that part of this country needing the fertilizers if the plant were in any of the extreme Western States.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That would not—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That would not be true if the stream were navigable and reasonably near the Pacific, would it?

Mr. KENYON. I assume not, if they could get a rate down through the Panama Canal, but I have not studied that proposition.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. KENYON. I do for a question.

Mr. THOMAS. If the railway rates are so excessive as to prohibit an otherwise desirable site for a power plant in the development of this proposed method of producing nitrogen, does it not suggest either a further extension of Governmental control of the railway systems or the possession of them, as Germany has taken possession of them, as a part of the general scheme of preparedness? In other words, if we are going to prepare national defenses upon an adequate scale, does not that situation suggest the prime necessity, among other things, of controlling the lines of transportation of the country?

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator believe we are going into a military camp in this country?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not, but many want us to do it; and yet those who are anxious for an extreme plan of preparedness have not thus far suggested what seems to me to be a prime element in such a plan, an element which Germany recognized 40 years ago, and that is the acquisition or the control by the Government of the various lines of transportation in the country.

Mr. KENYON. I will not go into a discussion of that. It is too broad a field, and I have talked about long enough. I do not want to delay this bill.

From the Manufacturers' Record of March 9, 1916, I place in the Record as evidence on the proposition I am discussing the statement of the Alabama Power Co., in a part of which they say:

In connection with the occasion for employing the \$96,000,000, not covered by immediate plans, it is stated that "the Alabama Co.'s ultimate development in Alabama is predicated upon legislation regarding power sites now sought in Washington and bears special reference to the use of Muscle Shoals. The large water-power site owners of the country are pressing certain legislation which is being as stoutly resisted by others who claim that too much encroachment upon the rights of the public is contemplated in the form in which the power-site owners desire this legislation. The use of the remainder of the \$100,000,000 available bears relation to the ultimate future and the possibilities of favorable legislation."

Certainly the impression has been conveyed to the good people who live in the region of Muscle Shoals that the Government is going to engage in a wonderful development there. I do not take a great deal of stock in lobby investigations. Of course, if the powder trust is doing what the Senator from Alabama said, it probably should be investigated. If others are doing what has been charged on the House side, they probably ought to be investigated also. I do not think as a general thing Members of Congress are particularly influenced by anybody coming to see

them. For my part, I am always glad to see anyone who has any information, and think I have been able to stand up against any influences thus far. But if there was to be any investigation of the powder company I want to see it go far enough to investigate the activities of the water-power companies also.

I received an invitation to visit Muscle Shoals last May, my expenses to be paid from the point of departure, and the exact time of departure being given, but as I have been opposed to the proposition in the past and expected to be opposed to it in the future I did not accept the very kindly hospitality. However, there were evidently some acceptances, and I hold in my hand a paper which leads me to believe that the good people down in Alabama at least believe that this is a project for Muscle Shoals. This paper is the Huntsville Daily Times of May 12, 1915. It is headed "Dam Muscle Shoals." There is no typographical error in that, I think.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what the Senator has been doing very effectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair will admonish Senators that the rules provide that before interrupting a Senator the Chair shall be addressed and permission granted by the Senator occupying the floor.

Mr. KENYON. This write up of the meeting down there and various Members of Congress who attended it is very interesting. I am not going to read it all. I merely cite it as a part of the line of evidence I have been trying to introduce in support of my statement that we might as well write Muscle Shoals into the Underwood amendment and be done with it. Certainly that is the impression in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals. This paper, the Huntsville Daily Times, says:

Between 5,000 and 6,000 people shout the merits of Muscle Shoals, and with one voice say, "Dam it, we need it." Occasion a gala one and success comes in near future.

United pull to extract the cork from the Tennessee and make the river a blessing to mankind. Big system of cooperation between private capital and the Government. Joint congressional inspection of proposed waterway a pleasing and stupendous success.

It was indeed—

The paper says—

the greatest event of its kind ever celebrated in the United States, and if any of the congressional party had any doubts as to the desire of this people and their complete interest in the development of this matchless enterprise it was forever removed when they visited Muscle Shoals and saw with their own eyes the water power that will bring a new world to this country.

It was a memorable occasion, the demonstration being marked by a wonderful outpouring of people of the immediate counties surrounding the proposed and completed navigation development at Muscle Shoals, and from the nine vitally interested near-by States.

A huge impression was made on the visitors and the only regret is that the whole of Congress could not be there on this or any other occasion and see the real good. It is actual, a substantial business proposition, not the hope of a dreamer. Impressions satisfactory were made on the visitors, and when they face their colleagues in December there should be a prompt adoption of the United States Army engineers' recommendation and let the final work proceed. Confidence believes this will be done promptly.

That Niagara is a baby compared with the tremendous value and importance of Muscle Shoals possibilities goes without saying.

So it proceeds. I will not read the speeches of the various Members of the House and Members of the Senate upon that very enthusiastic occasion, but I want to refer to the conclusion of the article:

The Tennessee River Improvement Association declares that the Muscle Shoals project is a challenge to the courage and genius of the President, the Secretary of War, and the Congress of the United States for immediate adoption.

Mr. President, that may be so.

If our visitors would know the inspiration for the hope and confident belief of the Tennessee River Improvement Association, that the first session of the Sixty-fourth Congress will adopt the Muscle Shoals project as recommended by the United States engineers, they will find our hopes and our sentiments expressed in the last annual message of President Wilson to Congress as follows:

The poor President is drawn in to sustain the Muscle Shoals proposition, although I can not find that he says a single word about it; but such things read well in a newspaper.

The Chief of Engineers of the United States Army—

This paper says—

the greatest and most competent in the world have said the project is practical, feasible, and good. They are the captains, the final judges to make the decision. This has been done and this people call upon Congress to say amen to it.

That has been some of the business of Congress for some time, not entirely, I understand, confined to this branch.

The Muscle Shoals project having been recommended for congressional adoption by the United States Engineers, it was very appropriate of course for the keynote of the occasion to be Dam Muscle Shoals and dam it now.

Now, Mr. President, I have not intended in my brief and rather scattering remarks to say anything to reflect upon anyone. I have placed some matters before the Senate that seemed a duty. These gentlemen have the right to believe, as they do believe with basis for it, that Muscle Shoals is a great project. If some board to be appointed should, after considering all the facts, be in favor of Muscle Shoals for our Government plant, I should not raise my voice against it, but I am objecting to adopting an amendment to this bill which gives to the Army Engineers the power to select a site when the record, statements, and documents show that the Army Engineers some years ago had practically adopted this as the best site for a great water power. If the Board of Army Engineers have determined that question what is the use in having them do it again? If the Government is to build and maintain these plants they should be located in different parts of the country where in time of peace they may be of the most good to the greatest number of our people.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I regret that there are expressions in the able speech of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] who has just taken his seat and whom I admire very much, that I think are calculated to draw attention from the real merits of the question and to arouse prejudice against a great water power and men who may develop it. I never heard of Mr. Washburn until the day he appeared before the Committee on Agriculture about three weeks ago. I knew there was a cyanamide process and that fertilizers were being manufactured in Canada by somebody and shipped into the United States. I had heard that that plant would have been located on the Muscle Shoals, Tennessee River, but for the fact that a bill allowing the development of that water power passed by Congress some time ago was vetoed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Coosa River.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Coosa River. I thought it was the Muscle Shoals. It was somewhere, in northern Alabama.

Mr. President, the importance of producing nitrates inside of the United States and from the air can not be overestimated. Unquestionably if our Nation were involved in war with any nation possessing a substantial fleet the supply of nitrate of sodium or saltpeter from Chile would be cut off to a dangerous extent.

It was shown before the Committee on Agriculture that while Germany had laid in a large supply of the raw material out of which nitric acid was to be manufactured for military supplies, it was exhausted in three months after the war began, and but for the capacity of Germany to produce nitric acid from the air they would have been almost helpless.

It is essential to the production of food also in our country. It increases largely our food supply. In case of war it is essential.

It seems that there are two processes for extracting nitrogen from the air, one of which is called the arc process and the other the cyanamide process. So far only those two processes have been perfected. The arc process requires a much greater water power, the principal plants using this process being located in Norway. Germany adopted the cyanamide process for lack of greater water power. A plant can not be economically operated without 100,000 horsepower all the time.

Mr. President, if we have a water power of that kind it ought to be used, and it is the part of wisdom to take the necessary steps to have it prepared for use at once.

Reference has been made to Niagara Falls. It was fully brought to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture that we are limited in the use of Niagara Falls by treaty, and we are now using practically all the water power we could from Niagara Falls. The commercial requirements of New York State are at present consuming practically the entire water-power product that can be had from those Falls. Then, again, it is not a proper location for a plant upon which the United States should depend for military purposes. Any wise selection would involve going reasonably far from the border.

Mr. President, I am not wedded to the idea of the construction of this plant by the Government, but I do believe that the Government ought not to stand in the way of developing such a plant; on the contrary, it ought to take action which will insure it.

No private company could build a plant upon a navigable stream without Government concession. No private company could build a plant in the West upon Government land. Private companies will to-day find their hands tied in any effort to develop such an enterprise, unless the opportunity for use of a navigable stream or a stream located on Government lands is provided by congressional action.

I am sorry the Tennessee River does not flow through Georgia. I really think that the best of everything should go to my own State, and I wish this plant was to be built in Georgia. But,

unfortunately, the Tennessee River is not there. I do not care, it being outside of Georgia, whether it is in Ohio or Indiana or western Pennsylvania or West Virginia or Kentucky. It happens to be located nearly on the edge of southern Tennessee and northern Alabama.

The Senator from Iowa seems to be disturbed about the fact that the result of this bill would cause the development of Muscle Shoals, on the Tennessee River. In my own opinion, if anything intelligent on this line is done, if the wisest course is pursued, it will be built there. And why not, if it is to be east of the Mississippi River? The great bulk of our population is east of the Mississippi River, and without saying that there should not also be one built in the West, there certainly ought to be one in the East, and that Muscle Shoals is the place in the East I have no question. Engineers, or anyone else who studies the problem, guided simply by search of the truth, will in all probability determine that the one great interior point for water-power development east of the Mississippi River is on the Tennessee River, which happens to be located in northern Alabama. Why? Because this river at that point is a mile wide and the banks over 100 feet high, stretching back for miles and miles. A dam can be built across the stream a mile in length, 100 feet high, furnishing over 100,000 horsepower at lowest water.

If there is some other place east of the Mississippi River that is better, take it. I have not only no interest in Muscle Shoals, but I never heard of Mr. Washburn until he appeared before the Committee on Agriculture. Do not get the idea that Mr. Washburn has a company that will control if Muscle Shoals is developed. He has not. I believe that two dams should be built in the Tennessee River, if possible, to develop navigation, and that their construction would be a great contribution to navigation. If they can be built, making their construction for navigation and also to produce a water power that will more than pay interest on the cost of their construction, then we get the navigation free. If the Government builds the dam and develops the power and contributes to the navigation of the stream, then I think it would be stupid on the part of the Government if it did not dispose of the power, if it can be done, in such a way as to carry the cost of construction. If Washburn had a company that would take the power on proper terms from the Government and carry the cost of the development, I would not object to his having it. If the Du Pont Powder Co. are ready to take it and pay the cost of this great development under contracts that will guarantee that the Government will pay for the product from the manufactory which it needs at proper prices, at prices to be approved by the Secretary of War, I will not object to their having it.

This I say, although I believe, when practicable, the Government should manufacture those things it needs for purposes of war.

There is one feature of this amendment that I do not like. It excludes the Government from having anything to do with any private company. If we produce power for the construction of a dam and can dispose of the power to any company advantageously and take the burdens of the development entirely off the taxpayers of the country there is nothing in such a proposition that at all frightens me.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes, sir.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Would the Senator be opposed to the Government manufacturing these fertilizers?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I did not say I was.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I can not see the difference between the Government creating the power and selling it and creating the nitrate and selling that, and if the Government should do that, it could be—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yielded to the Senator for a question only, which is all I can yield for under the rule.

Mr. President, I am in favor of the Government going no further into the business as a competitor of private enterprise than is essential to furnish to the public that which the public is entitled to have. The water power of the stream belongs to the Government. It can not be developed except by authority of the Government.

I should be willing, under proper arrangement, to permit the dam and locks to be built by private enterprise, if the arrangement could be made in a perfectly satisfactory manner. I regard it as a business problem.

What I rose for, Mr. President, was to say that I think it unfortunate to inject anything into this debate that would create prejudice against a private corporation building a nitrate plant or a fertilizer plant—against the Government permitting it to use a water power for such a purpose. I think it unfortunate

in any way to create a prejudice against what seems to be the greatest water-power opportunity for development that we have east of the Mississippi River. Unless somebody can point me to a better water power, it would not frighten me at all to put Muscle Shoals into the amendment. If that is the best water-power site, there it ought to be.

Mr. President, without being wedded to any particular plant, and without being hostile to any plan, I do insist that it is our duty either to take steps in behalf of the Government to develop the necessary water power without delay or to take steps on the part of the Government to permit some private corporation to develop the water power without delay. The chief cause of delay in time of war, if we needed nitric acid, would be the construction of the dams and the creation of the water power. It would take much less time to complete the industrial end of the enterprise in the shape of assembling the necessary machinery.

I hope the Senate will consider the subject without prejudice on account of the fact that a number of Senators once went down to see Muscle Shoals. I was not in the party; I did not know until the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] told us about it that there had been a party of Senators and Members of the other House who went down to see Muscle Shoals; but if what I am informed is true, they saw a wonderful opportunity for water-power development. I have no preference as to locality, provided the best suited to the purpose is selected; but, so far as my information goes, if we are to have a plant east of the Mississippi River, and are to take the best place, we shall put the plant east of the Mississippi River, on the Tennessee River, at Muscle Shoals.

Mr. LEWIS and Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield the floor?

Mr. LEWIS. I wish first to ascertain what is the request of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. At this particular juncture, so as to sustain the continuity of what has been said, I want merely to read—and it would not take more than five minutes, if so long as that—into the RECORD an explanation of certain facts, which I think are pertinent. I prefer to do that now rather than to have the continuity of what has been said broken. Of course I could do so at some other time, but this being the proper time if, without prejudice to the rights of the Senator from Illinois, he can yield to me for a sufficient length of time and then be recognized, I wish he would do so. Of course I should very much dislike to have him lose his place because of doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield the floor?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I have yielded the floor once or twice previously to accommodate a Senator. I do not like to interrupt my speech; but while my remarks, such as I expect to submit, are not wholly upon this subject, I will yield a few minutes, if the Senator from South Carolina so desires, and trust that I may be recognized immediately following him.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will remind Senators that this is a recess, and that the rule of the Senate that Senators may not speak more than twice in one day on the same subject would apply. The present occupant of the chair, however, has no disposition to insist upon the observance of the rule, unless occasion makes it necessary for him to do so. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, do I understand that the rule in regard to speaking twice on the same subject would apply to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It certainly would, if insisted on.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. What I mean to say is that I have not spoken on this subject this morning at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; but this is the same legislative day as yesterday; it is one legislative day.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understand the Chair to hold—and I do not dissent from the view of the Chair at all—that this day starts with the first legislative day; that it is a continuation of that day, and that the rule limits a Senator to two speeches on one subject throughout the entire legislative day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the present legislative day started on the 30th day of March.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The President pro tempore of the Senate, who made the ruling, stated that, in his judgment, the appeal which was made to the Senate, and on which the ruling of the Chair was not sustained, did away with the rule to which the Chair now refers, and that the rule hereafter would be that interruptions would be permitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair will take occasion to say to the Senator from Colorado that that was an entirely different question from the one now involved. There being no objection, the Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, several of the speakers this morning took occasion to say that the processes for the production of nitrogen were in an imperfect and nebulous condition; that nothing in relation thereto was settled. There are two gentlemen upon whom we should rely by virtue of the position which they occupy in relation to this question; one is Dr. Norton, who is employed by this Government, who was sent to Germany, and who returned just previous to the outbreak of the war; the other is the chemist of the consulting board of the Navy. I am going to put into the RECORD what these gentlemen say about these processes. I will also include what Mr. Washburn said with reference to whether or not this process is practicable. Mr. Washburn said:

So the point I wish to make is this, that the nitrogen industry is no longer in the experimental stage.

It has taken the greatest scientists in the world, men understanding such things, 16 years to bring it to where it is a great, successful, reliable, extraordinarily cheap method of producing the most valuable single substance known to mankind.

Dr. Baekeland says:

The whole situation is a shame to the human race. We know how to get nitrogen from the air; we know how to increase the yields of our acres. We do not do it, although those chemical processes are no longer secrets, and we know all about them. The key to the whole situation is better utilization of our natural resources of cheap power. If you make your nitrogen compounds or your nitric acid at too high prices, you may be able to use it in war time—in war time nothing is too expensive when it comes to murdering each other.

Dr. Baekeland, the consulting chemist for the Naval Board, makes that statement. He further says:

This nitric acid is made by a chemical process, which, I am glad to say, the chemists of the United States can duplicate at any time. There is no particular secret about it, and if the chemists of the United States were confronted with this problem I have no hesitation in saying that, if properly supported and given the necessary time, they would make as good a showing for themselves as did the German chemists.

The question of the fixation of nitrogen from the air from the chemical standpoint is clear and easy, and is a problem no more difficult than any other chemical problem.

Dr. Norton, on the same subject, states:

The nitrogen derived from the air in that way easily meets in competition Chilean saltpeter. It holds its own; the works are being enlarged. That demonstrates to us, with perfect clearness, that we can take the nitrogen out of the air; we can put it into such a form that it is susceptible of utilization for our agriculture, and on even terms with the supplies from Chile.

Furthermore, gentlemen, you must remember that the supplies of Chilean saltpeter are limited.

So I want to set at rest right at this juncture the idea that we are feeling our way and were about to make an appropriation for something as to the practicability of which nobody had decided. Germany is an evidence that it can be accomplished; the process at Niagara is testimony as to that, and if the word of scientists can be taken at all, we need not hesitate.

I wanted to present this evidence just at this juncture, because I did not desire Senators, who will consider this question seriously, to be misled as to their being any doubt in the minds of anybody who really wants this ingredient that we are prepared to obtain it.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I arise to submit some remarks suggested by the early part of the speech of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], and the expressions of other Senators along similar lines. The Senator from Iowa expressed some doubt as to the wisdom of introducing this measure touch-

ing nitrates at this particular time. He questioned the wisdom of having it annexed in any form upon a general bill of legislation designated for the increase of the Army, and asks that it later be treated as separate legislation.

My reflections, Mr. President, bring me to a viewpoint, which I here express, doubtless meeting the unfavorable observations of some of my fellow Senators. I do not feel that we in the Senate are properly appreciating the aspect in which we are being held by the country, whose servants we are. These measures which are now being suggested, which necessarily occupy time for debate upon their merits, and which to the country at large seem foreign to the real bill at issue, are impressing the country with one thought: either that as to this war measure we have not statesmanship enough to sustain it and to pass it quickly, with the spirit that should attend it, or, if opposed to it, we lack courage to say so. That there is a disposition manifested by our conduct to avoid responsibility at both sides of the issue.

Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa alluded to a letter from one of his constituents demanding that the public buildings hereafter authorized by Congress be constructed in a shape that is round, the constituent intimating his opposition to any public building that should be constructed square. The general opinion of the country is that there is no public building emanating from Congress that is "square." [Laughter.] The Senator from Iowa by his letter recalls the general attitude of mind that Iowa has to this body. I recall that a distinguished Member from Iowa, now departed, Maj. Lacey, formerly chairman of the Committee on Public Lands—I had the pleasure and the honor to serve on his committee and under him—received a letter from one of his constituents which read something as follows:

DEAR MR. LACY: I have been gettin' them books called obituaries and have been readin' them speeches about them dead Congressmen. I wish you would please have more of them obituaries sent out to our people in Iowa, for nothin' we please so much as to read about dead Congressmen.

[Laughter.]

The public mind is likely to apply that expression in a political way; and unless we move about something in a spirit that shows our desire for action, either for or against, we will meet a sentiment on the part of our countrymen that politically will visit deace, if not upon the Senator politically, upon the respect in which the office is held.

These amendments on collateral subjects presented by Senators from different States have no doubt great merit; and the fact that a prolonged debate is indulged upon them indicates that they have a merit that can be advanced for them and that there are objections which have merit that may be presented against them; but it all demonstrates that we are having now presented collateral subjects which are taking the time of the Senate at a time when, I respectfully insist, we should move absolutely to the end that we are about to accomplish. We should either surround our Government at this time with force sufficient to meet its exigencies as we see them, or announcing to the country that we do not agree that such exigencies exist, cease parleying with this question of preparation, and turn our attention wholly to these other subjects which refer to the civil welfare of the citizen.

SITUATION OF COUNTRY.

Mr. President, I view the situation of my country at this particular time as rather precarious in the matter of her diplomatic surroundings. I behold the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. STONE] sitting here, doing me the honor to pay heed to these observations. Missouri can well lay "unction to her soul" at the compliment afforded the State in having her distinguished citizen preside over that equally distinguished committee. The attention he has been giving to these public questions, the patience which has characterized his investigations, and the ability disclosed in his discussions are guaranties that these great considerations will be attended to with patience, discretion, and statesmanship. Mr. President, I fear for the impression we are leaving upon the country at large. It is either that we do not regard the conditions of our country calling for the immediateness of action on our part and have not the courage to say so, or that we do so regard them, but have not the statesmanship to act with the immediateness that the situation calls for. We must gather much of our information from the public press. We take some of it from that which is confided to us in our official capacity; but it is no exaggeration to say that we all recognize that this is the hour when there is necessity for action.

Mr. President, there is Mexico. Deplorable as is the situation in Mexico, the incontrovertible fact is there is Mexico with the deplorable situation. Some sources have been affording the enemy

of the United States in Mexico munitions of warfare. Whether smuggled in by those who are guilty of the meretricious trade without regard to nationality, or whether tendered these forces by those in the United States inimical to the welfare of the United States, is unsettled and may be debated; but the fact remains that there is some form of aid being given Villa and his followers by those whose particular identity we may not at this time assign, but aid of quality sufficient to make the task of the United States more difficult than it at first appeared, and will continue to make it more difficult as time goes on and the opportunities for those who act against us be increased.

MEXICO.

Mr. President, there has come the information through the public press—and from the foreign press particularly—that the United States is upon the eve of withdrawing from Mexico because of these new and multiplied embarrassments. It might as well now be understood, speaking wholly for myself and only for myself, that, so far as I am concerned, the United States will not withdraw from the undertaking it has so commendably entered upon in this punitive expedition to properly chastise those who have violated the honor of the country, and to punish those who have taken the lives of citizens of the United States. We have undertaken this task because of the justice in it, because of the right of the United States, and because of the necessity for it. We are going to maintain the dignity of our country and the freedom of an American. Therefore, in the language of the Scriptures, "Having laid our hand to the plow, we will not look back"; or, if I may apply an expression in the Merchant of Venice—

An oath, an oath, I have an oath in heaven:
Shall I lay perjury upon my soul?
No; not for Venice.

Therefore, Mr. President, it becomes important, as I view it, that speedy action on the part of this body touching these measures of preparation be had. That speedy action be had in order that those who assume that this body is indifferent to supporting the President in these undertakings may obtain—from the evidence we give proof to the contrary—that all may see that what we are doing has for its object the putting behind the President at a very early moment—and at the most early moment feasible—all the power that the wisdom and statesmanship of this body can justify. That rather than that we should, through measures that are only incidental, delay the matter, that we give the other evidence—that we move to it with that rapidity which recognizes that in rapid action in supporting the President and the measures of preparation we justify before the country the movement undertaken, and by it announce to all those who may be concerned in the question as to whether we will withdraw or lessen our zeal, that, to the contrary, far from lessening it by virtue of the increased difficulties, we increase our perseverance and multiply our own activities. That we will meet these difficulties as fast as they shall arise, conscious, as we are, of our strength and of the rectitude of our conduct, and we assert that we are absolutely convinced that shortly that which we seek to do—execute justice—will be done by the United States in Mexico.

Now, Mr. President, not only will our delay add to these embarrassments to which I am alluding, but our course will be misconstrued abroad. It will be charged that we are hesitating to support these measures of necessary defense for the lack of support of our countrymen on the outside of this Chamber. It will be said that we do not feel that our countrymen at large are behind their public representatives, and for that reason we are dismayed. That we are discouraged, or that we hesitate for fear of the political punishment that may be visited upon us by a constituency that may be opposed to the constructive policy here undertaken.

Mr. President, one of the very last places to obtain the political sentiment of America is here at the Capital, at Washington. The most deplorable fact that has been established before this country seems to be this, that whenever a Senator has become unpopular in this body, he has by the things that makes him unliked here become the most liked and the most popular among the people; and the Senator who oftentimes receives at the hands of a certain form of constituency in this country approval and praise has the least standing in this body, as a man either of constructive measures or of patriotism. This I merely mention to indicate how poor a judge is this forum and how much poorer a judge is this locality in Washington of the public sentiment that surrounds our country.

Mr. President, I am not one who would yield to public sentiment merely because it is such, unless I could feel that that sentiment is one that spoke the needs of my country. I prefer, sir, to dispute with the king whose theory was that we should not rule according to the weal of the people but to the will

of the king. I would rather take the other rule, that so soon as we could justly ascertain what is the weal of our countrymen, we turn to serve these needs, and not be moved from them, because here and there there may be evidences on the part of those who have not had opportunity to reflect of opposition suddenly exploding against the policies which, thought, calmness, and consideration on the part of the public agents of the country have undertaken.

It is believed by many that the vote in the State of Michigan, whereby one of the distinguished Members of this body and one of the eminent presidential candidates from the vast numbers which the Senate produces, received something of a hip-and-thigh blow from his brother—was an indication that the country at large had reversed its sentiments touching the need of a national defensive policy as against dangers that all men who look with clear vision must behold.

Mr. President, that there will arise from time to time expressions such as we have seen in Michigan we all will admit; but, sir, we can not assume from these that our countrymen have reversed their orders—that its Representatives shall do that which they know is necessary for the welfare of the country at large. We should not only not be moved by these whiffs, but we will earn the contempt of our countrymen if we let them behold that, with every wind that blows slightly against our cheek, we turn from our task and fly from that direction where we think ultimately the storm may come.

Mr. President, not only, therefore, do the conditions in Mexico call for our supporting whatever may be the policy of the President, and supporting it with such movement here as will indicate to the country at large the immediateness of action on the part of this body—putting arms, force, discipline, and patriotism behind him—but they also call for action in order that the outside world shall not assume that we have lagged in our sense of appreciation of these situations, and that the opponents of the policy of the United States may not draw further license from this delay to assume that we are unprepared to back up quickly and sufficiently the movement we have undertaken in Mexico.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator to ask him a question?

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

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want to ask the Senator if the President has not announced, through the War Department, that he had all the power he wanted in Mexico?

Mr. LEWIS. Has the Senator concluded?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Yes. I understood that the War Department has stated that they needed no further troops for Mexico. They might need a good pack of dogs; but I do not see any need of more troops.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, it may be the Senator is right that the President has made a statement that no more troops now are needed in Mexico. I do not know concerning that. I am not referring to an immediate use of troops; I am referring to some action of Congress in preparing the country in whatever way it shall decide to prepare, so that, whatever may be needed now or hereafter may be at hand. This is wiser than to allow this delay that I see will be considered as an evidence on the part of this honorable body that it does not appreciate the gravity of a situation which at any time may make necessary further aid to the President.

GERMANY AND THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. President, I come to a second feature, to which I feel I can well invite the attention of the body as a justification for our not further intruding immaterial and collateral matters upon the pending bill.

The diplomatic relations between this country and Germany, gathered from the public press and from other information, indicate very clearly that the United States is nearer to the necessity of having to choose some decisive course than it ever has been since the beginning of the disputation over the *Lusitania* or since the arising of complications over the submarine warfare. It is sufficient to say that both sides of this Chamber will be found supporting the administration in whatever course it shall take as the final act of America; but it is perfectly clear, Mr. President, that the United States has now reached the point when it must apply to itself the Scriptural injunction:

Choose you this day whom ye will serve.

If the policy of the United States is to be that which the distinguished President has uttered in public places—that the United States asks for itself only that which it asks for humanity—then, sir, we must be prepared to obtain for all humanity that which we are assuming to ask for ourselves. It must be very plain, Mr. President, that if such shall be the course we

are to embark upon, then, for the protection of humanity at large, the whole theory of the Republic must be changed, if not wholly transformed, and a course of offensive attitude on the part of America must be entered upon that shall be sufficient in its strength to obtain for humanity that which we will demand in behalf of America.

We can not utter the doctrine as a text on the one hand and ignore it in execution on the other. This would make us ridiculous in the eyes of the wise and make us contemptible before the face of the brave.

Therefore, sir, if such is to be the policy, all the more is it necessary now that we should proceed with such measures of power as will enact them into legislation. This is essential, that the country may know how far we have gone; that from that knowledge they may derive the fact of how far afterwards we are able to go. Without the President of the United States having the information from Congress as to what support is to be put behind him, he is left uncertain as to what course to take. Not only is he left uncertain, but he is forced necessarily to present himself before the country as changing his viewpoint from time to time to meet the exigencies put upon him by Congress. Then he is to be charged, as he has been, with the "change of opinion," apparently without justification, when his real justification is that he is forced to change his attitude by the attitude of his superiors—the people, speaking through their official representatives.

Conditions change, Mr. President. It was Emerson, I believe, who remarked that consistency was the virtue of fools, while an eminent Greek left behind him the statement for us that they who could not change their minds could not hope to know when their life had changed. Things may occur to-day and, by existing, may call for one set of observations on the part of a wise ruler or a wise governor who is prudent and cautious and anxious to avoid the assertion of extremes that may invite opposition, create antagonism, and awaken enmity; and yet, sir, after having made every effort to appease an aroused multitude and quell the mutiny in the body politic by assuring them that the hour upon us is one of security, should subsequent events develop, not of his making but at the instance of others, that render insecure that which previously looked firm and secure, he may find his duty—as duty of the President would be—to admonish his countrymen of these changed affairs, and to invite their attention to them. Then, if he felt the policy should change from that which it was in the past to the new present, it is courage on his part to assert such and demand the change. It would have been a lack of statesmanship to adhere to the yesterdays when they have been changed by the to-morrows.

So, Mr. President, if the future policy of this country, with regard to foreign nations is to be different from that of the past, and we are to be forced unhappily to deal with them in the manner that they are dealing with each other, and in the only manner which it appears they accept, by force, it would be foolhardiness for us to blind our eyes to surrounding situations and to refuse to prepare for those conditions by this one form of preparation—legitimate force.

Sir, the real question is, To what extent shall our country go for preparation? There are two extremes of thought. They seem so far apart that the man seeking to be just has difficulty to reconcile them.

WHAT IS THE JUST MIDDLE GROUND?

And, sir, the question remains, What is the just intermediate ground made necessary by the conditions of the country? If, Mr. President, the distinguished head of our Government shall adhere for the future to the lesser policy we have seen announced as his second proposition—the protection of an American citizen in the enjoyment of an American right wherever he is—then, sir, we have the second proposition to prepare for. If we shall not embark upon the first, of giving the guarantee to humanity, wherever they are, of the full extent of protection that we give to our own citizens, we will essentially be driven, soon or late, to that other of assuring to the American, wherever he is, the full enjoyment of an American's rights when asserted in peace and within the law. To do this, Mr. President, even though we should qualify the previous doctrine and not assume the guardianship of humanity at large, we will nevertheless, sir, have to prepare ourselves for such course of action as will present to the world our ability to enforce the just rights of the American, exercising an American's privilege, wherever that American is. This latter expression is the text I offer as our practicable duty.

But, sir, it is foolishness, and the office of a braggart, that we should announce to the world the right of an American within an American's rights, and our announcement of his privilege to enjoy them, and yet present before the world our utter inability to secure him in this enjoyment. That, sir, makes us ridiculous;

such presents us before the world as subject to the criticism of being vain boasters; and while we may tickle the ears of the groundling by boastful halloas, we make the judicious grieve when they behold the true situation in which our country may be—boastful but useless; hopeful but helpless.

Mr. President, I desire to have it understood that I do not agree with the distinguished Senators in the idea expressed that this country is unprepared to back up any demands. Some things have been wholly lost sight of. That in addition to the Army and the National Guard there are a million men in this country who have had some form of service through the Guard, through the Volunteer service, through the national Army, through the last generation, and who have from time to time passed out into other occupations, and who at this time possess the training they have had during these last 20 years. These are accessible for some uses, and in their valor and patriotism can be relied upon to the full extent of their complete capacity.

Nor can I concur in the suggestion, made here and there, that our country is unprepared to defend itself. To the contrary, if left alone as against any single opponent that might arise, our country is as amply prepared to meet any advance against it this day as it ever has been at any time since the Civil War, and it is better prepared now than it ever has been at any time since the Spanish-American War.

Let it be remembered that no mind could have conceived that there would have been a combination of the world in war in this civilized era. We shall hereafter be forced to characterize the present pending war as the "War of the Twentieth Century." The war of the world, combining nations together in a crash and combination of power through events which no philosophy could have reasoned out, no statesmanship anticipated, and to which no form of military preparation could have been adequate.

If there shall arise in this body a Senator, however sincere, who would assume that the United States shall embark upon a course of preparation that shall be equal in power to all forms of contingencies that might arise through the combined assaults of the world, our answer is, our countrymen would not accept the program. You never can make our fellow citizens at large believe that such a holocaust could befall America. First, they behold no affront given on our part against the world, as they see it. They behold no offense on the part of America to mankind at large. They behold no reason why there should be such preparation to meet such imagined combined foe. But, alas! our countrymen do not realize that there is more to be considered than that. This country is not preparing to make assault upon any other country. True, sir, this Nation of ours is not contemplating assailing others. Our countrymen, however, fail to realize that the countries at large throughout the world have arisen with grievances, real or imaginary, against their neighbors in Europe. Their hearts are filled with old and long-contested disputes; their minds inflamed with revenges that have been surging in their lives; and their souls aflame with retaliation and resentments that have been multiplying through a century. Our countrymen fail to recognize that this very spirit when aroused, this very flame when lighted, heeds not the course it will take, and at any hour in its fury will mistake the course of America asserting her just rights as an assault upon another country. This they will charge to be a wrong against them.

POSSIBILITIES OF FUTURE COMPLICATION.

Let us dwell, sir, for a moment on the possibilities of such antagonism by only suggesting a phase or two of our threatening surroundings. We recall that respecting our trade we have demanded of England: First, that she cease opening the private letters of our fellow citizens; second, that she cease obstructing the commerce of our countrymen; third, that she end interfering with neutrals in the direct enjoyment of their legitimate commerce within international law and international practice. Britain feels that in these demands we are doing her injustice, and are putting an impediment in her way to accomplish that which she feels is essential to her future life if she shall exist as a nation upon the face of the earth.

Germany beholds us selling supplies and ammunition to the allies. She reckons this as a direct assault upon her opportunities, and a violation of what she feels should be the humane doctrine of neutrality. Then beholds us ever as an ally of Britain in our war upon her use of submarines in sea warfare. She sits as one brooding in deep grievance, and because of this, together with other offenses which she claims we have visited upon her, joins Austria in the resentment she has against us. We sent Von Papen and the military attachés to their homes, and likewise sent back the Austrian ambassador in dishonor. Austria and Germany feel the sting of this indignity put upon

them. They suffer under the insult that they seem compelled to endure before the world. We justify our actions on the ground of Americanism, and can not retreat.

Mr. President, Russia still feels that the United States committed a grave affront to her when we severed the commercial treaties because of her treatment of certain of our citizens, and because of her inability at that time to come harmoniously to an understanding with us which we hope in the future will be soon entered on. Russia likewise feels that the United States lent its aid to Japan in the Japan-Russian War, and through that aid enabled Japan to humiliate Russia in the hour of that conflict.

Japan to-day is opposing the Asiatic bill touching the question of immigration. She beholds in it the item prohibiting her people from coming into our country while our people assume to go into hers. Likewise, in her new and renewed strength, she beholds the policy of America that excludes her countrymen from the domain of the United States.

China revolts at the humiliation which we have put upon her by holding her people out to the world as unworthy to be of the fellow humankind of America.

Think you, Mr. President, that all of these nations to which I allude, having these grievances, will not bide their time legitimately, from their point of view, to express these grievances in such manner as is natural to humankind? Shall America pass into an agreeable stupor merely because it is isolated by the seas, and feel itself secure from all assault, and be unconscious of these wrongs which other countries feel we have visited upon them? And shall we be indifferent to the already awakened mind on the part of these countries, and to the executions we now see in Europe by nations on the nations against which they were aggrieved?

Sir, it is because of these things I recount, these instances I recite, that our countrymen should be awakened to the fact that America should awake. Sir, America is not preparing to assail any people. America is not presenting a war measure here for attack on anyone, or a measure looking to maintaining a war upon the theory of enmity against any people. But it is because of the knowledge that, being compelled, soon or late, to assert American rights, she is conscious that these rights will be opposed individually, perhaps jointly, combinedly, by those countries having the power when they come out of this war, to meet us in such manner that, if we are not at least prepared to oppose, we shall suffer the humiliation which no American can endure without feeling the death of honor within him.

Mr. President, it is because of these surroundings that our countrymen must mark well the real situation in which now stands America. We well might paraphrase Malcolm to Macduff:

Stands Scotland where it did?

And ask, "Does America stand where she was?" Where is the philosophy of those fathers who spoke about the safety of the United States in the great isolation of America? Sirs, America is in greater danger to-day through these isolations than she ever had protection. Every hour in this country has given civilization the opportunity to increase its methods by which it has put the United States between the two great forces that may be the foes of this Nation—Europe on the west, Asia to the east—and, sir, far from the seas being a source of our protection, they will on either side of us be occupied by the forces of antagonism, by navy and aerial machines, and we destined to find ourselves between them all. All with a common interest at that particular time to defeat the objects which America has declared shall be her policy for the future.

Let me advert to one. My eminent friend, the distinguished chairman of the committee, referred a moment past to the Monroe doctrine. I view the operation of that doctrine differently from the eminent chairman. If I may be permitted, sir, I press to your consideration where I feel our future difficulty lies; and I use the word "difficulty" conscious that a stronger word may be very appropriately adopted.

COURSE OF MONROE DOCTRINE.

• There south of us is South America. In Brazil, Germany has large possessions. We are speaking to-day of Chilean nitrates. In Chile, England has large control. In Argentina, Italy has large possessions. Throughout different parts of South America Europe has moved. When this war is over in Europe, Mr. President, as I see it, these countries will demand to enter into South America in such form of colonization as the South American countries themselves will accept. South America, needing capital and feeling that these advances of aid from Europe would be to her interest, will be found accepting those proffers in many instances. Already South America resents what she feels to be the assumption on the part of America of guardianship over her, as if she were of the tutelage of children. She does not

approve the Monroe doctrine further than this—that if the hour shall come when she shall need our aid she may be permitted to invoke it with the assurance that we will respond. But, sir, she resents that we should enter with our authority into her country at any time to say to any people, "Thus far and no farther," when she herself has made no protest. Consequently, sir, from South America and Central America, in view of what has transpired touching the Panama Canal and Nicaragua and through American administrations in Haiti and San Domingo and portions of the Central American countries around us, the United States will receive little sympathy indeed, as I view it, for the enforcement of our present day Monroe doctrine. As we have announced it as a policy of protection and guardianship of these countries, it will be resented. It will not be accepted. Therefore, sir, these southern nations will be found giving such aid to these European countries as will attempt to colonize there as that aid may indicate to the South American country to be profitable to it. All this opposing our effort to maintain the Monroe doctrine against European or Asiatic royal governments.

Then the hour will clearly come upon this my country, as I see it, when, confronted by these European foes, unless we shall compose our difference—as I pray heaven we shall—in treaties of peace and peaceful arrangements—we shall be surrounded with these awakened European enmities, these aroused animosities, these multiplied oppositions, with their long-increased grievances, all centered—as their announced point of expression in the opposition before the world to our assuming to interfere in lands which are no part of our country and by power without right. That we are doing such against the desire of these lands themselves. Then under that theme and under that theory of grievance they will vent grudges they have long espoused against us. The Orient, feeling the indignity that we have by our past course visited, and by present purpose threatens to visit, upon it, burns to join our foes to the end of forcing our abandonment of our exclusion policies. It may be that these Asiatic nations have long since endured their exclusion, but keep this in mind: I do prophesy here this day that Japan will shortly be found making such arrangements with China as will put China under her legislative and official protection. Then Japan will announce to America and to the world a Japanese Monroe doctrine. This shall have for its purpose the retaliation upon America for the Monroe doctrine enforced in Mexico against Japan and in South America against the European countries. Then Japan's policy will be: "Asia for the Asiatics"; American people and American trade will be forced out of Asia. China will likewise be glad of the hour when she can resent the affront that she feels has been visited upon her by America, and if not through herself, then by cooperation with Japan, arise to an independent nation capable of establishing her people in any land they choose to adopt. It may be true, sir, as the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] now remarks, that they have long endured our policy of exclusion. It may be true, sir, that they have yielded to it, and in well-known instances obeyed it; but that they have felt it as a wrong, and are still conscious that we will not yield up the policy. But that does not lessen the buried feeling that they have, and the hour then waits. They stand muttering through Byron:

If we do but watch the hour,
There never yet was human power
Which could evade, if unforgiven,
The patient search and vigil long
Of him who treasures up a wrong.

Then, Mr. President, with these surrounding conditions that must submit themselves to our thoughtful consideration shall we falter here and continue with this debate, on subjects however commendable yet quite apart and foreign to the main measure in hand? Shall we continue such and by such notify the country at large that we have not courage to pass these measures; shall we by our hesitancy indicate that we have been frightened by our own people? I pray we shall consider the aspect we are tendering to the Nation and contemplate the conclusions which may be drawn from it.

Mr. President, the future before us is filled with all uncertainty and to mankind much mystery. If the decree of our administration would be to secure to humanity that which we ask for ourselves, then, sir, toward that object let us prepare. If the policy shall be to enforce for America wherever an American is the rights of an American, let us in haste move toward that purpose. But, sir, whatever the course, let us now have the country see that we are rapidly legislating to enforce these rights, and that we are prepared to do so.

Mr. President, there may be many provisions in this bill that certain Senators might not agree to, but let us move to the consideration of the bill. Let us move to amend, let us move, if

you please, to correction, but let us move to the measure that our country may not be prejudiced by our course, and that our course may not mislead those whose deductions from our present situation may license them then to further assaults upon our rights, seriously complicating our situation and making it more difficult for us to work it out in peace and in security.

Therefore, may I take the liberty to urge what I really rose to present to my distinguished fellow Senators, the doctrine that as to this passage of measures of preparation, let our text be, "If it were done when 'tis done, 'twere well 'twere done quickly"?

I thank the Senate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I have no intention whatever to reply to or comment upon the speech of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] as a whole. It stands for itself and, of course, voices his opinions, very eloquently stated, on the subjects that he discussed. But having in mind what he said in the earlier part of his address about Mexico, I wish to make one observation only, and I am done.

I wish to say that the proposal to increase the Army or Navy of the United States, or both, has no special reference whatever to the troubles in Mexico. I would have the people of Mexico understand that much. The movement to increase the military and naval power of the United States would have been just as it is even though happily Mexico was one wide field of peace and prosperity. The President and the Government of the United States desire only peace with Mexico and to promote the welfare of that Republic.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I am in accord with the views of the Senator from Missouri in that respect. The question of reorganizing and increasing the Army began to be discussed over a year ago, shortly after the European war commenced, not with a view of engaging in war with any power but simply for the purpose of placing our country in a position of absolute defense.

Mr. President, I am in thorough accord with the distinguished Senator from Illinois in his desire to have us move toward the consideration of this bill. We have been at it now for more than a week. There has been no attempt made to limit debate or the offering of suggestions or amendments, but it seems to me, as has been well said by the Senator from Illinois, we ought now to endeavor to take steps that will bring this measure to a hasty conclusion.

Carrying out the thought of the Senator, I send to the desk the following proposed unanimous-consent agreement and ask that it be entered into.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Oregon asks for the adoption of the following unanimous-consent agreement:

That at not later than 4 o'clock p. m. on Saturday, April 15, 1916, the Senate will proceed to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 12 o'clock m. on Monday, the 10th day of April, 1916, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill, or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule the roll will be called.

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

Borah	Hardwick	Norris	Stone
Brady	Hughes	Overman	Sutherland
Brandegree	Johnson, Me.	Page	Taggart
Burleigh	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Thomas
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Poindexter	Thompson
Chilton	Kern	Reed	Tillman
Clapp	Lane	Robinson	Vardaman
Clark, Wyo.	Lee, Md.	Saulsbury	Walsh
Cummins	Lewis	Shafroth	Warren
Curtis	Lodge	Sheppard	Weeks
Dillingham	McCumber	Simmons	Williams
du Pont	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.	
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Mich.	
Gore	Myers	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. WALSH. I wish to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. HUSTING] is absent on account of official business.

Mr. LEWIS. I announce the absence of the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. He has been called on official business to the State of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Secretary will again read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent—

That at not later than 4 o'clock p. m. on Saturday, April 15, 1916, the Senate will proceed to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, the 10th day of April, 1916, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I am as anxious as any Senator in this Chamber to bring this bill to a speedy vote. It is not my desire to offer any objection to the proposition to vote upon the bill next Saturday, but the exigencies of the situation with reference to the so-called sugar bill are of such a character that I feel that measure would be jeopardized if its consideration were postponed longer than the coming week. It is my purpose, and I so notified the Senator from Oregon, to move on Monday that the Senate proceed to the consideration of that measure.

The necessity for speedy action on the bill grows out of the fact that on the 1st day of May, unless there shall be congressional action in the meantime, sugar will go upon the free list. It is easy to see if sugar should go upon the free list what would be the result both as affecting the revenues of the country and as affecting importations to this country of foreign sugar.

Ordinarily there would be sufficient time to pass the measure even after next week, because I do not suppose it will provoke any great debate in the Senate; but, Mr. President, the House has passed the bill upon one theory with reference to the extension of the duty, and the Finance Committee of the Senate has reported the bill providing for a different method looking toward the taxation of sugar. It is, therefore, evident that when the bill has been passed in this body, if the proposition of the Senate committee is adopted, there will be a sharp conflict between the House and the Senate conferees which may be somewhat prolonged; and when the matter comes back to the Senate, if the proposition of the Senate should not be sustained by the conferees—and of course we can not tell about that—a situation might be developed here which would lead to prolonged debate. The temptation might be created to make that debate so prolonged as ultimately to defeat any legislation looking to the extension of the duties upon sugar.

Under those circumstances, without at least casting upon the Finance Committee responsibility and blame in case there should be a failure, I do not feel that I can with safety consent to this proposition unless it is made clear that the agreement shall not interfere with the success of my efforts to secure action upon the sugar bill next week.

I wish to ask the Chair whether, if this unanimous-consent proposition is agreed to, it would preclude me from offering a motion on Monday or some subsequent day during the week to proceed to the consideration of the sugar bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the present occupant of the chair it would not preclude the suggested action. The only matter that binds the Senate in connection with the unanimous-consent agreement is that it shall vote on a certain hour of a certain day.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think the Chair is clearly right. I simply wanted the ruling of the Chair upon that point.

The only other matter which might possibly affect the purpose I have in view, by reason of the very short time that will be left for debate upon this bill, is the difficulty to carve out of the time allotted in this proposition one or two days next week, and it might interfere with the success of my motion to displace this measure with the sugar bill. I felt I ought to notify the Senate that if there is any feeling or purpose on the part of Senators to defeat the proposition to take up the sugar bill because of the short time fixed in the unanimous-consent agreement, I have had it in mind to suggest to the Senator from Oregon that he make the time a little longer.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, would it not meet the situation if an agreement could be entered into that if any number of days, one or more, should be occupied next week in the consideration of the bill referred to by the Senator from North Carolina that much additional time should be added to the consideration of the Army bill and the day fixed for voting postponed accordingly?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I wish to suggest that if the Senator from Oregon would ask for that portion of the unanimous-consent agreement which limits debate to 10 minutes and postpone the question of a day certain to vote until the sugar measure is disposed of we would likely make time by following that course. If the debate is limited to 10 minutes we will dispose of a vast part of the measure between now and the time

when the sugar bill will come up, at 2 o'clock some day next week.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, no one can be more anxious than I am for the speedy disposition of the Army bill, and I am entirely ready to consent to any agreement that will facilitate the disposition of that measure. But, Mr. President, we ought to take immediate action on the sugar bill. There we are confronted by a date. If on the 1st of May the bill has not passed the Houses and been signed by the President sugar will come in free and the Government will lose the revenue. There are many hundreds of tons of sugar, I am told, now in storage in New York awaiting the chance of the proposed law failing.

Mr. SMOOT. Thousands of tons.

Mr. LODGE. I have no doubt there is as much as that. All that revenue would be lost to the country at a time when it is admitted by the very friends of the bill here that revenue is greatly needed. It seems to me that it is the duty of us all to see that the sugar bill is disposed of and disposed of so that there can be no possibility of its failing before the 1st of May.

Therefore I am very glad the Senator from North Carolina has given the notice he has given. I sincerely hope that it will not interfere with the request of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator I have no disposition in the world to delay the consideration of that revenue measure. I realize, with other Senators, its importance. It is a matter that ought to be acted on promptly, and I have not intended to interfere with its consideration within the limits required. What I am particularly anxious about, Mr. President, is to try to have a limitation upon debate and to have a time set when this measure shall be acted on. I am not particular about whether it is next Saturday or a week from next Saturday, so far as that is concerned. If we can agree on a time when it shall be disposed of, if the Senate is willing to make a unanimous-consent agreement at all, and it is postponed even a week longer, I will be perfectly satisfied.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator understands, of course, that I am not objecting to the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I realize that.

Mr. LODGE. I entirely assent to it, but I wanted to call attention to the fact that I think the Senator from North Carolina is bound to call up that bill. I think it is his duty to do so, and I think the Senate ought to take it up and dispose of it next week.

Mr. HARDWICK. I wish to inquire of the Senator from Oregon, because I am not familiar with the terms of the proposed agreement, whether his proposal to limit debate to 10 minutes is to take effect after Monday?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The proposition is to make it take effect beginning on Monday.

Mr. HARDWICK. I just want to say that I hope he will modify that. I have one amendment, to which I have given a great deal of time, and it will take me more than 10 minutes to present it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Let me make—

Mr. HARDWICK. It will not take me very much more than 10 minutes. I am not a lengthy speaker.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The suggestion of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] I think is a good one, that for the present we limit debate, beginning Tuesday at 12 o'clock instead of Monday at 12 o'clock, and cut out the time as to voting.

Mr. HARDWICK. Of course, if the Senator will pardon me, there would be this trouble about that suggestion: If the sugar bill comes in on Monday, then we would have no opportunity to have more than 10 minutes on any one amendment upon the Army bill. I wish to say this to the Senator and the Senate: I have not served a very great length of time in this body, as the Senator knows. As a rule, I do not make lengthy speeches. I do not imagine it would take me more than 20 minutes, but I can not present the proposition in 10 minutes, and I do not intend to try to do so. If the agreement were modified so as to allow me 20 or 30 minutes, I would be content.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think it is important that the agreement to vote on the so-called military bill at a fixed time be entered. I think the agreement asked by the Senator from Oregon ought to be made now in order that Senators may have notice in advance of the time when the vote will be taken. The only difficulty may be easily obviated, so far as the Senator from Georgia is concerned, by agreeing that the agreement shall take effect at 2 o'clock next Monday.

Mr. HARDWICK. Unless the sugar bill, if the Senator will pardon me, took up the time. Then the agreement would hold me down to 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON. That difficulty can also be obviated by agreeing that at noon Monday the Senate shall proceed with the consideration of this bill, if that is necessary, and that no other business should be in order, and that at 2 o'clock the limitation as to the length of speeches shall take effect.

The bill suggested by the Senator from North Carolina undoubtedly ought to be disposed of very promptly, and I had not understood that it would require any great length of time to determine that matter in the Senate. I think it is important that the Senate should proceed with these measures as speedily as possible. We have had a great many interesting speeches here touching a variety of subjects during the time this military bill has been under consideration, and we have digressed from it to consider other questions which are of themselves of great importance. It is an abuse that exists in the Senate, as all of us realize. Our debate ought to be shortened in some way, and there ought not to be an objection to entering into this agreement.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am very sorry that the Senator from Arkansas imputes such conduct to me as that. I for one shall have to be the judge as to whether there ought to be an objection made, and I simply can not agree to a proposition like this that confines me to a 10-minute presentation—

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

Mr. HARDWICK. I am not yielding.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will not the Senator yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Not for the present. I want to make a statement myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia declines to yield.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will not agree to any proposition after we have taken up other amendments and devoted days and weeks almost to some of them, under which I can not get for what I regard the most important amendment that will be offered to the bill more than 10 minutes in which to present it.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator entirely misunderstood me. My suggestion was that an agreement be entered into which would give the Senator two hours.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not want that. I have already suggested—

Mr. ROBINSON. That was the agreement I suggested, and the Senator from Oregon indicated his assent to it. I am utterly at a loss to understand the process of the Senator's mind by which he has reached the conclusion that I was in any way antagonizing him.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am not responsible for the Senator's difficulty in understanding.

Mr. ROBINSON. Perhaps not.

Mr. HARDWICK. The effect of the agreement proposed by the Senator from Oregon is that if the pending amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina takes until 2 o'clock on Monday, I could not have more than 10 minutes to present my amendment. I do not think I shall need more than 20 minutes, but I can not agree to any proposal that will deny me that.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator he can speak 20 minutes, 10 minutes on the bill and 10 minutes on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inquire of the Senator from Oregon whether he has modified his request? If so, it ought to be stated in its present form.

Mr. HARDWICK. I should like to have it stated exactly as it is proposed.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Secretary will read the proposed agreement as modified.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator from Oregon. Evidently in preparing this agreement the Senator had in view to allow a week for discussion upon this bill. I am sure the sugar bill will not take over two days. I believe we can get through with it in one day. My idea would be, if there was any prospect of getting the bill through on Monday, to hold a night session Monday and finish it up; but I am sure we can get through with it in a couple of days. Let me suggest to the Senator from Oregon that he change the time stated in the proposed agreement so as to allow a week after Tuesday for discussion on the Army bill.

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

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me finish, if the Senator please. And to accommodate the views of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] I suggest that we begin the application of the 10-minute rule on Thursday instead of Wednesday, which would be the next day after the sugar bill was disposed of, if it should take two days.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, of course if that is satisfactory to the Senator having the bill in charge I shall not object, but I

was going to suggest that there are two or three Senators who desire to make speeches of 20 or 30 minutes, or perhaps one of three-quarters of an hour, and why would it not be better for the Senator from North Carolina to give notice now that he will call up the sugar bill on Tuesday?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I do not want to lose another day.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is not any more anxious to pass that bill than I am, and I do not believe that the postponement would make a particle of difference as to the bill. Then we could use all day Monday in the delivery of speeches on the Army bill that it would take some time to deliver and agree upon a 10-minute limit to apply after Monday.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator must see that the very same purpose he has in view will be accomplished by the suggestion I made a little while ago. Instead of limiting debate to 10 minutes, beginning on Monday, fix the time for limiting debate to 10 minutes on Thursday. That would give all day Wednesday, if it takes us two days to pass the sugar bill, to general unlimited debate. If we can pass it in one day, it would give two days for unlimited debate.

Mr. SMOOT. If it takes two days, then there will not be any time at all left. That is what I was trying to avoid.

Mr. SIMMONS. I said not Wednesday, but Thursday, to begin the operation of the 10-minute rule.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to that. I was only trying to get a time fixed, so that Senators could speak on the bill now.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, this difficulty suggests itself to me with regard to the proposition of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. His supposition is a very probable one—that the sugar bill will be disposed of within two days; but there is always in this body, in any event, the possibility that a longer amount of time will be consumed, and properly consumed, in the consideration of a bill. I have this suggestion to make: That we take up the sugar bill and devote the evenings of next week to its consideration, so that our day sessions can be devoted, just as they have been, to the consideration of the Army bill. There is no reason in the world why we should not come here at 8 o'clock every evening and consider and dispose of the sugar bill. That proceeding would have the double effect, perhaps, Mr. President, of not interfering with the present pending business and, at the same time, of shortening the debates upon the sugar bill on the part of those who may object to such a strenuous procedure.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. Just one word. I would not have any objection to the plan proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] except for the fact that, if we only devote night sessions to the discussion of the sugar bill, it might take us a week to pass it, because we might be troubled about questions of quorums and all that sort of thing, at the will of any Senator who might oppose the proposed legislation.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator, Why would it not be well now to ask unanimous consent to close debate on the sugar bill at a certain time?

Mr. SIMMONS. I was just about to ask the Chair, as a parliamentary inquiry, whether it would be in order for me at this time to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed on Monday next with the consideration of the sugar bill, and that by unanimous consent a vote be taken thereon at 5 o'clock on Tuesday?

Mr. STONE. At not later than 5 o'clock.

Mr. SIMMONS. At not later than 5 o'clock on Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In answer to the inquiry of the Senator from North Carolina, the present occupant of the chair will say that he is of opinion that it is competent to have a unanimous-consent agreement to that effect, to vote at a certain hour of the day.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection, I will say to the Senator from North Carolina, to his asking for any agreement that the Senate may reach as a part of this unanimous-consent agreement; but I am not going to give up the right of way here, unless the Senate takes it away from me, unless I can have some understanding about the disposition of the bill now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inquire of the Senator from Oregon whether he proposes to modify the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. SIMMONS. I will offer this as an amendment to the unanimous-consent agreement—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator from North Carolina first rises and objects here to a proposal that I offered to the Senate, and I think it comes with rather poor grace from him to now come and undertake to sidetrack an attempt to get a unanimous-consent agreement as to the other. I have expressed the desire,

Mr. President, to help the Senator from North Carolina get consideration of the sugar bill, but I do not feel very patient about having him undertake to sidetrack the proposition which I have submitted to the Senate in favor of the proposition which he makes.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to assure the Senator from Oregon that I had no such thought in my mind, and I did not make this request to interfere with him in the slightest degree. I am glad he made the request, and I am willing to offer my request for unanimous consent as an amendment to his request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from North Carolina permit the amended request for a unanimous-consent agreement to be now read?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will now be read by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. It is agreed by unanimous consent that, at not later than 4 o'clock p. m. on Tuesday, April 18, 1916, the Senate will proceed to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the House bill 12766, to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 12 o'clock meridian on Thursday, April 13, 1916, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry of the Senator from North Carolina. Suppose that under that arrangement the sugar bill is taken up on Monday or Tuesday and continues for two weeks, what would happen to amendments that are to be proposed to the military bill?

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from Iowa probably did not hear all of my proposition. It was that we should take up the sugar bill on Monday and proceed to its consideration on Monday at 12 o'clock, and that a final vote should be taken on the bill and on all amendments thereto not later than 5 o'clock on Tuesday.

Mr. CUMMINS. If that element is put into the unanimous-consent agreement, I have no objection whatever to it; but that is not now in the agreement.

Mr. SIMMONS. I offer that as an amendment to the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. Is a proposed unanimous-consent agreement subject to be amended?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a precedent where five unanimous-consent agreements were agreed upon at the same time.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I can understand that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] can modify his own proposed unanimous-consent agreement to suit himself; but that the Senate by a majority vote can amend a unanimous-consent agreement is something of which I had not heard.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understood the Senator from Oregon to say that he would accept the amendment, that it might be incorporated in his proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and that we vote at one time upon the proposition as amended.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Then it would become a part of the Senator's own proposition and, of course, that would be perfectly proper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will take the liberty of calling attention to the fact that, while the precedents do not bind, yet when the Canadian reciprocity agreement was under consideration a unanimous-consent agreement was made to vote on that bill, a unanimous-consent agreement was made to vote on the wool bill, a unanimous-consent agreement was made to vote on the farmers' free-list bill, a unanimous-consent agreement was made to vote on the apportionment of representation bill, and a unanimous-consent agreement was made to vote upon the question of the admission of New Mexico and Arizona; but they were to take effect on different days and at different hours, of course. So the Chair has suggested that it would now be competent to reach a unanimous-consent agreement to vote upon the sugar bill as well as upon the bill now under consideration.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] will make the 10-minute rule begin on Friday, instead of on Thursday, I shall have no objection to the agreement.

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

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senate will consent to a recess until 11 o'clock on Monday morning and on Tuesday morning of next week, I shall have no objection to the agreement.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from North Carolina state his request?

Mr. SIMMONS. It is that at noon on Monday next the Senate proceed to the consideration of the sugar bill and the amendments thereto, and that not later than 4 o'clock on Tuesday there shall be a vote upon—

Mr. THOMAS. Say 5 o'clock.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no objection to 5 o'clock. I would, however, rather have it 4 o'clock; but if the Senator insists upon it being 5 o'clock—

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I want to dispose of the bill and am just as anxious to do so as is the chairman of the committee; but I think there should be some time for discussion.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Make it 5 o'clock.

Mr. SIMMONS. Well, make it 5 o'clock. I ask that the Secretary place the remainder of the agreement in the usual form.

Mr. LODGE. And that the Senate recess on Monday to 11 o'clock on Tuesday.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes. If the Senator from Oregon agrees to that, it is perfectly satisfactory to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will now state the request as amended.

The Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at not later than 4 o'clock p. m. on Tuesday, April 18, 1916, the Senate will proceed to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, April 14, 1916, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

And it is further agreed by unanimous consent that, at not later than 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, April 10, 1916, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill H. R. 11471, an act to amend an act entitled "An act to reduce the tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913, and that at not later than 5 o'clock p. m. on Tuesday, April 11, 1916, the Senate will proceed to vote upon any amendment that may then be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMMONS. I think the words "without further debate" should be included.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from North Carolina a question. I do not exactly understand the proposal. I desire to inquire how much time will intervene between the close of the consideration and vote on the sugar bill and the time when debate and consideration of the military bill shall close?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. A week.

Mr. SIMMONS. Just one week.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I ask that the proposed agreement be modified so that debate shall close on the sugar bill at 5 o'clock on Tuesday, April 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request for unanimous consent will be modified in that respect.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The words "without further debate" should be added.

The SECRETARY. So as to read:

Shall vote without further debate.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I ask for a division of this question, so that there may be a separate presentation of each part of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Senator's privilege. The question will first be put upon the request for unanimous consent proposed by the Senator from Oregon. Is there objection?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to submit a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair. I inquire whether or not under the proposition contained in this request all debate would be precluded upon amendments offered to the bill after the hour of 4 o'clock on April 14th?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Chair will reply that debate will be in order on amendments offered.

Mr. POINDEXTER. A further inquiry. The language of the request is that at that hour we shall proceed to vote upon the bill and amendments. I understand the Chair holds that debate will be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the 10-minute rule.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Under the 10-minute rule.

Mr. JONES. I understand debate will not be in order after the time set for voting; but after Friday, April 14, until April

18, debate under the 10-minute rule will be in order. After 4 o'clock on the 18th, however, we can not, under the proposed agreement, debate any amendment that may be pending.

Mr. POINDEXTER. After 4 o'clock on the 18th?

Mr. JONES. After 4 o'clock on the 18th, when we begin to vote, debate shall not be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is right in that respect, that on the 18th after 4 o'clock debate shall not be in order.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I think that I will have to object to the request in that form. It seems to me that the five-minute rule at least ought to be in order upon amendments that may be offered to the bill. It would be rather unsatisfactory if amendments which may occur to Senators shall not even be subject to explanation or to any debate whatever. So, I ask the Senator from Oregon to modify his request by providing that Senators shall not speak more than once or longer than five minutes upon the bill or any amendment after the hour of 4 o'clock on the 18th of April.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection to that, Mr. President. It is desired to get a date fixed when we may dispose of this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that change will be made in the proposed unanimous-consent agreement. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement covering House bill 12766 as finally entered into is as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at not later than 4 o'clock p. m. on Tuesday, April 18, 1916, the Senate will proceed to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States, through the regular parliamentary stages, to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, April 14, 1916, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill, or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto; and, further, that after the hour of 4 o'clock p. m. on Tuesday, April 18, 1916, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 5 minutes upon any amendment pending or offered to the said bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Now, is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I make the same observation with reference to that request.

Mr. SIMMONS. I thought that the agreement was all one.

Mr. LODGE. It is all one agreement, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has asked for a division.

Mr. LODGE. How is it possible to divide a proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the Senator from Massachusetts is wrong about that.

Mr. LODGE. But the second agreement, if it may be called so, came to us as a part of the first agreement, having been accepted by the Senator from Oregon as a modification of his own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will still hold that it is a divisible question.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington insists, I will consent to a modification, so as to provide for the same arrangement concerning debate under the five-minute rule on the sugar bill as was made regarding the military bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for unanimous consent as modified? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement as to House bill 11471 as finally entered into is as follows:

And it is further agreed by unanimous consent that at not later than 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, April 10, 1916, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill H. R. 11471, an act to amend an act entitled "An act to reduce the tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913; and that at not later than 5 o'clock p. m. on Tuesday, April 11, 1916, the Senate will vote upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 5 o'clock p. m. on said day, Tuesday, April 11, 1916, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than five minutes upon any amendment pending or that may be offered to the said bill.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, in view of what has been said with reference to the National Guard being represented in Washington by a lobby, and also what has been said in reference to the position of Gen. O'Ryan on the subject of a Volunteer Army, I ask leave to have incorporated in the Reconnaissance a communication in behalf of the executive committee of the National Guard Association of the United States, Gen. Foster, and also an article from the New York Times of to-day, showing Gen. O'Ryan's position on the subject of the Volunteer Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Ebbitt Hotel, Washington, April 8, 1916.

HON. BLAIR LEE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LEE: The charge that the National Guard is represented in Washington by a lobby, and that it is seeking by improper means to influence the action of Congress, with regard to pending military legislation, would not call for comment if it had emanated from a less important source. As that charge has been made, it seems proper and necessary that this committee make a statement with regard to that matter.

The National Guard Association of the United States is a representative organization which meets annually in convention made up of delegates selected upon a basis of 1 for each 500 or fraction thereof of organized troops. Its object is to promote this branch of the National Military Establishment, and practically all of the Federal legislation dealing with the militia which has been enacted in recent years has been initiated by this organization. During the interim between its conventions the affairs of the association are conducted by an executive committee, and it may be stated in passing that guardsmen do not seek positions upon this committee; they are selected for that duty, and if they serve they do so at some personal expense and sacrifice.

The members of this executive committee appeared before the Military Committees of Congress at the hearings which were held prior to the formulation of the bills which have since been introduced in the House and Senate. Some of the members of this committee have been here since, during the progress of the pending military legislation. If excuse for their presence within the precincts of this sacred city is required, it may be said that they are here at the suggestion and request of Members of both the Senate and House who are not only interested in the National Guard, but who are earnestly trying to preserve that institution against the assaults of those who would destroy it.

When the House military bill had been introduced the members of the National Guard executive committee met here and spent a week in careful consideration of those of its features dealing with their branch of the service and they submitted to Mr. HAY and to the members of his committee certain suggested amendments which they felt would improve the National Guard sections of the bill. The chairman of the House committee graciously gave the National Guard representatives a hearing, and while he did not accept all of the suggestions which were made, every opportunity was afforded them for consultation and discussion. A similar course was followed with the Senate bill when it was finally introduced. On March 18 certain amendments proposed by this committee were submitted to Senator CHAMBERLAIN with request that they be considered and that opportunity be given to present to him the reasons which prompted their suggestion. This communication was not acknowledged nor replied to. I think it must be admitted that our committee was not unduly insistent in pressing its recommendations upon the notice of the Senate committee.

These recommendations have, however, been brought to the attention of Senators through National Guardsmen of their own States, and, for the most part, have now been offered in the Senate as amendments to the Senate bill.

Inquiry suggests itself as to what constitutes a "bald" or "insidious" lobby.

We may without disadvantage, I think, compare the activities of the National Guard committee with those of other organizations and interests and "movements" concerned with the same legislation. What the "bald lobby" of the National Guard has done has already been stated. Here are some of the things it has not done:

Those composing it have not sought to interview or called upon any Senator or Representative except when specially invited to do so. The writer has not written or spoken to either Senator or the Representatives from his own State upon the subject of military legislation, a privilege that probably would not have been denied him.

No printed matter has been gotten out or circulated. No headquarters is maintained; no publicity agent is employed or other medium for extending propaganda.

The Members of Congress have not been circularized and their mail has not been burdened with letters from this committee.

The above humiliating confession as to the further defects in the National Guard system, indicating lack of efficiency in the methods of influencing legislation which are recognized and practiced by the experts, is unwillingly wrung from us.

On the other hand, practically every other branch of the military service has its "league" for promotion, with established offices and paid publicity agents actively at work in extending its propaganda. The president of one of the patriotic preparedness leagues recently employed a whole page in a Washington paper to warn the House of Representatives against legislating for the development of the National Guard and sent each Member one or more letters.

Presumably that newspaper space was not donated for the purpose. The organization referred to and the many others of similar character rendered kin by a system of interlocking directorates which would put the Standard Oil system to blush is expending thousands of dollars in extending its propaganda against the long-established volunteer military system of the country in favor of conscription and compulsory military service.

Hundreds of telegrams have been received within the last few days in the Senate from various sources and complacently placed in the RECORD as evidence of the patriotic purpose of the senders, but telegrams from National Guardsmen were made the basis for scathing denunciation. If it is an offense against the peace of the Nation and the dignity of the Senate for the Members of that body to be made acquainted by telegram with the views of their constituents who are guardsmen, upon matters of pending legislation, let the excuse offered by the executive committee of the Military Training Camp Association for similar action, as quoted in the New York Times of Thursday, be accepted also for the offending guardsmen. The "Plattsburg" representatives said: "It has been our consistent policy to keep out of politics and legislative activities, but when it becomes a matter of self-preservation, such as is this, it is not only proper but absolutely necessary that we take measures to protect the future of the movement."

The relationship between the military training camp project and the continental army scheme is thus for the first time officially disclosed. If a policy alleged to attach to a mere "movement" can gain consistency in a year, something may be said for the record of an institu-

tion which for more than a hundred years has practiced similar rectitude and repression, and, with small encouragement, has worked to keep alive the military spirit of our people "during the many years of our national indifference on the subject of preparedness," as the Senate Military Committee has very fairly expressed it.

If Congress be desirous of identifying the military influences which it is willingly and unwillingly subjected, we suggest the simple expedient of a statute requiring all who receive pay or emoluments in the military service of the Government to wear the uniform while in Washington. If this were done, my dear Senator, it may be safely predicted that the much-dreaded National Guard "lobby" would be lost sight of in the crowd.

For more than two years the National Guard representatives stood on the steps at the War Department and urged the Secretary of War to recommend to Congress those measures for the improvement of their service, which they and all of the agencies of the War Department had agreed were consistent and necessary. During that time they were repeatedly told by the former Secretary of War that they might go direct to Congress with their proposals; but, believing that the National Guard is sustained for its Federal uses and that its needs should be presented by the head of the War Department, the same as is done for the Army, the suggestion was not acted upon until all other doors stood closed. The National Guard has now come to Congress. Openly and not without confidence, because sure of the justice and wisdom of what it proposes. With due regard to our respective official relationships we have been scrupulously careful to observe the amenities of the situation, as we understand them and as they have been revealed to us. Conscious of no inconsistent action and being actuated by motives which we know to be proper and which we believe to be patriotic, we protest against misrepresentation and unjust denunciation by those who, as the representatives of the Government we seek to serve, we have the right to look for fair treatment and reasonable consideration.

Due to the fact that the National Guard has not advertised its virtues and has left its enemies free to proclaim its deficiencies, there is no institution of the American Government which at this time is more generally misunderstood, more incorrectly estimated, and more persistently and maliciously misrepresented. Knowing this, we can the better appreciate the attitude of yourself and others in Congress who are supporting our branch of the service and speaking in its defense.

Very sincerely, yours,

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL
GUARD ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
J. CLIFFORD R. FOSTER, Chairman.

[From the New York Times of Apr. 8, 1916.]

GEN. O'RYAN ASSAILS VOLUNTEER ARMY PLAN—DENIES HIS LETTER INDORSED IT—NATIONAL GUARD AT WAR WITH TRAINING CAMP LEADERS.

The breach that separates the two groups most interested in the Army legislation now pending in Congress, one group being composed of the officers of the National Guard and those in sympathy with them and the other group comprising the men who attended the training camps held last year and numerous officers of the Regular Army, is widening to the point where the two groups are almost openly at war. Section 56 of the Chamberlain bill, which creates a "volunteer army" separate and distinct from the National Guard organization as provided for in section 58, is the cause of the division.

The National Guardsmen almost to a man maintain that the existence of the two forces at the same time is impossible, because, as an officer of the New York Guard expressed it yesterday, it requires "two bodies with identical functions to occupy the same space at the same time." Among the officers none is more outspoken in his opposition to the "volunteer army" than Maj. Gen. John E. O'Ryan, commanding the National Guard of this State. He said yesterday that he believed that section 56 of the Chamberlain bill was backed by "a strong ultra-military group, who can see nothing good in the way of preparedness except a huge Regular Army, supported by conscription."

The letter written to Senator O'GORMAN by Col. Henry S. Sternburger, chief quartermaster on the staff of Gen. O'Ryan, which Senator O'GORMAN interpreted as a command to vote for the elimination of the "volunteer army" provision of the Chamberlain bill, is approved by the great majority of guard officers in New York. In the opinion of brother officers, Col. Sternburger was within his rights when he wrote that letter, in which, among other things, he said:

"I shall use my influence, not only with the National Guardsmen but with all citizens with whom I come into contact, toward pointing out to them that the so-called continental army scheme is impracticable and will have a bad effect if passed."

Gen. O'Ryan did not say so, but it is believed that he indorsed every word that Col. Sternburger wrote.

Senator O'GORMAN, in expressing in the Senate Thursday his disapproval of Col. Sternburger's utterances, stated that Gen. O'Ryan had written on January 17 a letter stating that the volunteer army provision would not impair the efficiency of the National Guard. Gen. O'Ryan said yesterday that he was at a loss to understand how such an interpretation could be placed upon the letter referred to, which relates to training camps, and not to any volunteer army such as is proposed in the Chamberlain bill.

GEN. O'RYAN'S VIEWS.

"The letter referred to as having been written by me," said Gen. O'Ryan, "was doubtless a letter written to Gen. Wood or Capt. Johnson of his staff, commanding the Plattsburg training camp, and suggesting the cooperation of the National Guard regimental commanders. The letter had no reference to the Federal Army proposition."

"The officers of the National Guard generally throughout the country do not believe in the wisdom of the volunteer army provision of the Chamberlain bill, and I am of the opinion that this sentiment is not based on selfish grounds, for if there is any unselfish aggregation of men in this country it is the army made up of the officers and men composing the National Guard. Their practical spirit of self-sacrifice over a long period of years has demonstrated this. They believe the provision referred to unwise, because they think there is a strong ultra-military group who can see nothing good in the way of preparedness except a huge Regular Army, supported by conscription, and that the opposition to the reorganization of the National Guard as a Federal force is fostered by this element."

"They further believe that the volunteer army provision, while resulting in nothing practical in the way of creating an efficient fighting force, will nevertheless create a new organization to assist in fighting the National Guard—a force to be later discarded as evidence of an honest but fruitless attempt to develop a force other than by conscrip-

tion. They believe that the wealthy men and the professional and business men who constitute the personnel of the training camp associations would not enlist in a volunteer army any more than they would enlist in the National Guard; or, if they did, it would be for the sole purpose of attempting to give the organization a start, after which they would drop out. They believe that the members of these training camp associations do not realize the probability of this outcome.

"The sentiment of the National Guard is that while the widely advertised shortcomings of the National Guard have been greatly exaggerated, there are faults of organization and insufficient Federal control, all of which will be corrected after the passage of the legislation now pending in Congress, which will give to the National Guard a Federal status.

"I say this is the sentiment of the National Guard as I understand it from correspondence and conversation with officers from all over the country. They feel that they have not had sympathetic support, and some go so far as to state that the recent remarkable increase in efficiency has resulted in increased antagonism on the part of the group referred to. It is to be regretted that this sentiment exists, but that it does exist is not to be denied.

"Some officers who make these criticisms give voluntary acknowledgment of their confidence in the large number of regular officers working with the National Guard, and who believe in the possibilities of its future development under Federal control.

"Personally, I do not believe in the volunteer army provision of the Chamberlain bill, for the reason that it creates an additional category of troops of the same class as the National Guard of the United States under the new bill, and because it will constitute a force that will be worthless without the expenditure of millions of dollars to provide it with facilities, which the National Guard already possesses. An additional objection is the fact that the new force will necessarily be in conflict with the reorganized Federal National Guard in the matters of recruiting and obtaining appropriations for field training and armament. The results could not but be contrary to the best interests of the country.

"Much misinformation exists concerning the effect of the new legislation on the National Guard. If anyone will take the trouble to read the provisions of the bill it will be found that they provide for uniformity in every detail of military organization, discipline, training, armament, and equipment throughout the country."

Other officers at National Guard headquarters in the municipal building stated that Gen. O'Ryan had expressed their views. One of these officers referred to a letter sent to members of the Military Training Camps Association of the United States this week, in which the men who attended the military training camps were asked to telegraph their Senators immediately to support the volunteer army section of the Chamberlain bill, under which section the President would have the power, in discretion, to organize camps similar to the Plattsburg camp in all parts of the country.

"If a Guard officer writes his Senator it is dictation, but if a member of the Training Camps Association telegraphs him, it is a perfectly proper thing to do," was one officer's comment.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon consents that the military bill may be temporarily laid aside so that I may ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 12207, the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 12207) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I want it understood that that will not displace the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not at all. The regular order will be laid aside temporarily. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 12207) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Legislative," subhead "Senate," on page 2, line 13, after "\$6,500," to strike out "hire of horse and wagon for the Secretary's office, \$420"; in line 15, after "\$5,000," to insert "reading clerk, \$3,600"; in line 17, after the words "principal clerk," to strike out "reading clerk," and on page 3, line 4, after the words "in all" to strike out "\$94,230" and insert "\$94,410," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Secretary: Secretary of the Senate, including compensation as disbursing officer of salaries of Senators and of the contingent fund of the Senate, \$6,500; assistant secretary, Henry M. Rose, \$5,000; reading clerk, \$3,600; chief clerk, \$3,250; financial clerk, \$3,000;

minute and journal clerk, principal clerk and enrolling clerk, at \$3,000 each; executive clerk, and assistant financial clerk, at \$2,750 each; Librarian, file clerk, chief bookkeeper, assistant journal clerk, and printing clerk, at \$2,500 each; first assistant Librarian, and keeper of stationery, at \$2,400 each; assistant Librarian, \$1,800; skilled laborer, \$1,200; clerks—3 at \$2,500 each, 4 at \$2,220 each, 2 at \$2,100 each, 1 \$1,800, 2 at \$1,600 each, 1 \$1,440; assistant keeper of stationery, \$2,000; assistant in stationery room, \$1,200; messenger, \$1,440; assistant messenger, \$1,200; laborers—3 at \$840 each, 3 at \$720 each, 1 in stationery room, \$720; in all, \$94,410.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in the item of appropriation for "Clerks and messengers to the committees of the Senate," on page 7, line 15, after the words "Rules—clerk," to strike out "\$2,220" and insert: "\$2,720, to include full compensation for the preparation biennially of the Senate Manual, under the direction of the Committee on Rules," and, on page 8, line 3, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$427,880" and insert "\$428,380," so as to read:

Rules—clerk \$2,720, to include full compensation for the preparation biennially of the Senate Manual, under the direction of the Committee on Rules, assistant clerk \$1,800, messenger \$1,440; Standards, Weights, and Measures—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Territories—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,440; Transportation and Sale of Meat Products—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Transportation Routes to the Seaboard—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; University of the United States—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Woman Suffrage—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; in all, \$428,380.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 10, after "\$3,000," to insert "two floor assistants, at \$2,000 each," and, in line 12, after "\$1,000," to strike out "two on the floor of the Senate, at \$2,000 each," so as to read:

Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$6,500; Assistant Sergeant at Arms, \$2,500; Assistant Doorkeeper, \$3,000; Acting Assistant Doorkeeper, \$3,000; two floor assistants, at \$2,000 each; messengers—4 (acting as assistant doorkeepers) at \$1,800 each, 32 at \$1,440 each, 1 \$1,050, 1 \$1,000, 1 at card door \$1,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 13, after the word "Foreman," to strike out "\$1,400" and insert "\$1,600," and, in line 15, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$17,720" and insert "\$17,920," so as to make the clause read:

Folding room: Foreman, \$1,600; assistant, \$1,400; clerk, \$1,200; folders—7 at \$1,000 each, 8 at \$840 each; in all \$17,920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 4, after the word "each," to insert "24 assistant clerks, at \$1,200 each," and, in line 6, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$76,800" and insert "\$105,600," so as to make the clause read:

For assistance to Senators who are not chairmen of committees, as follows: Twenty-four clerks, at \$2,000 each; 24 assistant clerks, at \$1,200 each; 24 messengers, at \$1,200 each; in all, \$105,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 11, to strike out:

For maintaining and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails, \$6,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

And to insert:

For maintaining, exchanging, and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails and for official use of the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, \$6,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 22, after the word "thousand," to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$10,000," so as to make the clause read:

For folding speeches and pamphlets, at a rate not exceeding \$1 per thousand, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 5, to insert: For rent of warehouse for storage of public documents, \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Library of Congress," on page 22, line 21, after the word "each," where it occurs the second time, to strike out "two" and insert "four," and on page 23, line 4, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$58,020" and insert "\$59,220," so as to make the clause read:

Reading rooms (including evening service) and special collections: Superintendent, \$3,000; assistants—2 at \$1,800 each, 5 at \$1,200 each (including 1 in room for the blind), 2 at charging desk at \$1,080 each, 3 at \$960 each, 10 at \$840 each, 4 at \$600 each; stenographer and typewriter, \$960; attendants—Senate reading room, \$960; Representatives' reading room—1 \$960, 1 \$840, 2 in cloakroom at \$780 each, 1 in Toner Library \$960, 1 in Washington Library \$960, 2 for gallery and alcoves at \$540 each; telephone operator, \$660; 4 junior messengers, at \$420 each; 2 watchmen, at \$780 each; evening service, assistants—5 at \$960 each, 15 at \$840 each, 2 at \$600 each; in all, \$59,220.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 8, after "\$1,500," to insert "assistant, \$900," and in line 9, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$4,920" and insert "\$5,820," so as to make the clause read:

Semitic and Oriental Literature: Chief of division, \$3,000; assistant, \$1,500; assistant, \$900; junior messenger, \$420; in all, \$5,820.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 3, after the word "each," where it occurs the second time, to strike out "two" and insert "three"; in line 4, after the word "each," where it occurs the first time, to strike out "three" and insert "four," and in line 10, after the word "Librarian," to strike out "\$40,900" and insert "\$43,000," so as to make the clause read:

Distribution of card indexes: For service in connection with distribution of card indexes and other publications of the Library: Chief of division, \$3,000; chief assistant, \$1,800; assistants—1 \$1,600, 3 at \$1,500 each, 3 at \$1,400 each, 3 at \$1,200 each, 3 at \$1,100 each, 4 at \$1,000 each; for services of assistants at salaries less than \$1,000 per annum and for piecework and work by the hour, \$17,000, including not exceeding \$500 for freight charges, expressage, traveling expenses connected with such distribution, and expenses of attendance at meetings when incurred on the written authority and direction of the Librarian, \$43,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 6, before the word "watchmen," to strike out "sixteen" and insert "eighteen"; in line 7, before the word "painter," to strike out "carpenter" and insert "two carpenters"; in line 8, before the word "laborers," to strike out "fourteen" and insert "sixteen"; and in line 15, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$77,745" and insert "\$81,525," so as to make the clause read:

Library building and grounds: Superintendent, \$3,000; clerks—1 \$2,000, 1 \$1,600, 1 \$1,400, 1 \$1,000; property clerk, \$900; messenger; assistant messenger; telephone switchboard operator; assistant telephone switchboard operator; captain of watch, \$1,400; lieutenant of watch, \$1,000; 18 watchmen, at \$900 each; 2 carpenters, painter, and foreman of laborers, at \$900 each; 16 laborers, at \$540 each; 2 attendants in ladies' room, at \$480 each; 4 check boys, at \$360 each; mistress of charwomen, \$425; assistant mistress of charwomen, \$300; 58 charwomen; chief engineer, \$1,500; assistant engineers—1 \$1,200, 3 at \$900 each; electrician, \$1,500; machinists—1 \$1,000, 1 \$900; 2 wiremen, at \$900 each; plumber, \$900; 3 elevator conductors, and 10 skilled laborers, at \$720 each; in all, \$81,525.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 2, to insert: For resurfacing west driveway and repairs to stone curb in Library grounds, \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 4, to insert: For refitting of boiler room and coal vaults, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Botanic Garden," on page 28, line 11, after the words "Joint Committee on the Library," to strike out "\$17,000" and insert "\$19,500," so as to make the clause read:

For assistants and laborers, under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, \$19,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 14, after the word "supplies," to insert "traveling expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence of the superintendent and his assistants"; in line 17, after the words "Botanic Gardens," to insert "purchase and maintenance of motor-propelled delivery vehicle"; and in line 19, after the words "Joint Library Committee of Congress," to strike out "\$9,000" and insert "\$11,903," so as to make the clause read:

For procuring manure, soil, tools, fuel, purchasing trees, shrubs, plants, and seeds; services, materials, and miscellaneous supplies, traveling expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence of the superintendent and his assistants, street car tickets not exceeding \$25, and contingent expenses in connection with repairs and improvements to Botanic Gardens, purchase and maintenance of motor-propelled delivery vehicle, under direction of the Joint Library Committee of Congress, \$11,903.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Executive," on page 29, line 5, after the word "clerks," to insert "two at \$2,500 each"; in line 6, before the words "of class four," to strike out "six" and insert "five"; in the same line, before the words "of class three," to strike out "three" and insert "two"; in line 8, before the word "at," where it occurs the first time, to strike out "two" and insert "three"; in the same line, before the word "at," where it occurs the second time, to strike out "two" and insert "three"; and in line 9, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$73,440" and insert "\$76,780," so as to make the clause read:

Office of the President: Secretary, \$7,500; executive clerk, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$4,000; appointment clerk, \$3,500; record clerk, \$2,500; 2 expert stenographers, at \$2,500 each; accountant and disbursing clerk, \$2,500; 2 correspondents, at \$2,500 each; clerks—2 at \$2,500 each, 4 at \$2,000 each, 5 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 4 of class 2, 3 of class 1; messengers—3 at \$900 each, 3 at \$840 each; 3 laborers at

\$720 each; in all, \$76,780: *Provided*, That employees of the executive departments and other establishments of the executive branch of the Government may be detailed from time to time to the office of the President of the United States for such temporary assistance as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Civil Service Commission," on page 30, line 19, before the words "of class four," to strike out "six" and insert "seven"; in the same line, before the words "of class three," to strike out "twenty-six" and insert "thirty"; in line 20, before the words "of class two," to strike out "thirty-six" and insert "forty-two"; and on page 31, line 1, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$278,330" and insert "\$294,930," so as to make the clause read:

For commissioner, acting as president of the commission, \$4,500; 2 commissioners, at \$4,000 each; chief examiner, \$3,500; secretary, \$2,500; assistant chief examiner, \$2,250; chiefs of division—3 at \$2,000 each; examiners—1 \$2,400, 3 at \$2,000 each, 6 at \$1,800 each; clerks—7 of class 4, 30 of class 3, 42 of class 2, 52 of class 1, 34 at \$1,000 each, 22 at \$900 each; messenger; assistant messenger; skilled laborer, \$720; 4 messenger boys, at \$360 each. Custodian force: Engineer, \$840; general mechanic, \$840; telephone-switchboard operator; 2 firemen; 2 watchmen; 2 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 3 laborers; 4 charwomen; in all, \$294,930.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 2, after the word "commission," to strike out "\$18,000" and insert "\$20,000," so as to make the clause read:

For necessary traveling expenses, including those of examiners acting under the direction of the commission, and for expenses of examinations and investigations held elsewhere than at Washington, and including not exceeding \$1,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of public officials when specifically directed by the commission, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 6, after the word "commission," to strike out "\$5,700" and insert "\$7,500," so as to make the clause read:

For field examiners at the rate of \$1,500 per annum each, for work in connection with members of local boards and other necessary work as directed by the commission, \$7,500.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of State," on page 32, line 9, after "\$12,000," to insert "Undersecretary of State, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, \$7,500"; in line 13, after "4,500," to strike out "Counselor for the department, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, \$7,500"; in line 16, after the word "work," to strike out "four" and insert "five," so as to read:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

For Secretary of State, \$12,000; Undersecretary of State, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, \$7,500; Assistant Secretary, \$5,000; Second and Third Assistant Secretaries, at \$4,500 each; Director of the Consular Service, \$4,500; officers to aid in important drafting work, five at \$4,500 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I notice, so far as the bill has been read, on almost every page the creation apparently of additional clerkships and additional positions of watchmen and messengers. There seems to be, to quite an extent, a multiplication of positions in this bill. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Virginia if he has made any computation as to how many new positions are provided for by the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I can not give the number, but in the aggregate it is small. All the Senate amendments only involve an increase of about half a million dollars. Increases have only been made where they are very necessary, and they are much fewer than were estimated and asked for by the departments. Some increases in the service in some places were absolutely necessary to accomplish efficient work.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, Mr. President, under the situation which every Senator is familiar with, it is absolutely impossible for Senators, with the other duties which they have, to be informed about these matters, and we have to rely—and I do rely—on the committee in charge of them, particularly on the chairman of the committee; but my observation, in going into the various departments here, is that there is no lack of messengers and watchmen. It seems to me, if anything, there is a superfluity of them. The impression that one gets is that, so far as those positions are concerned, those who hold them are suffering for lack of something to do. They seem to spend the day sitting in the corridors; and so it is somewhat surprising to see, on every page in this bill, additional positions of this kind, and other kinds, created.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say to the Senator, Mr. President, that I am sure the committee all feel that if we have erred at all, it was in denying things that were asked, rather than in giving what we have given. The increases are

very often apparent and not real. They are struck off in one place and added in another.

You may take particularly the State Department. There they were paying 93 clerks out of a lump sum, and we discontinued that. We repealed the sections that allowed lump sums for clerks, and made them statutory appointments.

I am sure that if we have erred at all it has been in denying things rather than in allowing too much.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I sincerely hope that is true, Mr. President. Of course, that matter will have to stand upon its merits, and the Senator, no doubt, is assured of the need for these new positions; but it is very surprising.

I should like to ask the Senator further if this entire increase of \$500,000, or the greater part of it, is for these new positions?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Oh, no—a very small part of it, Mr. President. The largest increase is for an increased force for the collection of the income tax.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Can the Senator inform the Senate as to the total amount of the appropriations contained in this bill for the salaries of new positions that are provided for in the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have not a list made up giving that aggregate, but I can assure the Senator that it is not large, and we have pruned it wherever we possibly could. The committee has made a conscientious effort to prevent duplication of service or too liberal a supply of assistants in the departments.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I notice on page 33 of the bill, just turning to it at random, in line 8, that the bill as it came from the House provided for 17 clerks of class 4. The Senate bill provides for 25 of these clerks. In line 9 the House bill provided for 19 clerks of class 3. The Senate bill provides for 26 clerks of class 3. In the same line and in line 10, 25 clerks of class 2 are increased to 35 clerks of class 2. In line 10, 43 clerks of class 1 are increased to 53 clerks of class 1. That seems to be, so far as I have been able to follow the reading of the bill, characteristic of the entire legislation.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If the Senator will permit me, I am sure I can set his mind at rest about that. If he will turn over to page 34, he will find stricken out of the bill the \$30,000 lump sum which had been provided for clerks. I will say to him, furthermore, that we found that the State Department was employing 93 clerks and paying them out of the appropriation of \$2,750,000 made to meet war conditions in Europe. We have made these places statutory positions so far as they were preserved. The number is reduced, and they are made statutory positions. That makes it appear that we are making a large increase in the State Department, whereas, as a matter of fact, we are reducing the clerical force in the State Department.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator stated a moment ago, as I understood him, that the appropriation for the clerical force was increased.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. No; I said I did not know about the aggregate. I said the clerks are increased in some places and diminished in others. I have not made up a statement of the entire amount paid for clerical help; but I know that in the State Department we have reduced the clerical force, and the reason why they appear as increases on the face of the bill is that we have taken the payment from a lump sum and made them statutory provisions, but in a reduced number.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am only asking for information. I am not speaking in any contentious spirit or on account of any fractious disposition in regard to it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I understand the Senator, and we are glad to give him the information.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I call attention to the fact that this item of \$30,000, which the Senator from Virginia says is stricken out of the House bill, was merely a provision for emergency clerical services. It seems that the Senate committee has substituted permanent employment for what was only a contingency, provided against an emergency, in the House bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that the appropriation of \$2,750,000 was for emergency clerks and assistants in foreign lands, the necessity for which was brought about by reason of the war. So far, of that \$2,750,000 the State Department has spent \$2,021,000, leaving a balance of \$729,000 in the fund. The Committee on Appropriations thought that was a very loose way, indeed, of handling the money. We have no report as to what it was expended for. We can not tell how much of that money is to be returned after peace is established by these foreign countries. But the abuse that has existed in the past, where lump sums have been appropriated, every Senator knows should be obviated in the future; and I will say to the Senator that it was for that reason that the number of clerks

provided in the bill was given to the State Department. It is not the full number of 92 clerks that they have now, called emergency clerks, but there are some forty-odd that are put in here that will be permanent, because of the fact that the State Department claim that with the immense amount of work that is piled upon them on account of the war conditions they are compelled to have these forty-odd clerks. Those we gave them as statutory positions, but we struck out the \$30,000 that the House had put in there for emergency clerical services.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I should just like to remark, if the Senator will allow me, at this time that, judging from general conditions, the need for additional clerks seems to arise in many of the departments from the fact that many of the clerks are superannuated. I have long been of the opinion, and am of the opinion now, that as a matter of economy—placing it, if you choose, solely upon the proposition of economy and efficiency, to say nothing of justice—the country could well afford to establish a civil-service pension list, so as to retire clerks at a certain age, and not have the rolls filled with those whom we do not like to discharge and yet who are not capable of performing their duties.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true, Mr. President, in some of the departments; and I hope to see reported to the Senate at this session a bill for the very purpose of granting age pensions to all of the employees of our Government.

Mr. President, I simply can not resist at this time congratulating my Democratic friends upon acknowledging their error some years ago when we Republicans, led by Senator Root, tried to put into this bill the wording that we find now on page 32, as follows:

Undersecretary of State, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say to the Senator that that amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I know it has been agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I thought the Senator wanted to discuss it.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply wanted to congratulate my Democratic friends, because when we had that proposal before the Senate heretofore there were hours and hours of time taken up to show that such a thing was unreasonable and that we were aping foreign nations.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, in line 17, after the word "each," where it occurs the second time, to insert "one at \$2,500"; in line 23, after the word "each," to insert "one at \$2,500"; in line 25, after "\$2,500," to insert "two law clerks, at \$2,250 each; law clerk, \$2,000"; on page 33, line 8, before the words "of class four," to strike out "seventeen" and insert "twenty-five"; in line 9, before the words "of class three," to strike out "nineteen" and insert "twenty-six"; in line 10, before the words "of class two," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "thirty-five"; in the same line, before the words "of class one," to strike out "forty-three" and insert "fifty-three"; in line 13, before the word "messengers," to strike out "six" and insert "seven"; in the same line, before the words "assistant messengers," to strike out "twenty-three" and insert "twenty-five"; in line 15, before the word "laborers," to strike out "four" and insert "seven"; in line 16, after the word "operator," to insert "five female laborers, at \$240 each"; and in line 17, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$321,020" and insert "\$393,900," so as to read:

One at \$2,500, to be appointed by the Secretary, any one of whom may be employed as chief of division of far eastern, Latin American, near eastern, or European affairs, or upon other work in connection with foreign relations; assistant solicitors of the department, to be appointed by the Secretary—3 at \$3,000 each, 1 at \$2,500; chief clerk, who shall sign such official papers and documents as the Secretary may direct, \$3,000; law clerk, \$2,500; 2 law clerks, at \$2,250 each; law clerk, \$2,000; law clerk and assistant, to be selected and appointed by the Secretary, to edit the laws of Congress and perform such other duties as may be required of them, at \$2,500 and \$1,500, respectively; chiefs of bureaus—2 at \$2,250 each, 5 at \$2,100 each; translators, at \$2,100 each; additional to Chief of Bureau of Accounts as disbursing clerk, \$200; private secretary to the Secretary, \$2,500; clerk to the Secretary, \$1,800; clerks—25 of class 4, 26 of class 3, 35 of class 2, 53 of class 1 (3 of whom shall be telegraph operators), 18 at \$1,000 each, 18 at \$900 each; chief messenger, \$1,000; 7 messengers; 25 assistant messengers; messenger boy, \$420; packer, \$720; 7 laborers, at \$600 each; telephone switchboard operator; assistant telephone switchboard operator; 5 female laborers, at \$240 each; driver, \$840; holster, \$720; in all, \$393,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I note an error in spelling on line 17. It ought to be "hostler." It is "holster." It is just an error in spelling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the correction will be made by the clerks.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 34, to strike out:

For emergency clerical services, to be expended by the Secretary of State in his discretion, \$30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 6, after the word "repairs," to strike out "\$10,500" and insert "\$12,500," so as to make the clause read:

Contingent expenses: For stationery, furniture, fixtures, typewriters, including exchange of the same, repairs, and material for repairs, \$12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 16, after the word "foregoing," to strike out "\$7,280" and insert "\$10,000," so as to make the clause read:

For miscellaneous expenses, including purchase, care, and subsistence of horses, to be used only for official purposes, repair and maintenance of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; automobile mail wagon, including exchange of same, harness, equipment for drivers, street-car tickets not exceeding \$100, and other items not included in the foregoing, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 18, after the words "District of Columbia," to strike out "\$11,200" and insert "\$19,080," so as to make the clause read:

For rent of buildings in the District of Columbia, \$19,080.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Treasury Department," on page 37, line 6, after the words "Chief of division," to strike out "\$4,000" and insert "\$4,800," and, in line 17, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$70,750" and insert "\$71,550," so as to make the clause read:

Division of Customs: Chief of division, \$4,800; assistant chiefs of division—1, \$3,000 (in lieu of supervising agent at \$4,500 paid from appropriation "Expenses of collecting revenue from customs"), 1, \$3,000; supervising tea examiner, \$2,750; law clerks—4 at \$2,500 each, 3 at \$2,000 each; clerks—5 of class 4, 4 of class 3 (1 transferred from Division of Special Agents), 6 of class 2 (1 transferred from Division of Special Agents), 9 of class 1 (1 transferred from Division of Special Agents), 5 at \$1,000 each; 2 messengers (1 transferred from Division of Special Agents); assistant messenger; in all, \$71,550.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 23, after the words "lock shop," to strike out "\$1,100" and insert "\$1,200"; in line 25, before the word "at," where it occurs the first time, to strike out "three" and insert "one at \$600, two"; and, on page 40, line 2, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$220,800" and insert "\$221,020," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Supervising Architect: Supervising Architect, \$5,000; executive officer, \$3,250; technical officer, \$3,000; drafting division—superintendent \$3,000, assistant superintendent \$2,750; mechanical engineering division—superintendent \$2,750, assistant superintendent \$2,400; structural division—superintendent \$2,750, assistant superintendent \$2,400; superintendents—computing division \$2,750, repairs division \$2,400, accounts division \$2,500, maintenance division \$2,500; files and records division—chief \$2,500, assistant chief \$2,250; head draftsman, \$2,500; administrative clerks—8 at \$2,000 each; technical clerks—4 at \$1,800 each; clerks—9 of class 4, additional to one of class 4 as book-keeper \$100, 4 at \$1,700 each, 14 of class 3, 6 at \$1,500 each, 13 of class 2, 8 at \$1,300 each, 21 of class 1, 4 at \$1,100 each, 7 at \$1,000 each, 3 at \$900 each, 2 at \$840 each; photographer, \$2,000; foreman, duplicating galley, \$1,800; 2 duplicating paper chemists at \$1,200 each; foreman vault, safe, and lock shop, \$1,200; 5 messengers; 2 assistant messengers; messenger boys—1 at \$600, 2 at \$480 each, 2 at \$360 each; skilled laborers—4 at \$1,000 each, 7 at \$960 each, 1 \$900, 1 \$840; laborers—1 \$660, 1 \$600; in all, \$221,020.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 12, to insert:

For law books, including their exchange, to be expended under the direction of the Comptroller of the Treasury, \$250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 5, before the words "at \$1,000 each," to strike out "eight" and insert "nine," and, in line 7, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$290,010" and insert "\$291,010," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Auditor for War Department: Auditor, \$4,000; assistant and chief clerk, \$2,250; law clerk, \$2,000; chief of division of accounts, \$2,500; chief of claims and records division, \$2,000; 2 assistant chiefs of division, at \$1,900 each; chief transportation clerk, \$2,000; clerks—22 of class 4, 49 of class 3, 55 of class 2, 45 of class 1, 9 at \$1,000 each; 3 at \$900 each; skilled laborer, \$900; messenger; 5 assistant messengers; 9 laborers; messenger boy, \$480; in all, \$291,010.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 13, after the word "each," where it occurs the second time, to insert "helper, \$900 (transferred from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing)," and, in line 15, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$141,390" and insert "\$142,290," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Auditor for Navy Department: Auditor, \$4,000; chief clerk and chief of division, \$2,250; law clerk, \$2,000; chief of division, \$2,000; assistant chief of division, \$2,000; clerks—13 of class 4, 22 of class 3, 20 of class 2, 23 of class 1, 6 at \$1,000 each, 6 at \$900

each; helper, \$900 (transferred from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing); messenger; assistant messenger; three laborers; in all, \$142,290.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 20, before the words "of class 4," to strike out "13" and insert "16"; in the same line, before the words "of class 3," to strike out "15" and insert "18"; and, in line 24, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$134,430" and insert "\$144,630," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Auditor for Interior Department: Auditor, \$4,000; chief clerk and chief of division, \$2,250; law clerk, \$2,000; chief of division, \$2,000; clerks—16 of class 4, 18 of class 3, 17 of class 2, 22 of class 1, 12 at \$1,000 each, 12 at \$900 each (7 transferred from lump-sum appropriation); 2 messengers; 2 assistant messengers; laborer; in all, \$144,630.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 18, to insert:

For the employment of clerical help in the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue at rates to be fixed by the commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 4, after the words "captain of," to strike out "watch" and insert "guards"; in line 5, after the words "lieutenants of," to strike out "watch" and insert "guards"; and, in line 6, after the word "sixty," to strike out "watchmen" and insert "guards," so as to read:

Bureau of Engraving and Printing: Director, \$6,000; assistant director, \$3,500; chief of division of assignments and reviews, \$3,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; disbursing agent, \$2,400; medical and sanitary officer, \$2,000; stenographer, \$1,800; storekeeper, \$1,600; assistant storekeeper, \$1,000; clerk in charge of purchases and supplies, \$2,000; clerks—1 of class 4, 6 of class 3, 9 of class 2, 9 of class 1, 8 at \$1,000 each, 12 at \$900 each, 15 at \$840 each, 3 at \$780 each; 9 attendants, at \$600 each; helpers—1 at \$900, 2 at \$720 each, 2 at \$600 each; 3 messengers; 7 assistant messengers; captain of guards, \$1,400; 2 lieutenants of guards, at \$900 each; 60 guards, at \$720 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 14, after the words "District of Columbia," to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$15,000," so as to make the clause read:

For investigation and experimentation and to secure better methods of administration, with a view to increased efficiency or to greater economy in the expenditure of public money, including necessary traveling expenses, in connection with special work, or obtaining of better administrative methods in any branch of the service within or under the Treasury Department, including the temporary employment of agents, stenographers, accountants, or other expert services, either within or without the District of Columbia, \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 53, after line 5, to strike out:

Hereafter no moneys appropriated by this or any other act shall be used for the payment of gas furnished for use in any of the public buildings of the United States in the District of Columbia at a rate in excess of 70 cents per 1,000 cubic feet.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the subhead "Collecting internal revenue," on page 57, after line 4, to insert:

All internal-revenue agents, inspectors, and the cotton-futures attorney may be granted leave of absence with pay, which shall not be cumulative, not to exceed 30 days in any calendar year, under such regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 57, line 21, after the date "1914," to strike out "\$1,600,000" and insert "\$1,750,000, and authority is hereby given to use \$90,000 of said sum for the employment in the District of Columbia of necessary clerical and other personal services and the purchase of such supplies, equipment, mechanical devices, and other articles as may be necessary for use in the District of Columbia," so as to make the clause read:

Collecting the income tax: For expenses of assessing and collecting the income tax as provided in paragraph N, section 2, of an act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties, and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913, including the purchase of such supplies, equipment, mechanical devices, and other articles as may be necessary for use in the several collection districts, including not to exceed \$4 per diem, in lieu of subsistence, pursuant to section 13 of the sundry-civil act approved August 1, 1914, \$1,750,000, and authority is hereby given to use \$90,000 of said sum for the employment in the District of Columbia of necessary clerical and other personal services and the purchase of such supplies, equipment, mechanical devices, and other articles as may be necessary for use in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 59, after line 21, to insert:

When absent on duty from their customary residence, all internal-revenue agents appointed under section 3152, Revised Statutes, as amended, and cotton-futures attorneys may be granted per diem in lieu of subsistence not exceeding \$4, and, when absent on duty from their customary residence, income-tax agents and inspectors, special gaugers, and special employees may be granted a per diem in lieu

of subsistence not exceeding \$3, the per diem in lieu of subsistence to be fixed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will call the attention of Senators to the fact that on page 57, line 6, the bill says "the cotton-futures attorney," while on the page just read it is in the plural.

Mr. OVERMAN. There is only one, but I suppose we had better leave it that way.

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; there is only one in one case, but there is more than one in the other case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well; that explains it.

Mr. SMOOT. But, Mr. President, there is a question in my mind as to the advisability of this amendment. I do not want to go into the discussion of it to-day, however. I will content myself by allowing it to go into conference, and having it thoroughly discussed in conference.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Mints and assay offices," on page 64, line 16, after the word "employees," to strike out "\$90,000" and insert "\$92,000," so as to make the clause read:

For wages of workmen and other employees, \$92,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Assay office at Deadwood, S. Dak.," on page 66, line 20, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$500" and insert "\$1,500," so as to make the clause read:

For incidental and contingent expenses, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "War Department," on page 68, line 13, before the words "of class 2," to strike out "14" and insert "15"; in line 14, after the word "each," to insert "one at \$900"; in line 17, after the word "messengers," to insert "two assistant messengers, at \$600 each"; and in line 22, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$143,540" and insert "\$147,040," so as to make the clause read:

Office of the Secretary: Secretary of War, \$12,000; Assistant Secretary, \$5,000; assistant and chief clerk, who shall sign such official papers and documents as the Secretary may direct, \$4,000; private secretary to the Secretary, \$2,500; clerk to the Secretary, \$2,000; stenographer to the Secretary, \$2,000; clerk to the Assistant Secretary, \$2,400; assistant chief clerk, \$2,400; disbursing clerk, \$2,750; appointment clerk, \$2,250; four chiefs of divisions, at \$2,000 each; superintendent of buildings outside of State, War, and Navy Department Building, in addition to compensation as chief of division, \$500; chief telegrapher, \$1,800; clerks—5 of class 4, 5 of class 3, 15 of class 2, 19 of class 1, 5 at \$1,000 each, 1 at \$900; foreman, \$1,200; carpenters—one \$1,200, one \$1,080; chief messenger, \$1,000; skilled laborer, \$1,080; six messengers; seven assistant messengers; two assistant messengers, at \$600 each; telephone switchboard operator; assistant telephone switchboard operator; engineer, \$900; assistant engineer, \$720; fireman; four watchmen; three watchmen, at \$660 each; eight laborers; hostlers—one \$600, one \$540; four charwomen; in all, \$147,040.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 17, after the words "chief clerk," to strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$2,200," and in line 20, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$24,800" and insert "\$25,000," so as to make the clause read:

Signal Office: Chief clerk, \$2,200; clerks—2 of class 4, 1 of class 3, 1 of class 2, 4 of class 1, 9 at \$1,000 each; two messengers; assistant messenger; in all, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 20, after the word "each," to insert "3 at \$2,000 each"; in line 21, after the word "clerks," to strike out "15" and insert "12"; and on page 71, line 5, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$372,320" and insert "\$372,920," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Quartermaster General: Chief clerk, \$2,750; principal clerks—5 at \$2,250 each, 3 at \$2,000 each; clerks—12 of class 4, 25 of class 3, 44 of class 2, 85 of class 1, 50 at \$1,000 each, 10 at \$900 each; advisory architect, \$4,000; draftsmen—three at \$1,800 each, seven at \$1,600 each, five at \$1,400 each; supervising engineer, \$2,750; hydraulic and sanitary engineer, \$2,000; civil engineer, \$1,800; electrical engineer, \$2,000; electrical and mechanical engineer, \$2,250; marine engineer, \$3,500; sanitary and heating engineer, \$1,800; blue-print operator, \$900; 6 messengers; 14 assistant messengers; 12 laborers; laborers—one \$600, one \$480; in all, \$372,920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, after line 23, to insert:

Section 7 of the general deficiency appropriation act approved August 26, 1912, as amended by section 4 of the act making appropriations for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government, approved March 4, 1913, restricting changes in salaries of certain employees paid from lump-sum appropriations, is further amended to provide that it shall not apply to draftsmen whose services are necessary in carrying on the various manufacturing or constructing operations of the Government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 4, after the word "messenger," to strike out "assistant messenger" and insert "two assistant messengers," and in line 5, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$38,480" and insert "\$39,200," so as to make the clause read:

Division of Militia Affairs, Office of Chief of Staff: For the following authorized by section 20 of the act approved January 21, 1903, as amended by the act approved May 27, 1908, and as restricted by the legislative, executive, and judicial act approved March 4, 1915: Chief clerk, \$2,000; clerks—2 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 4 of class 2, 11 of class 1, 8 at \$1,000 each; messenger; 2 assistant messengers; 2 laborers; in all, \$39,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 11, after the word "offices," to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$25,000," so as to make the clause read:

For stationery for the department and its bureaus and offices, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Public buildings and grounds," on page 75, line 23, after the words "landscape architect," to insert "and the purchase of park designs," so as to make the clause read:

Office of public buildings and grounds: Superintendent, \$3,000; assistant and chief clerk, \$2,400; clerks—1 of class 4, 1 of class 3, 1 of class 2 and stenographer, 1 of class 1; messenger; landscape architect and the purchase of park designs, \$2,400; surveyor and draftsman, \$1,500; in all, \$16,140.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 3, after the word "park," to strike out "watchmen" and insert "police," so as to make the clause read:

For sergeant of park police, \$950.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, after line 3, to strike out "For second sergeant of park watchmen, \$900" and insert "For two second sergeants of park police, at \$900 each, \$1,800," so as to make the clause read:

For two second sergeants of park police, at \$900 each, \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 6, after the word "day," to strike out "watchmen" and insert "police"; in line 21, before the words "in Potomac Park," to strike out "three" and insert "four"; in line 22, before the words "in all," to strike out "twenty-two" and insert "twenty-three"; and in the same line, after the word "each," to strike out "\$18,480" and insert "\$19,320," so as to make the clause read:

For day police, as follows: One in Franklin Park and adjacent reservations on New York Avenue; 1 in Lafayette Park; 2 in Smithsonian Grounds and neighboring reservations; 1 in Judiciary Park; 1 in Lincoln Park and adjacent reservations; 1 in Iowa Circle and reservations to the northeast; 1 in Thomas and Scott Circles and neighboring reservations; 1 in Washington Circle and neighboring reservations; 1 in Dupont Circle and neighboring reservations; 1 in McPherson Park and Farragut Square; 1 in Stanton Park and neighboring reservations; 2 in Henry and Seaton Parks and neighboring reservations; 1 in Mount Vernon Park and reservations to the northeast; 1 in grounds south of the Executive Mansion; 1 in Garfield and Marion Parks and reservations to the east; 1 in Monument Park; 4 in Potomac Park; 1 in Montrose Park; 23 in all, at \$840 each, \$19,320.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 23, after the word "night," to strike out "watchmen" and insert "police"; in the same line, before the word "in," to strike out "Two" and insert "Three"; on page 77, line 5, before the words "in Lafayette," to strike out "one" and insert "two"; in line 10, before the words "in all," to strike out "nineteen" and insert "twenty-one"; and in the same line, after the word "each," to strike out "\$15,960" and insert "\$17,640," so as to make the clause read:

For night police, as follows: Three in Smithsonian Grounds and neighboring reservations; 1 in Judiciary Park; 2 in Henry and Seaton Parks and adjacent reservations; 1 in grounds south of the Executive Mansion; 1 in Monument Park; 1 in Garfield Park and neighboring reservations; 1 in Iowa, Scott, and Thomas Circles and neighboring reservations; 1 in Stanton and Lincoln Parks and neighboring reservations; 2 in Lafayette, McPherson, Franklin, and Farragut Parks; 1 in Washington and Dupont Circles and neighboring reservations; 1 in Mount Vernon Park and neighboring reservations; 2 for greenhouses and nursery; 4 in Potomac Park; 21 in all, at \$840 each, \$17,640.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 18, after the word "park," to strike out "watchmen" and insert "police," so as to make the clause read:

For purchase and repair of bicycles and revolvers for park police and for purchase of ammunition, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, after line 19, to strike out:

For purchase of one motor cycle \$250, and for the upkeep of the same, \$240; in all, \$490.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, after line 21, to insert:

For purchase of two motor cycles at \$250 each, and for the upkeep of same at \$240 each, \$980.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 25, after the word "bridge," to strike out "watchmen" and insert "police," so as to make the clause read:

For purchasing and supplying uniforms to park, Monument, and bridge police, \$2,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 2, after the words "sum of," to strike out "\$37,845" and insert "\$37,845," so as to make the clause read:

Of the foregoing amounts appropriated under public buildings and grounds, the sum of \$37,845 shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "State, War, and Navy Department Building," on page 78, line 6, after the words "of class 3," to strike out "stenographer and typewriter, \$900" and insert "clerk of class 1," and in line 18, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$103,560" and insert "\$103,860," so as to make the clause read:

Office of superintendent: Clerk of class 3; clerk of class 1; chief engineer, \$1,400; 5 assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each; electrical machinist, \$1,200; captain of the watch, \$1,200; 2 lieutenants of the watch, at \$840 each; 40 watchmen; carpenter, \$1,000; electrician, \$1,200; machinist, \$1,000; painter, \$1,000; plumber, \$1,000; 3 dynamo tenders, at \$900 each; 7 skilled laborers or mechanics, at \$840 each; messenger; foreman of laborers, \$840; 10 firemen; 11 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 17 laborers; 3 second-class firemen, at \$660 each; 4 forewomen of charwomen, at \$300 each; 67 charwomen; gardener, \$720; in all, \$103,860.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 21, after "\$32,000," to strike out "Provided, That the commission in charge, or a majority of the members thereof, may at any time reapportion space among the departments now occupying the State, War, and Navy Department Building if the same can be done with a reduction of the amount of floor space occupied by any branch of the public service in said building, the reduction or avoidance of public expense for rent of office or storage space for the Government, and the reduction of the number of watchmen required for said building from 40 to not more than 38: *Provided further*, That no arrangement of space made hereunder shall involve the ejection from the building of any department or branch of the public service now occupying the same: *Provided further*, That no rooms vacated under any arrangement of space hereunder shall be used for museum purposes," so as to make the clause read:

For fuel, lights, repairs, miscellaneous items, printing, and city directories, \$32,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Navy Department," on page 79, line 22, after the word "Secretary" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$2,750"; in line 23, after "\$2,250," to insert "private secretary to Assistant Secretary, \$2,400"; on page 80, line 1, after the word "clerks," to strike out "two" and insert "one"; in line 4, after the word "carpenter," to strike out "\$900" and insert "\$1,000"; and in line 7, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$81,140" and insert "\$82,090," so as to make the clause read:

Office of the Secretary: Secretary of the Navy, \$12,000; Assistant Secretary, \$5,000; chief clerk \$3,000; private secretary to Secretary, \$2,750; clerk to Secretary, \$2,250; private secretary to Assistant Secretary, \$2,400; clerk to Assistant Secretary, \$2,000; disbursing clerk, \$2,250; appointment clerk, \$2,000; estimate clerk, \$1,800; stenographer, \$1,800; clerks—1 of class 4, 3 of class 3, 5 of class 2, 5 of class 1, 1 \$1,100, 6 at \$1,000 each; stenographer, \$1,200; 3 copyists; carpenter, \$1,000; 4 messengers; 4 assistant messengers; 3 laborers; messenger boys—4 at \$600 each, 1 \$420, 1 \$400, 1 \$360; 2 telephone switchboard operators; in all, \$82,090.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, line 7, after the word "clerks," to strike out "1 at \$2,000" and insert "2 at \$2,000 each," and, in line 12, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$82,050" and insert "\$84,050," so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Navigation: Chief clerk, \$2,250; clerks—2 at \$2,000 each, 5 of class 4, 5 of class 3, 6 of class 2, 8 of class 1, 3 at \$1,100 each, 14 at \$1,000 each; 14 copyists; 9 copyists at \$840 each; 2 assistant messengers; messenger boy, \$600; 5 laborers; in all \$84,050.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, line 13, after the word "Clerks," to strike out "1 of class 4" and insert "2 of class 4," and in line 16, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$12,300" and insert "\$14,100," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Naval Intelligence: Clerks—2 of class 4, 1 of class 3, 1 \$1,300, 3 at \$1,000 each; 2 translators, at \$1,400 each; draftsman, \$1,200; messenger boy, \$600; in all \$14,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 3, after the word "repair," to insert "exchange," so as to make the clause read:

For fuel, oil, grease, pipe, wire, and other materials needed for the maintenance and repair of boilers, engines, heating apparatus, electric lighting and power plant, and water-supply system; purchase and maintenance of teams; maintenance, repair, exchange, or operation of motor truck and of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; material for boxing nautical instruments for transportation; paints, telegraph, and telephone service, and incidental labor, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for Bureau of Steam Engineering, on page 85, line 23, before the words "of class 1," to strike out "5" and insert "6"; in line 24, after the word "copyist," to insert "2 expert radio aids, at \$3,130 each"; on page 86, line 3, after the word "laborers," to insert "1 at \$720"; in the same line, after "\$720," to strike out "3" and insert "2"; and, in line 5, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$46,890" and insert "\$54,410," so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Steam Engineering: Chief clerk, \$2,250; bookkeeper and accountant, \$1,800; clerks—1 of class 4, 4 of class 3, 4 of class 2, 2 at \$1,300 each, 6 of class 1, 1 \$1,100, 4 at \$1,000 each, 1 \$900; copyist; 2 expert radio aids, at \$3,130 each; expert in wireless telegraphy, \$3,000; draftsman—1 (who shall be an expert in marine construction) \$2,000, 1 \$1,400, assistant \$1,200; blue printer, \$720; 2 assistant messengers; laborers—1 at \$720, 2 at \$660 each; 2 at \$600 each; messenger boy, \$600; in all, \$54,410.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 21, before the words "of class 1," to strike out "three" and insert "four"; in line 22, after the words "at \$1,100 each," to strike out "nine" and insert "ten"; and in line 24, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$60,950" and insert "\$63,250," so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Construction and Repair: Chief clerk, \$2,250; clerks—2 of class 4, 3 of class 3, 3 of class 2, 4 at \$1,300 each, 4 of class 1, 10 at \$1,100 each, 15 at \$1,000 each; 5 copyists; two assistant messengers; laborer; messenger boys—9 at \$600 each; 1 \$400; in all, \$63,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 15, after the word "clerks," to strike out "1 of class 4" and insert "2 of class 4," and in line 19, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$30,210" and insert "\$32,010," so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Ordnance: Chief clerk, \$2,250; draftsman, \$1,400; clerks—2 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 2 of class 2, 1 \$1,300, 3 of class 1, 1 \$1,100, 5 at \$1,000 each; 3 copyists; 2 copyists, at \$840 each; assistant messenger; messenger boys—2 at \$600 each, 2 at \$400 each; laborer; in all, \$32,010.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 12, after the word "clerks," to strike out "four" and insert "five"; in line 13, before the words "of class 2," to strike out "seven" and insert "eight"; in line 14, before "at \$1,100," to strike out "ten" and insert "twelve"; in line 16, after the word "boys" to strike out "three" and insert "four"; in line 17, before the words "at \$400," to strike out "three" and insert "two"; and in the same line, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$118,890" and insert "\$124,490," so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Supplies and Accounts: Civilian assistant, \$2,500; chief accountant, \$2,250; 2 chief bookkeepers, at \$2,000 each; statistician, \$1,800; clerks—5 of class 4, 8 of class 3, 8 of class 2, 15 of class 1, 12 at \$1,100 each, 28 at \$1,000 each, 14 at \$900 each; 2 copyists, at \$840 each; 5 assistant messengers; messenger boys—4 at \$600 each; 2 at \$400 each; laborer; in all, \$124,490.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, line 22, before the words "at \$1,000," to strike out "three" and insert "four," and in line 23, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$10,100" and insert "\$11,100," so as to make the clause read:

Division of Naval Militia Affairs: For the following, authorized by section 17 of the Naval Militia act approved February 16, 1914: Chief clerk, \$1,600; clerks—1 of class 2, 2 of class 1, 1 \$1,100, 4 at \$1,000 each; messenger boys—1 \$600; in all, \$11,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 1, after the word "binding," to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$3,600," so as to make the clause read:

For miscellaneous expenses, including stationery, furniture, office equipment, postage, typewriters and exchange of same, and necessary printing and binding \$3,600, which sum, together with the foregoing amount for salaries, shall be paid from the appropriation for "Arming and equipping Naval Militia" for the fiscal year 1917, and no other or

further sums shall be expended from said appropriation for or on account of said Division of Naval Militia Affairs during the fiscal year 1917.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 17, after the word "vehicles," to insert "automobile mail wagon, including exchange of same," and, in line 21, after the word "offices," to strike out "\$42,000" and insert "\$45,000," so as to make the clause read:

For stationery, furniture, newspapers, plans, drawings, drawing materials, horses and wagons to be used only for official purposes, including rental of stable; purchase, maintenance, repair, or operation of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, automobile mail wagon, including exchange of same, street car tickets not exceeding \$250, freight, expressage, postage, typewriters and computing machines and exchange of same, and other absolutely necessary expenses of the Navy Department and its various bureaus and offices, \$45,000; it shall not be lawful to expend, for any of the offices or bureaus of the Navy Department at Washington, any sum out of appropriations made for the Naval Establishment for any of the purposes mentioned or authorized in this paragraph.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of the Interior," on page 91, line 20, after "\$2,500," to strike out: "Two special inspectors, whose employment shall be limited to the inspection of offices and the work in the several offices under the control of the department, at \$2,500 each," so as to read:

Office of the Secretary: Secretary of the Interior, \$12,000; First Assistant Secretary, \$5,000; Assistant Secretary, \$4,500; chief clerk, including \$500 as superintendent of buildings, who shall be chief executive officer of the department and who may be designated by the Secretary to sign official papers and documents during the temporary absence of the Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries, \$4,000; assistant to the Secretary, \$2,750; assistant attorney, \$2,500.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, from information I have received, I think the committee acted on that amendment and struck it out upon misinformation.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think myself, Mr. President, that it would be well if the committee amendment were rejected in that case.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, in the item for the maintenance of the office of the Secretary of the Interior, on page 92, line 21, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$275,820" and insert "\$270,820," so as to read:

Engineer, \$1,200; assistant engineer, \$1,000; 7 firemen; clerk to sign, under the direction of the Secretary, in his name and for him; his approval of all tribal deeds to allottees and deeds for town lots made and executed according to law for any of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in the Indian Territory, \$1,200; in all, \$270,820.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That amendment is a mere matter of total, but the amendment just rejected necessitates the rejection of this also. I ask unanimous consent that the clerks may readjust the totals if any mistake is made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that order will be made. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 94, line 13, after the word "clerks," to strike out "twenty-seven" and insert "twenty-nine"; in line 14, before the words "of class 3," to strike out "fifty-one" and insert "fifty-two"; in line 15, before the words "of class 2," to strike out "seventy-four" and insert "seventy-seven"; in line 16, before the words "of class 1," to strike out "seventy-seven" and insert "eighty-two"; in the same line, before the words "at \$1,000," to strike out "sixty-five" and insert "sixty-six"; in line 17, before the word "copyists," where it occurs the first time, to strike out "sixty-five" and insert "seventy-one"; in the same line, before the word "copyists," where it occurs the second time, to strike "twenty-six" and insert "twenty-nine"; and, on page 95, line 2, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$631,250" and insert "\$655,210," so as to make the clause read:

General Land Office: Commissioner, \$5,000; assistant commissioner, \$3,500; chief clerk, \$3,000; chief law clerk, \$2,500; 2 law clerks, at \$2,200 each; 3 law examiners of surveyors general and district land offices, at \$2,000 each; recorder, \$2,000; chiefs of divisions—one of surveys \$2,750, one \$2,400, ten at \$2,000 each; assistant chief of division, \$2,000; law examiners—13 at \$2,000 each, 10 at \$1,800 each, 18 at \$1,600 each; clerks 29 of class 4, 52 of class 3, 77 of class 2, 82 of class 1, 66 at \$1,000 each; 71 copyists; 29 copyists, at \$720 each; 2 messengers; 10 assistant messengers; messenger boys—10 at \$600 each, 6 at \$480 each; 6 skilled laborers, who may act as assistant messengers when required, at \$600 each; 16 laborers; laborer, \$480; packer, \$720; depository acting for the commissioner as receiver of public moneys, \$2,000, who may, with the approval of the commissioner, designate a clerk of the General Land Office to act as such depository in his absence; clerk and librarian, \$1,000; in all, \$655,210.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 95, line 14, after the words "General Land Office," to strike out "\$6,000" and insert "\$8,000," so as to make the clause read:

For per diem in lieu of subsistence, at not exceeding \$4, pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, of examiners and of clerks detailed to inspect offices of United States surveyors general and other offices in public-land service, to investigate fraudulent land entries, trespasses on the public lands, and cases of official misconduct, actual necessary expenses of transportation, including necessary sleeping-car fares, and for employment of stenographers and other assistants when necessary to the efficient conduct of examinations, and when authorized by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 96, after line 2, to strike out:

For separate State and Territorial maps of public-land States, including maps showing areas designated by the Secretary of the Interior under the enlarged homestead acts prepared in the General Land Office, \$3,000.

And to insert:

For maps showing areas designated by the Secretary of the Interior under the enlarged homestead acts, prepared in the General Land Office, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 97, after line 20, to strike out:

Appointments shall not be made to any of the positions herein appropriated for in the classified service of the Bureau of Pensions not actually filled June 30, 1916, nor shall more than 25 per cent of other vacancies actually occurring in any grade in the classified service of that bureau during the fiscal year 1917 be filled by original appointment or promotion. The salaries or compensation of all places which may not be filled as hereinabove provided for shall not be available for expenditure, but shall lapse and shall be covered into the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 98, line 22, after the word "each," to strike out "examiner of interferences, \$2,700" and insert "two examiners of interferences, at \$2,700 each"; in line 25, after "\$2,400," to insert "two second assistants, at \$2,100 each"; and on page 99, line 19, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$1,375,040" and insert "\$1,381,940," so as to make the clause read:

Patent Office: Commissioner, \$5,000; first assistant commissioner, \$4,500; assistant commissioner, \$3,500; chief clerk (who shall be qualified to act as principal examiner), \$3,000; 5 law examiners, at \$2,750 each; examiner of classification, \$3,600; 5 examiners in chief, at \$3,500 each; 2 examiners of interferences, at \$2,700 each; examiners of trademarks and designs—1 \$2,700, first assistant \$2,400, 2 second assistants at \$2,100 each, 6 assistants at \$1,500 each; examiners—43 principals at \$2,700 each, 86 first assistants at \$2,400 each, 86 second assistants at \$2,100 each, 86 third assistants at \$1,800 each, 86 fourth assistants at \$1,500 each; financial clerk, who shall give bonds in such amount as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, \$2,250; librarian, who shall be qualified to act as an assistant examiner, \$2,000; 6 chiefs of divisions, at \$2,000 each; 3 assistant chiefs of divisions, at \$1,800 each; private secretary, to be selected and appointed by the commissioner, \$1,800; translator of languages, \$1,800; clerks—9 of class 4, 9 of class 3, 17 of class 2, 130 of class 1, 91 at \$1,000 each; 3 skilled draftsmen, at \$1,200 each; 4 draftsmen, at \$1,000 each; 90 copyists; 50 copyists, at \$720 each; 4 messengers; 25 assistant messengers; laborers—14 at \$600 each, 42 at \$540 each; 40 messenger boys, at \$420 each; in all, \$1,381,940.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 99, after line 19, to insert:

For special and temporary services of typewriters certified by the Civil Service Commission, who may be employed in such numbers at \$2.50 per diem as may, in the judgment of the Commissioner of Patents, be necessary to keep current the work of furnishing manuscript copies of records, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 100, line 6, after the word "papers," to strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$140,000," so as to make the clause read:

For producing copies of weekly issue of patents, designs, and trademarks; production of copies of drawings and specifications of exhausted patents and other papers, \$140,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Offices of Surveyors General," on page 106, line 5, after the word "Clerks," to strike out "\$16,000" and insert "\$17,240," so as to make the clause read:

Clerks, \$17,240.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 106, line 6, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$21,240," so as to make the clause read:

Contingent expenses, \$1,000; in all, \$21,240.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, after line 2, to strike out:

The use of the fund created by the act of July 2, 1864 (13 Stat., p. 365), and the act of March 2, 1895 (28 Stat., p. 937), for office work in the surveyor generals' office and in the General Land Office is ex-

tended for one year from June 30, 1916: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$25,000 of this fund shall be used for the purposes above indicated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Post Office Department," in the item of appropriation for the maintenance of the Office of the Postmaster General, on page 110, line 2, before the word "dynamo," to strike out "three" and insert "two"; in the same line, after the word "each," to insert "(one omitted)"; and in line 11, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$191,450" and insert "\$190,550," so as to read:

Electrician, \$1,400; 2 assistant electricians, at \$1,200 each; 2 dynamo tenders, at \$900 each (1 omitted); fireman, who shall be a blacksmith, and fireman, who shall be a steam fitter, at \$900 each; 10 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 15 firemen; carpenters—one \$1,200, one \$1,000, two at \$900 each; captain of the watch, \$1,000; additional to 2 watchmen acting as lieutenant of watchmen, at \$120 each; 22 watchmen; foreman of laborers, \$800; 43 laborers; plumber, \$900; awning maker, \$900; female laborers—one \$540, 3 at \$500 each, 5 at \$480 each; 43 charwomen; in all \$190,550.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 111, line 12, after the word "building," to strike out "Three assistant engineers, at \$900 each," and insert "Two assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each"; in line 17, after the words "assistant plumber," to strike out "\$720" and insert "\$840"; and in line 19, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$38,700" and insert "\$38,120," so as to make the clause read:

Washington, D. C., post-office building: Two assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each; 3 assistant electricians, at \$900 each; 10 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 3 oilers, at \$720 each; 12 watchmen; additional to 1 watchman acting as lieutenant of watch, \$120; 15 laborers; assistant plumber, \$840; 2 female laborers, at \$480 each; 15 charwomen; in all, \$38,120.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 112, line 10, after the word "clerks," to strike out "17 of class 4 (2 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 2 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office), 23 of class 3 (3 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 1 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, and 1 submitted at \$1,400), 37 of class 2 (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,600, 2 transferred from Postmaster General's office, 4 from Second Assistant's office, 9 from Fourth Assistant's office, and 1 submitted at \$1,200), 50 of class 1 (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,400, 5 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 26 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, 3 submitted at \$1,000 each, and 1 at \$900), 34 at \$1,000 each (3 in lieu of 3 at \$1,200 each, 3 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 16 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, and 3 submitted at \$900 each), 20 at \$900 each (3 in lieu of 3 at \$1,200 each, 1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,200, 1 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 6 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, 2 submitted at \$840 each, and 3 at \$720 each); 4 messengers (2 in lieu of 2 at \$900 each and 1 submitted at \$660); 8 assistant messengers (3 in lieu of 3 at \$900 each, 1 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 2 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office); 7 laborers (1 in lieu of 1 at \$840, 6 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office); 3 female laborers at \$480 each (formerly pages in Fourth Assistant's office); in all, \$278,630," and to insert "16 of class 4 (1 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 2 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office), 24 of class 3 (4 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 1 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, 1 submitted at \$1,400, and 1 submitted at \$1,200), 36 of class 2 (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,600, 2 transferred from Postmaster General's office, 3 from Second Assistant's office, 9 from Fourth Assistant's office, 1 submitted at \$1,200, and 1 transferred to Postmaster General's office), 50 of class 1 (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,600, 1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,400, 5 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 26 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, 4 submitted at \$1,000 each, and 1 at \$900), 36 at \$1,000 each (4 in lieu of 4 at \$1,200 each, 5 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 16 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, and 3 submitted at \$900 each), 19 at \$900 each (3 in lieu of 3 at \$1,000 each, 1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,200, 1 transferred from Division of Postal Savings, 6 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, 2 submitted at \$840 each, and 4 at \$720 each); 4 messengers (2 in lieu of 2 at \$900 each and 1 submitted at \$660); 7 assistant messengers (4 in lieu of 3 at \$900 each, 2 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office); 7 laborers (1 in lieu of 1 at \$840, 6 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office); 3 female laborers at \$480 each (transferred from Fourth Assistant's office); in all, \$277,410," so as to make the clause read:

Office First Assistant Postmaster General: First Assistant Postmaster General, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; Division of Post Office Service—superintendent \$4,000 (formerly Superintendent of Division of Salaries and Allowances), assistant superintendent \$3,000 (formerly Superintendent of Division of City Delivery), assistant superintendent \$2,250 (formerly Assistant Superintendent of Division of Salaries and Allowances), 2 assistant superintendents \$2,000 each (1 formerly Assistant Superintendent of Division of City Delivery, 1 formerly Superintendent

Division of Miscellaneous Transportation, Second Assistant's office); Division of Postmasters' Appointments—superintendent \$3,000, 2 assistant superintendents at \$2,000 each, Superintendent Division of Dead Letters \$2,500 (transferred from Fourth Assistant's office), Chief Division of Correspondence \$2,000; clerks—16 of class 4 (1 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 2 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office), 24 of class 3 (4 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 1 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, 1 submitted at \$1,400, and 1 submitted at \$1,200), 36 of class 2 (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,600, 2 transferred from Postmaster General's office, 3 from Second Assistant's office, 9 from Fourth Assistant's office, 1 submitted at \$1,200, and 1 transferred to Postmaster General's office), 50 of class 1 (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,600, 1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,400, 5 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 26 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, 4 submitted at \$1,000 each, and 1 at \$900), 36 at \$1,000 each (4 in lieu of 4 at \$1,200 each, 5 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 16 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, and 3 submitted at \$900 each), 19 at \$900 each (3 in lieu of 3 at \$1,000 each, 1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,200, 1 transferred from Division of Postal Savings, 6 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, 2 submitted at \$840 each, and 4 at \$720 each); 4 messengers (2 in lieu of 2 at \$900 each and 1 submitted at \$660); 7 assistant messengers (4 in lieu of 3 at \$900 each, 2 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office); 7 laborers (1 in lieu of 1 at \$840, 6 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office); 3 female laborers at \$480 each (transferred from Fourth Assistant's office); in all, \$277,410.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 114, line 17, after the word "clerks," to strike out "11 of class 4 (2 transferred to First Assistant's office), 19 of class 3 (3 transferred to First Assistant's office and 1 submitted at \$1,200), 10 of class 2 (1 transferred to Postmaster General's office, 4 transferred to First Assistant's office, and 3 submitted at \$1,200), 10 of class 1 (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,600, 3 in lieu of 3 at \$1,400, 1 transferred to Postmaster General's office, 5 transferred to First Assistant's office, 2 submitted at \$1,000 each, and 1 at \$900), 10 at \$1,000 each (2 in lieu of 2 at \$1,200, 3 transferred to First Assistant's office, and 1 submitted at \$900), 8 at \$900 each (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,200, 1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,000, 1 transferred to First Assistant's office); messenger in charge of mails, \$900; 4 assistant messengers (1 in lieu of clerk, \$900, transferred from Division of Railway Mail Service, 1 transferred to First Assistant's office); page, \$360; in all, \$115,390"; and to insert "11 of class 4 (1 transferred to First Assistant's office, and 1 omitted), 18 of class 3 (4 transferred to First Assistant's office and 1 submitted at \$1,200), 12 of class 2 (1 transferred to Postmaster General's office, 3 transferred to First Assistant's office, and 2 submitted at \$1,200), 8 of class 1 (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,600, 2 in lieu of 2 at \$1,400, 1 transferred to Postmaster General's office, 5 transferred to First Assistant's office, 1 submitted at \$1,000, and 3 omitted), 8 at \$1,000 each (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,200, 5 transferred to First Assistant's office), 7 at \$900 each; messenger in charge of mails, \$900; 4 assistant messengers (1 in lieu of clerk, \$900, transferred from Division of Railway Mail Service, 1 omitted); page, \$360; in all, \$111,190"; so as to make the clause read:

Office Second Assistant Postmaster General: Second Assistant Postmaster General, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; Division of Railway Adjustments—superintendent \$3,000, assistant superintendent \$2,250; Division of Foreign Mails—superintendent \$3,000, assistant superintendent, \$2,000; clerks—11 of class 4 (1 transferred to first assistant's office and 1 omitted), 18 of class 3 (4 transferred to first assistant's office and 1 submitted at \$1,200), 12 of class 2 (1 transferred to Postmaster General's office, 3 transferred to first assistant's office, and 2 submitted at \$1,200), 8 of class 1 (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,600, 2 in lieu of 2 at \$1,400, 1 transferred to Postmaster General's office, 5 transferred to first assistant's office, 1 submitted at \$1,000, and 3 omitted), 8 at \$1,000 each (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,200, 5 transferred to first assistant's office), 7 at \$900 each; messenger in charge of mails, \$900; 4 assistant messengers (1 in lieu of clerk, \$900, transferred from Division of Railway Mail Service, 1 omitted); page, \$360; in all, \$111,190.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for the maintenance of the office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, on page 119, line 8, before the word "laborers," to strike out "21" and insert "19"; in line 10, before the word "omitted," to strike out "2" and insert "4," and, in the same line, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$311,070" and insert "\$309,750," so as to read:

Eight assistant messengers (1 submitted at \$660, 2 transferred to first assistant's office); 19 laborers (1 in lieu of assistant messenger, 6 transferred to first assistant's office, and 4 omitted); in all, \$309,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 120, line 10, after the word "cabinets," to strike out "\$7,000" and insert "\$12,000," so as to make the clause read:

For furniture and filing cabinets, \$12,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Justice," on page 123, after line 19, to insert:

The Attorney General is authorized to enter into a contract for the lease of a modern fireproof office building for the use of the Department of Justice, for a period not to exceed five years, renewable, at the

option of the Government, for an additional period not exceeding five years, at an annual rental not exceeding \$36,000, and at a rate per annum per square foot of available floor space not to exceed 36.3 cents.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary read the next paragraph of the bill, as follows:

Office of Solicitor of the Treasury: Solicitor, \$5,000; assistant solicitor, \$3,000; chief clerk, \$2,000; 1 law clerk, \$2,000; 2 docket clerks, at \$2,000 each; clerks—2 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 2 of class 2; assistant messenger; laborer; in all, \$26,980.

Mr. KERN. I desire to offer an amendment at that point, and I will present it now if it is in order to do so.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I suggest to the Senator from Indiana to wait until we get through with the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The agreement was that the committee amendments should be first considered, unless the Senator has an amendment to the committee amendment.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Commerce," on page 124, line 25, after the word "clerks," to strike out "nine" and insert "ten"; on page 125, line 7, after the words "assistant engineer," to strike out "\$800" and insert "\$1,000"; and in line 14, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$179,140" and insert "\$181,140," so as to make the clause read:

Office of the Secretary: Secretary of Commerce, \$12,000; Assistant Secretary, \$5,000; private secretary to the Secretary, \$2,500; confidential clerk to the Secretary, \$1,800; private secretary to Assistant Secretary, \$2,100; chief clerk and superintendent, \$3,000; disbursing clerk, \$3,000; chiefs of divisions—appointments \$2,500, publications, \$2,500, supplies \$2,100; assistant chief, division of publications, \$2,000; clerks—10 of class 4, 9 of class 3, 9 of class 2, 19 of class 1 (4 transferred from Census Office), 11 at \$1,000 each, 11 at \$900 each (1 transferred from Census Office); 2 telephone operators, at \$720 each; messenger to the Secretary, \$1,000; 5 messengers; 7 assistant messengers; 8 messenger boys, at \$480 each (1 transferred from Census Office); engineer, \$1,100; assistant engineer, \$1,000; skilled laborers—1 at \$1,000, 1 at \$900 (transferred from Census Office), 2 at \$840 each, 5 at \$720 each (1 in lieu of 1 watchman at \$720); 3 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 3 firemen; 13 laborers; 2 laborers, at \$480 each; cabinetmaker, \$1,000; carpenter, \$900; chief watchman, \$900; 9 watchmen; 25 charwomen; in all, \$181,140.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 125, line 22, after the word "draftsmen," to strike out "one \$1,800" and insert "two at \$1,800 each," and in line 24, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$64,030" and insert "\$65,830," so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Lighthouses: Commissioner, \$5,000; deputy commissioner, \$4,000; chief constructing engineer, \$4,000; superintendent of naval construction, \$3,000; chief clerk, \$2,400; clerks—1 \$2,000, 2 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 2 of class 2, 5 of class 1, 7 at \$1,000 each, 2 at \$900 each, 1 \$840; messenger; assistant messenger; messenger boy, \$480; assistant engineers—1 \$3,000, 1 \$2,400, 1 \$2,250; draftsmen—2 at \$1,800 each, 1 \$1,560, 1 \$1,500, 1 \$1,440, 2 at \$1,200 each; in all, \$65,830.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 126, line 5, before the words "of class one," to strike out "two hundred and forty-three" and insert "two hundred and eighty-three"; in line 8, before the words "at \$1,000," to strike out "one hundred and thirteen" and insert "eighty-three"; in the same line, before the words "at \$900," to strike out "ninety-one" and insert "eighty-one"; in line 11, before the words "three messengers," to strike out "two at \$720 each" and insert "one \$720"; in line 12, before the word "unskilled," to strike out "three" and insert "four"; and in line 14, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$664,460" and insert "\$673,460," so as to make the clause read:

Census Office: Director, \$6,000; four chief statisticians, at \$3,000 each; chief clerk, \$2,500; geographer, \$2,000; stenographer, \$1,500; nine expert chiefs of divisions, at \$2,000 each; clerks—15 of class 4, 25 of class 3, 40 of class 2, 283 of class 1 (4 transferred to Secretary's office), 83 at \$1,000 each, 81 at \$900 each (1 transferred to Secretary's office); skilled laborers—two at \$900 each (one transferred to Secretary's office), one \$720; three messengers; five assistant messengers; four unskilled laborers, at \$720 each; three messenger boys, at \$480 each (one transferred to Secretary's office); in all, \$673,460.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 127, line 6, after the word "Statistics," to insert "Provided further, That hereafter the Director of the Census may procure the information for the tobacco reports required by this act and the act approved April 30, 1912, by mail or by special agents or by other employees of the Bureau of the Census," so as to make the clause read:

For securing information for census reports, provided for by law, semi-monthly reports of cotton production, periodical reports of stocks of baled cotton in the United States and of the domestic and foreign consumption of cotton; quarterly reports of tobacco; per diem compensation of special agents and expenses of same and of detailed employees, whether employed in Washington, D. C., or elsewhere; the cost of transcribing State, municipal, and other records, temporary rental of quarters outside of the District of Columbia, for supervising special

agents, and employment by them of such temporary service as may be necessary in collecting the statistics required by law, including \$15,000 for collecting tobacco statistics authorized by law in addition to any other fund available therefor; *Provided*, That hereafter there shall be in the official organization of the bureau a separate, distinct, and independent division called the division of cotton and tobacco statistics; *Provided further*, That hereafter the Director of the Census may procure the information for the tobacco reports required by this act and the act approved April 30, 1912, by mail or by special agents or by other employees of the Bureau of the Census; *Provided further*, That the compensation of not to exceed five special agents provided for in this paragraph may be fixed at a rate not to exceed \$8 per day, \$512,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 128, line 8, after the words "United States," to insert "including exchange on official checks," and in line 9, after the word "checks," to strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$150,000," so as to make the clause read:

To further promote and develop the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, including exchange on official checks, \$150,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce; *Provided*, That not exceeding \$3,000 of this sum may be expended for the purchase of documents, manuscripts, plans, specifications, and other publications necessary for the promotion of our commercial interests; *Provided further*, That out of this sum there may be expended \$2,000 for the employment of an editorial assistant, and \$1,600 for an editorial clerk, in Washington, D. C., to edit the reports of the field agents employed under this appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 130, line 11, after the words "United States," to insert "exchange on official checks," so as to make the clause read:

Commercial attachés: For commercial attachés, to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, after examination to be held under his direction to determine their competency, and to be accredited through the State Department, whose duties shall be to investigate and report upon such conditions in the manufacturing industries and trade of foreign countries as may be of interest to the United States; and for one clerk to each of said commercial attachés to be paid a salary not to exceed \$1,500 each; and for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses, rent, purchase of reports, books of reference and periodicals, travel to and from the United States, exchange on official checks, and all other necessary expenses not included in the foregoing; such commercial attachés shall serve directly under the Secretary of Commerce and shall report directly to him, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 132, line 3, after the date "1911," to strike out "\$84,000" and insert "\$93,000," so as to make the clause read:

Clerk hire, service at large: For compensation, not exceeding \$1,500 a year to each person, of clerks to boards of steamboat inspectors, to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce in accordance with the provisions of section 4414, Revised Statutes, and the acts of April 9, 1906, and March 4, 1911, \$93,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 132, line 18, after the word "Commissioner," to strike out "\$4,000" and insert "\$4,500"; in line 21, before the words "at \$1,000," to strike out "two" and insert "four"; and in line 24, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$35,780" and insert "\$38,280," so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Navigation: Commissioner, \$4,500; deputy commissioner, \$2,400; chief clerk, \$2,000; clerk to commissioner, \$1,600; clerks—2 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 3 of class 2, 4 of class 1, 4 at \$1,000 each, 6 at \$900 each; 2 stenographers and typewriters to be employed not to exceed six months at the rate of \$75 per month each; 2 messengers; in all, \$38,280.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 124, line 3, after the word "boats," to strike out "\$22,000" and insert "\$33,500," so as to make the clause read:

Enforcement of navigation laws: To enable the Secretary of Commerce to provide and operate such motor boats and employ thereon such persons as may be necessary for the enforcement, under his direction by customs officers, of laws relating to navigation and inspection of vessels, boarding of vessels, and counting of passengers on excursion boats, \$33,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 134, line 11, after the word "therewith," to strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$18,000," so as to make the clause read:

To enable the Secretary of Commerce to employ temporarily, in addition to those now provided for by law, such other persons as may be necessary, of whom not more than two at any one time may be employed in the District of Columbia, to enforce the laws to prevent overcrowding of passenger and excursion vessels, and all necessary expenses in connection therewith, \$18,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 134, line 22, after the word "foregoing," to strike out "\$45,000" and insert "\$49,200," so as to make the clause read:

Wireless-communication laws: To enable the Secretary of Commerce to enforce the acts of Congress "to require apparatus and operators for radio communication on certain ocean steamers" and "to regulate radio communication" and carry out the international radio telegraphic convention, and to employ such persons and means as may be necessary, this employment to include salaries of employees in Washington not

exceeding \$7,150, traveling and subsistence expenses, purchase and exchange of instruments, technical books, rent, and all other miscellaneous items and necessary expenses not included in the foregoing, \$49,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for the maintenance of the Bureau of Standards, on page 135, line 12, before the words "of class 4," to strike out "one" and insert "two," and in the same line, before the words "of class 3," to strike out "one" and insert "two," so as to read:

Clerks—2 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 2 of class 2, 6 of class 1, 5 at \$1,000 each, 5 at \$900 each, 2 at \$720 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for the maintenance of the Bureau of Standards, on page 136, line 4, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$310,120" and insert "\$313,520," so as to read:

Ten laborers; janitors—three at \$660 each, one \$600; two female laborers, at \$360 each; in all, \$313,520.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 138, line 1, after the word "field," to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$125,000," so as to make the clause read:

For continuation of the investigation of structural materials, such as stone, clays, cement, and so forth, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$125,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 138, line 12, after the word "field," to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$40,000," so as to make the clause read:

For investigation of fire-resisting properties of building materials and conditions under which they may be most efficiently used, and for the standardization of types of appliances for fire prevention, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 138, line 18, after the word "field," to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$40,000," so as to make the clause read:

For investigation of the standards and methods of measurements of public utilities, such as gas, electric light, electric power, water, telephone, and electric railway service, and the solution of the problems which arise in connection with standards in such service, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 139, line 12, before the word "paint," to strike out "including cottonseed oil," and in line 14, after the word "field," to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000," so as to make the clause read:

To develop color standards and methods of manufacture and of color measurement, with special reference to their industrial use in standardization and specification of colorants such as dyestuffs, inks, and pigments, and other products, paint, paper, and textiles, in which color is a pertinent property, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 139, after line 14, to insert:

To study methods of measurement and technical processes used in the manufacture of pottery, brick, tile, terra cotta, and other clay products, and the study of the properties of the materials used in that industry, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$5,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask the chairman of the committee if he will not accept an amendment making the sum \$10,000, and let it go into conference?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have no objection.

Mr. SMOOT. I have some letters here that I wish to present to the conferees.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Let it go to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Change the amount from \$5,000 to \$10,000 in line 19.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, on page 140, line 18, after the word "field," to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$15,000," so as to make the clause read:

To develop methods of testing and standardizing machines, motors, tools, measuring instruments, and other apparatus and devices used in mechanical, hydraulic, and aeronautic engineering; for the comparative study of types of apparatus and methods of operation, and for the establishment of standards of performance; for the accurate determination of fundamental physical constants involved in the proper execution of this work; and for the scientific experiments and investigations needed in solving the problems which may arise in connection therewith, especially in response to the requirements of aeronautics and aviation for information of a purely scientific nature, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the head of "Department of Labor," on page 147, line 20, after the words "in all," to strike

out "\$36,100" and insert "\$38,100, of which sum not exceeding \$2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, which is made immediately available, shall be used for the repairs to the Mills Building which the Government is required to make under the terms of the lease," so as to make the clause read:

Contingent expenses, Department of Labor: For contingent and miscellaneous expenses of the offices and bureaus of the department, for which appropriations for contingent and miscellaneous expenses are not specifically made, including the purchase of stationery, furniture, and repairs to the same, carpets, matting, oilcloth, file cases, towels, ice, brooms, soap, sponges, laundry, street car tickets, not exceeding \$125, lighting and heating; maintenance and repair of a motor truck; purchase, exchange, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying vehicle for use of the Secretary and such other officials as exigency may require for official purposes; freight and express charges, postage to foreign countries, telegraph and telephone service, typewriters, adding machines and other labor-saving devices, including their exchange; repairs to the building occupied by the office of the Secretary of Labor; purchase of law books, books of reference, and periodicals not exceeding \$300; in all, \$38,100, of which sum not exceeding \$2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, which is made immediately available, shall be used for the repairs to the Mills Building which the Government is required to make under the terms of the lease; and in addition thereto such sum as may be necessary, not in excess of \$13,500, to facilitate the purchase, through the central purchasing office, as provided in the act of June 17, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 531), of certain supplies for the Immigration Service, shall be deducted from the appropriation "Expenses of regulating immigration" made for the fiscal year 1917 and added to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of Labor," for that year; and the total sum thereof shall be and constitute the appropriation for contingent expenses for the Department of Labor, to be expended through the central purchasing office (Division of Publications and Supplies), Department of Labor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 148, after line 17, to insert:

The Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into a contract for the lease of a modern fireproof building for the use of the Department of Labor for a period not to exceed five years, renewable, at the option of the Government, for an additional period not exceeding five years, at an annual rental not exceeding \$24,000 and at a rate per annum per square foot of available floor space not to exceed 36.3 cents.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Judicial," on page 149, line 3, after "\$4,500," to insert "9 law clerks, 1 for the Chief Justice and 1 for each Associate Justice, at not exceeding \$3,600 each per annum," and in line 7, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$153,500" and insert "\$185,900," so as to make the clause read:

Supreme Court: Chief Justice, \$15,000; 8 Associate Justices, at \$14,500 each; marshal, \$4,500; 9 law clerks, 1 for the Chief Justice and 1 for each Associate Justice, at not exceeding \$3,600 each per annum; 9 stenographic clerks, 1 for the Chief Justice and 1 for each Associate Justice, at not exceeding \$2,000 each; in all, \$185,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, on page 153, line 13, after the word "That," to strike out "appropriations in this act shall not" and insert "no part of any money appropriated by this or any other act shall," and in line 26, after the word "schools," to insert "Provided, That in construing this section the Commissioner of Patents shall advise the Comptroller of the Treasury as to whether the changes in any typewriter are of such structural character as to constitute a new machine not within the limitations of this section," so as to make the section read:

Sec. 4. That no part of any money appropriated by this or any other act shall be used during the fiscal year 1917 for the purchase of any typewriting machine at a price in excess of the lowest price paid by the Government of the United States for the same make and substantially the same model of machine during the fiscal year 1915; such price shall include the value of any typewriting machine or machines given in exchange, but shall not apply to special prices granted on typewriting machines used in schools of the District of Columbia or of the Indian Service, the lowest of which special prices paid for typewriting machines shall not be exceeded in future purchases for such schools: *Provided*, That in construing this section the Commissioner of Patents shall advise the Comptroller of the Treasury as to whether the changes in any typewriter are of such structural character as to constitute a new machine not within the limitations of this section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, page 154, line 11, after the word "made," to insert "Provided, That nothing in this section shall be deemed to apply to the investigation of any matter or the preparation, prosecution, or defense of any suit by the Department of Justice," so as to make the section read:

Sec. 5. That in expending appropriations made in this act persons in the classified service at Washington, D. C., shall not be detailed for service outside of the District of Columbia except for or in connection with work pertaining directly to the service at the seat of government of the department or other Government establishment from which the detail is made: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be deemed to apply to the investigation of any matter or the preparation, prosecution, or defense of any suit by the Department of Justice.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 154, after line 14, to insert as a new section the following:

Sec. 6. That no money appropriated by this or any other act shall be available for payment to any person receiving more than one salary when the combined amount of said salaries exceeds the sum of \$2,000

per annum, but this shall not apply to retired officers of the Army or Navy whenever they may be elected to public office or whenever the President shall appoint them to office by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE, Mr. SWANSON, and Mr. KERN addressed the Chair.

Mr. LODGE. I merely wish to offer an amendment to the amendment. I dare say the Senator from Virginia rose to offer the same amendment I was going to propose.

Mr. SWANSON. About the Marine Corps?

Mr. LODGE. To insert, after the word "Navy," the words "Marine Corps."

Mr. SWANSON. And, in line 20, "appointed or."

Mr. LODGE. "Appointed or" before "elected."

Mr. OVERMAN. What is the amendment?

Mr. LODGE. The amendment is to insert, after "retired officers of the Army or Navy," the words "or Marine Corps," and, of course, it ought also to read "whenever they may be appointed or elected to public office."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 154, in section 6, after the word "Army," insert a comma and strike out the word "or"; after the word "Navy" insert the words "or Marine Corps"; and, in line 20, before the word "elected," insert "appointed or"; so as to make the section read:

Sec. 6. That no money appropriated by this or any other act shall be available for payment to any person receiving more than one salary when the combined amount of said salaries exceeds the sum of \$2,000 per annum, but this shall not apply to retired officers of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps whenever they may be appointed or elected to public office or whenever the President shall appoint them to office by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think that is a proper amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the Senator from Virginia if he has any further amendment from the committee?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There is no further amendment to submit on the part of the committee.

Mr. KERN. On line 5, page 124, I move to strike out the words "1 law clerk, \$2,000," and to insert the words "2 law clerks, at \$2,000 each."

Mr. SMOOT. Where is the amendment proposed to be inserted?

The SECRETARY. At page 124, line 5.

Mr. KERN. That is the exact number of law clerks the Solicitor of the Treasury now has, and the House struck out the provision for one of them. The Solicitor of the Treasury has a chief clerk and two law clerks, and they are absolutely necessary. I myself have personal knowledge to that effect.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think the amendment ought to be adopted. When we get into conference, if we find any reason to doubt the wisdom of that action, it will be attended to, but I think the amendment is all right.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, which I send to the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, line 12, it is proposed to strike out the word "thirty-two," and to insert "thirty-four," so as to read:

Thirty-four at \$1,440 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 71, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "seventeen hundred dollars," and to insert in lieu thereof "eighteen hundred dollars."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know whether or not the chairman of the committee desires to say anything on that amendment, but it proposes an increase of the two translators' salaries from \$1,700 to \$1,800 each. That question was discussed before the committee; it was considered not only by the subcommittee but by the whole committee, and was rejected. Does the Senator desire to accept that amendment?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do not think the amendment ought to be accepted. The committee gave as careful consideration to it as it could. I shall not, however, object at this late

hour in the afternoon to the amendment, as I am anxious to finish the bill. We can investigate it in conference. I do not think, however, it is right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I wish to say, in connection with the Senator's statement, that that increase has been estimated for.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am fully aware of that fact. It was estimated for at \$1,800. That is correct.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. And it is recommended by the chief of the bureau.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish, for information, to make an inquiry regarding section 6. As I understand it, the combined amount of salaries that one person may draw has heretofore been limited to \$2,500. Am I correct in that?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. No. The former law was that no clerk who was receiving as much as \$2,500 per annum should have any second appointment at all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why was that amount reduced to \$2,000? Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Because we were informed of abuses in some of the departments; that when they could not raise a clerk's salary—when Congress refused to make the allowance—they would just give him some other place in addition to that which he held.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is entirely satisfactory to me, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are any of these items of the bill now subject to points of order as in Committee of the Whole?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A point of order might have been made when they were presented.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I did not hear the inquiry of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I was asking if any of the items of the bill are now subject to a point of order.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Which items?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any items of the bill as considered in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am not aware of any being subject to a point of order. If they are subject to a point of order, I hope the Senator from Texas is not going to make any such point. It is too late to do so, in fact.

Mr. ROBINSON. The amendments made as in Committee of the Whole have all been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have been agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON. Then they are not now subject to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have been agreed to as in Committee of the Whole; but, if it is a committee amendment, the point of order might be made when the bill comes into the Senate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it too late to make the point of order to any paragraph of the bill as adopted by the Senate as in Committee of the Whole?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To amendments of the committee?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can not make a point of order against any provision in the House bill in roman type.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is the information I desired, Mr. President. I wish to ask a further question: May a point of order be submitted when the bill reaches the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It can be.

Mr. SHEPPARD. To any item of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It can be.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I merely desire to reserve the right to make a point of order against any item in the bill when it reaches the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Senator's right.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from California will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 63, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,800," and to insert in lieu thereof "\$3,000," so that if amended it will read:

San Francisco, Office of Assistant Treasurer: * * * Cashier, who also acts as vault clerk, \$3,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I make the point of order that this is an increase of appropriation without an estimate from the department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the procedure of the Senate in reference to such matters, but I know that the other House arbitrarily reduced this cashier's salary from \$3,000 to \$2,800. It seems to me at a time when the work has grown to enormous proportions, when hundreds of millions of dollars are in the vaults, and this cashier is also the custodian of the vaults, it is manifestly unfair to reduce his salary. A recognition of this kind is a direct incentive to bad service among the public employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the proposed increase has not been estimated for, the Chair will sustain the point of order.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It has not been estimated for.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 9, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "one, \$840"; and, in line 14, to strike one "seven" and to insert "six."

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. As I understand, the Senator from Massachusetts offers those amendments to follow what was inserted a little while ago.

Mr. WEEKS. Exactly.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think the amendments are proper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the amendments proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts are agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, if it does not disturb the harmony of the proceedings, about clerks and messengers to committees. That proposition has been adopted, I know, but I have understood that where a chairman of a committee, an inactive committee, such, for instance, as the Committee on Revolutionary Claims or the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments—

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I object to any reference to the latter committee in that way. I have found, to my surprise, that that is a very active committee. It works nearly every day.

Mr. KENYON. Which one of the committees?

Mr. JONES. The Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

Mr. KENYON. Then I exclude that committee from my remarks and apologize to the Senator from Washington. I wish to ask where a Senator has been the chairman of such a committee and goes out of office on the 4th of March, are the clerks of that committee and the secretary and the messenger to that committee each paid until the time that the new Senator comes in, or does the service of those employees terminate when the service of the Senator terminates?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I believe such employees continue to draw their salaries until the new Senator comes in.

Mr. WARREN. That is usually provided for toward the close of a Congress by a provision that they shall remain.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is correct; but it is not a hardship, when people are turned loose in that way for two or three months, and until they can establish themselves in some other business, for the Government to pay them during that time. I have never felt that it was an economy that commended itself to a great Government that where employees were unexpectedly deprived of their places they should not be permitted to draw their salaries for two or three months until they could get into some other business. I do not think it is a vital matter to the United States Government.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, it is not vital to the United States Government to try to save any money anywhere; I realize that; but I wondered how long those salaries run and how much they amount to in such cases.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It may be nothing; we can not tell; but it is a bagatelle.

Mr. KENYON. Would it amount to \$22,000 or \$23,000?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do not think it would amount to so much as that. I have not the slightest idea that it would. I think it does not amount to half of that sum.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I wish to take just a moment. I hold in my hand a praised, but a much fractured and forgotten document, that was used a few years ago very generally,

from which I desire to read a paragraph. The document to which I refer reads as follows:

We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toll. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which benefits a democratic government, and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

Mr. PHELAN. The cashier in the office of the assistant treasurer at San Francisco is a victim of that doctrine.

Mr. JONES. I find in the last Republican legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, the appropriations were \$35,172,434.50. This bill, brought in by our Democratic friends, carries \$38,196,762.25. The estimate for the legislative bill submitted by the Republican administration for the year ending June 30, 1914, was \$36,514,955.50; the estimate submitted for the year ending June 30, 1917, by the present administration, was \$39,749,377.25. I am glad, Mr. President, that this administration is not adhering to that paragraph of the Democratic platform, but is making the necessary appropriations for the proper conduct of the business of the Government.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, of course the Senator understands the reason for that, does he not, and realizes how that was brought about? The Republicans failed to appropriate sufficient money just before they went out of power, so that we have been compelled to provide more money to conduct properly the affairs of the Government.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I simply wanted to put the facts in the Record, and our Democratic friends can explain them as they see fit.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] has again directed the attention of the Senate to that plank in the Democratic platform to which I have sometimes adverted. I do not perceive on either side of the Chamber any great tendency toward it; and although the question of economy should not be a partisan one, thus far I have noticed during my short experience in the Senate no exhibition of a desire to economize on either side of the Chamber. With the exception of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], and the Senator from Washington, I have observed no symptoms of economy either with regard to general appropriations or to bills carrying specific appropriations. And on this side of the Chamber conditions are about the same. And I have a lively recollection that during the summer of 1913 the Senator from Washington obstructed the business of the Senate of the United States day after day—and I am told that it costs the country about a thousand dollars an hour to enjoy that luxury known as the Senate of the United States—in order to get an extra clerk at \$1,200 or \$1,300. He finally wore us out and carried his point. We found it was more economical to let him have the extra clerk, with the expense involved, than to put the country to the continued additional expense consequent upon his persistent efforts. I still hope—although the hope is not a very strong one—that the people, who are really and primarily responsible for the extravagances of Congress, will ultimately realize the necessity of beginning at home with economy and demand of their Senators and Representatives that they decrease appropriations, many of which are entirely unnecessary.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, of course, in what I read I did not intend to make any personal reference to the Senator from Colorado; but I trust that the Senator will see to it that in the next Democratic platform there are no such apparently meaningless charges as that contained in the platform from which I have quoted.

The Senator, I think, if his recollection will go back, will remember that several times I have joined with him in attempting to eliminate appropriations or, in other words, to economize. Possibly the Senator was not very earnest in what he was desiring, and, as he and I were about the only ones who were working together, I confess that I got a little bit discouraged, as he seems to be. Of course, I have not learned of any Senator on the other side of the Chamber who seems to be willing to give up any of his clerical help for the useless committees which I myself have been trying for some time to get rid of. I do not, however, seem to be able to get very much assistance from the other side of the Chamber, and I have not heard the clarion voice of my friend from Colorado coming to my relief in this respect at all.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole were concurred in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is now in the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish to inquire if a point of order against the item, on line 4, page 2, is in order?

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to make a point of order, if it is permissible, against that item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If it is in the text of the House bill, it is not in order.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is in the House text.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then I will state that I intended to make the point of order that that provision which reads "for mileage of Senators, \$51,000," is contrary to law and not authorized by law; but, of course, inasmuch as the Presiding Officer states that it is not subject to a point of order, having come over from the House, I shall not make the point of order.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on next Wednesday morning I will submit some remarks on the Army reorganization bill.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pittsfield, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Boston, Somerville, Brookline, Everett, Malden, Melrose, Cambridge, and Worcester, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota presented petitions of Rev. Naphtale Lucock, of Helena; of William Henry Talmage, of Flandreau; and of sundry citizens of Sioux Falls, all in the State of South Dakota, praying for the establishment of Government economic experiment stations, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. JONES presented memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Everett, Wash., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to fix standard prices for patented and trade-marked articles, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented petitions of Local Grange No. 200, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ellensburg; of Buena Vista Grange, No. 415, Patrons of Husbandry, of Prosser; and of sundry citizens of Colville, all in the State of Washington, praying for Government ownership of telephone and telegraph systems, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of Local Grange No. 209, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ellensburg; of Mount Corgin Grange, No. 409, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rice; and of sundry citizens of Colville, all in the State of Washington, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Spokane and Richland, in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PHELAN presented petitions of Bennington Camp, No. 20, United Spanish War Veterans, of San Diego, and of Local Branch, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of San Francisco, in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish-American War, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 26, Laundry Workers' Union, of San Francisco, and of the Federated Trades Council, of Sacramento, in the State of California, praying for an investigation into the conditions surrounding the marketing of dairy products, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Los Gatos, Cal., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DU PONT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wilmington and Newport, in the State of Delaware, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the

right of suffrage to women, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the City Council of Wilmington, Del., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to employees of the Postal Service, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Delaware, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Stuttgart, Ark., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of North Carolina, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented memorials of sundry citizens of Fort Worth and Waco, in the State of Texas, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Paint Rock, Water Valley, San Angelo, Sterling City, Crosby, Thrall Circuit, Dallas, Washita, and Oakwood, all in the State of Texas, and of sundry citizens of Washington, D. C., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Montavilla, Ore., remonstrating against appropriations being made for sectarian purposes, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Oregon, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Oregon, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maine, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2458) authorizing the Cowlitz Tribe of Indians residing in the State of Washington to submit claims to the Court of Claims, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 333) thereon.

Mr. LANE, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (S. 4974) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Corvallis, in the State of Oregon, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 332) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TAGGART:

A bill (S. 5416) to place on the retired list of the Army the names of the surviving officers who were mustered out under the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 15, 1870, in reduction of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 5417) granting an increase of pension to Loami E. Scherer;

A bill (S. 5418) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Meredith;

A bill (S. 5419) granting a pension to Marilla Barnes (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5420) granting an increase of pension to John R. Kingman (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5421) granting an increase of pension to William D. Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANE:

A bill (S. 5422) granting a pension to George Hillis (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5423) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Monroe (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 5424) to construct a bridge in San Juan County, State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 5425) to standardize lime barrels; to the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 5426) granting a pension to Mary A. Barber; to the Committee on Pensions.

FOX RIVER BRIDGE, ILLINOIS.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, may I ask consent, without violating the rule, that I may tender a bill for private relief where a bridge has been condemned over a river caused by some flood or something in the community? The public-utilities commission has requested the Chicago & North Western to promptly put in a new bridge across a little river called the Fox River. I am told that there is not any navigation except for fishing, and it is necessary to get permission of the War Department. I ask the privilege that I may tender the bill preliminary to asking the Secretary of War to investigate the subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 5415) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Fox River at Geneva, Ill.; to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT TO POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HUGHES submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$62,000 to adjust the compensation of printers employed in certain post offices, intended to be proposed by him to the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 10484), which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

Mr. WALSH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 780) validating certain homestead entries, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Mr. JONES submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the amendment submitted by Mr. SMITH of South Carolina to the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. SIMMONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the amendment submitted by Mr. SMITH of South Carolina to the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. OWEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES.

Mr. REED submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 159), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized, during the Sixty-fourth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

RESOURCES OF ARID-LAND STATES (S. DOC. NO. 391).

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I ask to have printed as a public document an article by Mr. I. S. Barlett, of Cheyenne, Wyo., on the marvelous resources of the arid-land States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I should like to know what the title of the article is or what it is about?

Mr. SHAFROTH. It embraces a lot of statistics concerning water power.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Very well; I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter submitted by the Senator from Colorado will be printed as a public document.

RECESS.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday morning next at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m., Saturday, April 8, 1916) the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 10, 1916, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, April 8, 1916.

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

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

We thank Thee, our Father in heaven, that amid the roar and din of battle, the suffering, intense pain, and sorrows incident thereto, the angel of the Red Cross is pouring out Thy love in the oil of tenderness and mercy in its healing touch and comforting message.

We thank Thee for the great organization whose altruistic efforts lend a touch of human kindness to the awful picture. In it the Son of Man lives, and we pray that His blessed presence may dissipate the demons of hate and revenge, and through His spirit grant that the eyes of the blind may be opened, the ears of the deaf unstopped, and cold hearts be warmed again into love, peace, and good will for all mankind; that the prayer of prayers may be answered, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Amen.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of woman suffrage by printing a letter and resolution from the Congressional Union of the State of Washington and my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of woman suffrage. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MINORITY VIEWS—ARMOR-PLATE BILL.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority may have three days in which to present the minority views on the armor-plate bill, S. 1417.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] asks unanimous consent that the minority of the Committee on Naval Affairs shall have three legislative days in which to file its views as to the armor-plate factory. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter which I addressed to Dr. Melvin, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the reply to the same by Secretary Houston, in regard to the dairy and creamery industries of the country.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter which he wrote to the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry and the answer to the same, written by Secretary Houston. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. TAGGART. I rise to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of a movement toward adopting a universal alphabet. By request I introduced resolution No. 99 for that purpose—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has a right to ask unanimous consent, but not to argue. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of a universal alphabet?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, what is it? It is evidently not a speech.

Mr. TAGGART. It is not a speech; and I wish to say to the House that I have not, by any means, prepared all of it, and there is not very much of it. But I have been repeatedly asked and questioned for the last several weeks, while I was very busy, to get these remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. If there is not much of it, I shall not object.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, these matters of extension go in the back of the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. Of course they do. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire who it is or what agency it is that is urging this?

Mr. TAGGART. There is no agency that I know of, no organization that I know of, with a president, secretary, or treasurer, but a number of scholars in this country and teachers, particularly represented by a gentleman by the name of Mr. Robert Stein, an employee of the Government here, interested in the question of a movement to have a universal alphabet, so that people will study each other's languages.

Mr. MANN. Is not the purpose of this to have it printed as a public document and have it franked out by the thousands?

The SPEAKER. How many letters has your alphabet?

Mr. TAGGART. I beg leave to state that the object of this resolution is not to create a new alphabet, but to print an alphabet that everybody can read.

Mr. MANN. That is what I wanted to inquire, whether the intention was, having inserted it in the RECORD, to spread it the world over, at Government expense, so far as the Postal Service is concerned.

Mr. TAGGART. It could not go the world over at Government expense.

Mr. MANN. It could go to the United States and Canada and Mexico and Cuba, and that is a good share of the world.

Mr. TAGGART. I do not believe that under the present circumstances we are not in favor of sending this to Mexico. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the gentleman state whether that is the purpose.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

JOURNAL NATIONAL ENCAMPMENT GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following privileged resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana submits a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 26 (H. Rept. 508).

Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the journal of the national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed as a House document 1,500 copies of the journal of the fiftieth national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, for the year 1916, not to exceed \$1,700 in cost, with illustrations, 1,000 copies of which shall be for the use of the House and 500 for the use of the Senate.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. This fixes a limit of cost. Is that the limit of cost for the 1,500 copies?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes, sir. It is the same resolution, I will say to the gentleman, that has been put through in two or three of the last Congresses.

Mr. MANN. Did we always have that limit of cost in it?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; it is the same.

Mr. GARNER. What is the object of this?

Mr. BARNHART. We first passed that resolution without the limit of cost, and it went to the Senate, and the Senate added the \$1,700, and it has been running at that amount ever since.

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

REPORT OF UNVEILING OF STATUE OF HENRY MOWER RICE.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit another privileged resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 16 (H. Rept. 510).

Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of the proceedings in Congress and in Statuary Hall relative to unveiling of the statue of Henry Mower Rice, etc.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, the proceedings in Congress, together with the proceedings at the unveiling in Statuary Hall, upon the acceptance of the statue of Henry Mower Rice presented by the State of Minnesota, 16,500 copies, with suitable illustration, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and the remaining 1,500 copies shall be for the use and distribution of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Minnesota.

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

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman, has he any objection to the distribution of these documents through the folding room?

Mr. BARNHART. No.

Mr. MANN. It is made through the folding room.

Mr. BARNHART. When it is printed as a House document it always goes to the folding room unless otherwise provided for.

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

REVISED EDITION OF BANKRUPTCY LAWS.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit another privileged resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 27 (H. Rept. 509).

Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the bankruptcy laws, as prepared by the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 20,000 copies of the revised edition of United States bankruptcy laws, as prepared by the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives, the said 20,000 copies to be distributed as follows: Three thousand copies to the Senate folding room, 3,000 copies for the Senate document room, 7,000 copies for the House folding room, and 7,000 copies for the House document room.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wish to inquire of the purpose of the committee in allotting such a large number of these very much requested bankruptcy laws to the document room. I know in my own individual case that I often have requests for copies of the bankruptcy laws, and I assume that every other Member of the House has requests from attorneys in his district. You are not allotting as many as usual in proportion to the House as to the document room. Why not allot a larger proportion to the Members of the House than is herein provided?

Mr. BARNHART. The committee always inquires of the document rooms of the House and Senate as to whether or not they have any considerable demand for these documents, and the committee then inquires of Members of the House, and if there is not a large demand for the publication, we undertake to divide between the folding rooms and the document rooms, so that the document will probably be distributed. I ascertained from the document room of the House, for instance, that they have something like 400 applications for these pamphlets, and that is out of proportion to the applications that I have for them. I will say to the gentleman that it is the purpose of the committee to try to furnish these documents to such distributing agencies as will send them out to people who want them.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will realize that one of the many documents that can be distributed with advantage by Members of Congress is this document containing the bankruptcy laws. I suppose that I am in no exceptional condition when I say that I have frequent requests from attorneys of my city, and I assume that other Members have, that can not be filled. I will ask the gentleman when we last had at our disposal these bankruptcy laws?

Mr. BARNHART. I think two years ago.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think it must have been longer than that, because I do not recall having any at my disposal for many years.

Mr. BARNHART. It might have been a reprint of the former edition.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think it would be better to allot a larger number to the folding room, so that Members could distribute them as called for by the attorneys of their respective districts, rather than have them go out all at once from the document room. What is the proposal in the gentleman's resolution?

Mr. MANN. Fifty-fifty.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think it ought to be 75 and 25—75 per cent to the folding room and 25 per cent to the document room. I do not question that the document room has requests for them, but I say they could be more evenly distributed throughout the country by placing a larger number at the disposal of Members through the folding room.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, the difficulty about that is the demand for documents of this sort comes from lawyers, and they write to the Clerk of the House asking for the document. They do that more frequently than they write to Members of Congress. The Committee on Printing ascertained that the demands upon the document room for this particular document are so large that they thought it best to give the document room a liberal allowance, because it is a document that is needed only by lawyers, and the document room has such a large accumulation of requests that they will take up most of what are hereby allotted.

Mr. STAFFORD. You say they have 400 requests, and you are providing 7,000 copies for them?

Mr. BARNHART. Let me finish my statement. On the other hand, if they are sent exclusively to the folding room, the probability is that half the Members of this House will permit this document to lie there, if they do not happen to have requests for them, while requests from their own district are lying in the document room unanswered and unfilled, because the document room has not enough documents to fill orders.

Mr. STAFFORD. How many of the last allotment are now lodged in the folding room to the credit of Members of the House?

Mr. BARNHART. I do not know that there are any.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will find that the supply is virtually exhausted because of the demands upon the respective Members. Will the gentleman increase the quota to be at the disposal of Members through the folding room? I think we ought to have a larger quota.

Mr. MANN. We can get more when we need them.

Mr. BARNHART. I will agree to this, and the committee will agree to it, I think, that if this allotment is not found to be sufficient for the Members of the House, we will introduce another resolution and put it through later if we find there is a demand for it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I shall be after the gentleman very shortly to pass such a resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I notice that this is to print the bankruptcy law as presented or furnished in some way by the Committee on the Revision of the Laws. What is there new about the document?

Mr. BARNHART. I can not say to the gentleman from Illinois, except that the author of the bill says that the Committee on Revision of the Laws have revised it and brought it up to date, and that it contains everything in the way of bankruptcy laws up to the present time.

Mr. MANN. I do not recall many changes, if any, in the bankruptcy law now for a very long time.

Mr. SHERLEY. The last revision of the bankruptcy law was made as a result of a bill introduced by myself, and passed some six years ago. There may have been one or two bills affecting the law in a very slight way that have been passed since then, but there has been no general revision made since that one.

Mr. MANN. I wondered whether the purpose of it was to have an edition that had been recently annotated by the committee.

Mr. SHERLEY. It may be that there is something of that kind. For my own part I can not see why we should now publish this law free to the legal profession any more than any other law.

Mr. MANN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SHERLEY. When it was first passed there was a reason; but now any lawyer can obtain a copy of the bankruptcy law in the same way that he obtains a copy of any other law.

Mr. BARNHART. Well, the committee called before it the author of the bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. What bill?

Mr. BARNHART. This resolution.

Mr. MANN. The author of the resolution.

Mr. BARNHART. The committee called before it the author of the resolution, and we also had the superintendent of the document room before us, and got the information from the author of the bill that it had been revised and brought up to date in the matter of citations, and so forth, which the former publication did not carry, and that it had been done by the Committee on Revision of the Laws. We had no reason to dispute his word.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have no doubt there may have been some annotations made to the law, but the point I am calling to the attention of the gentleman is simply the policy of Congress, as to how far Congress is going to issue reprints of laws with annotations for the benefit of the profession. There is no more reason for doing that with this law than any other.

Mr. MANN. They can buy this document from the superintendent of documents now.

Mr. SHERLEY. Not only that, but there are any number of law books printed, and the Statutes at Large, that deal with the subject. The profession is not without means of getting copies.

Mr. BARNHART. I agree with what the gentleman says as to that.

Mr. MANN. I suppose it gives an excuse for the clerk of the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

Mr. BARNHART. If the gentleman will permit, I can explain the excuse. It is pressure from the membership of the House. I think the gentleman from Illinois will agree with me that the present Committee on Printing is bringing in a very limited number of bills; but the pressure for more is very great, and especially so in this particular instance.

Mr. MANN. I have not heard of the pressure before as to the bankruptcy law. I thought the pressure was to repeal it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I desire to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] a question.

Mr. BARNHART. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin. Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not know whether the gentleman has any resolution relating to the report of the Indus-

trial Commission. I have received a number of requests for copies of that report, and also quite a number of requests for copies of the testimony. When is it expected to print either the report or the testimony?

Mr. BARNHART. The situation as to the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations is this: Some time early in January this House passed a resolution providing for the printing and distribution through the folding rooms of 100,000 copies of the report. The Committee on Printing asked the officials of the late Industrial Commission to give us some information and data as to what parts of the hearings they wanted printed and what parts they thought ought to be eliminated, because the testimony taken at the hearings is of great bulk. We have not had any reply from them. In the meantime our resolution went to the Senate.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That resolution is in relation to the report, but not the testimony.

Mr. BARNHART. The resolution which we sent to the Senate relates to the report.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. And what the gentleman has said about writing to the chairman of the commission relates to the testimony and not the report?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes and no. We passed a resolution providing for the printing of the report and sent it to the Senate. The Senate committee amended our resolution by providing that instead of binding the report in cloth it should be bound in paper, and it also provided for the printing of 10,000 copies of the hearings, at a cost, I think, of \$87,500. And the matter has been hung up, I hear, by the economists over there because of the excessive cost of printing the hearings. Our bill for the publication of the report is attached to it, and has not gone through on that account.

Mr. MANN. Has there not been a question over there as to what part of the testimony shall be printed?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. The industrial relations committee has dissolved, and I understand that three members of the commission have refused to sign the report, and if the report is published they want the right to submit their views, and so it is in that tangled condition. Until it is straightened out over there we can do nothing. I have asked the committee to put our resolution through and give us the report and settle the question of printing the hearings afterwards, but so far we have been unable to get such action approved.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is certainly a remarkable situation that a commission of this importance should take the testimony of capitalists, the greatest in the world, because they are the greatest in the United States, the testimony of Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Carnegie, and Mr. Morgan, and of others engaged in various kinds of business, the testimony of farmers, of tenant farmers in Texas, of the wives of those farmers, of the great landowners and mine owners and miners, of laboring men in every business, of working girls and working women, of the owners of great stores, thus going into the great industrial questions which relate most closely to the lives and welfare of all the people in the country, should do this at such great expense, with every opportunity for examination and cross-examination of each witness, and that then the Congress of the United States should be unable to get either the report or the testimony printed.

When the bill to appoint the commission was up—I think it was July, 1912—in some remarks which I had the privilege of making during the debate I insisted that the bill ought to contain a mandatory provision for printing the testimony and the report. I prophesied at that time that because the commission was to consist of nine members divided into three distinct groups, if the law did not contain such mandatory provision and thus afford Congress some opportunity to get acquainted with the testimony we would not know what to believe about the report. The then chairman of the committee having the bill in charge, now the Secretary of Labor, said that he thought that the report would be printed anyway. But it now appears that the printing is completely hung up.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I do not like a statement like that to go abroad without explanation, because I have some information that I think the House and those interested ought to have. The House will recall that at the time the commission was created there was an appropriation of \$350,000 to supply it with the means of prosecuting the work. Afterwards they came back to Congress, so I am informed, and asked for an additional \$100,000 to finish the work and print the report. They printed an edition of only 10,000 copies of the report, and kindly allowed to each Member of Congress one copy, and the members of the commission distributed the balance.

They did not have the report printed at the Government Printing Office where the plates might be available for the use of Congress, but by some private concern. They did not

print the hearings and put so much in the hearings consisting, as I understand, of such bulky volumes as the life of John D. Rockefeller, and so forth, that the committee of the House asked the commission to edit out all of this extraneous matter and give the plain evidence with references to publications mentioned.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is there any reason why the two Houses could not print what they want to print?

Mr. BARNHART. The committee does not like to assume the responsibility of editing the report of a commission of investigation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It would not be editing, but simply excluding from publication volumes of biography, and nobody would impute any wrong motive should those be excluded.

Mr. BARNHART. The members of the committee of the House do not like to undertake to edit a report of any commission or department of the Government. They prefer that the commission should edit it, otherwise the committee might be subjected to criticism for leaving out important matter or leaving in irrelevant matter.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. These volumes the gentleman speaks of are not in the report?

Mr. BARNHART. No; they are in the hearings. But the question of editing the hearings so as to leave out the books, and so forth, admitted as reference and the dispute over the correctness of the report did not come up until after the House passed the resolution. Now it is said three members of the commission refuse to approve the report and say it is not a report of the commission.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. There were nine on the commission?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Three is a very decided minority.

Mr. BARNHART. The names of only four of the members are attached to the report itself.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I thought there was more than one report.

Mr. BARNHART. There is one general report and two or three on special investigations, such as the Colorado strike.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. There are two reports?

Mr. BARNHART. No; the general is one volume, one report.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. They did not agree on the report. Prof. Commons filed a separate report, did he not?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; but some members of the commission do not agree to some parts of the report, while others do not agree to other parts.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is not an uncommon thing in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BARNHART. What we are anxious to do is to get the commission to edit a report that will not be disputed by its members when it is issued.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have had handed to me what is entitled the final report of the Commission on Industrial Relations. Here is another report by the same commission dealing with the Colorado strike.

Mr. BARNHART. The Colorado report is a separate report.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Here is one report, signed John R. Commons, Florence J. Harriman, Horace Weinstock, S. Thurston Ballard, and Richard H. Aishton. That is one report. Then here is a separate report signed by three of those five, being the report of Commissioners Weinstock, Ballard, and Aishton. As a matter of fact, all of these commissioners signed something, and five of the nine sign one report. Here we have another report signed by the other four. Here is a separate report of Commissioner John B. Lennon on industrial education. Here is another report signed by John B. Lennon, James O'Connell, Mr. Garretson, S. Thurston Ballard, and Frank P. Walsh. S. Thurston Ballard, it appears—and I had not noticed that before—is one of the five who signed this report, and is also one of the five who signed the other report which I mentioned. So, as a matter of fact, instead of three of the commissioners not signing a report, every one has signed a report.

Mr. BARNHART. That is, signed some part of it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Five is the majority of nine, and there are two reports here each of which is signed by five members of the commission; so, instead of there being any report signed by only four, there are two reports each signed by five, a majority of the commission.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, this is all foreign to the matter. The House has already passed this resolution authorizing the publication of this report, and my remarks refer to the condition that exists in another body of the Congress. We did all that we could two or three months ago by promptly passing a resolution to print the report for distribution; but if

it is within the power of any gentleman of this House to hurry it through in another branch of this Congress, I would be very glad to be advised how it can be done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, does not the gentleman from Wisconsin think, in view of this report and partial reports signed this way and that way, that it would be a good plan to have Congress provide a commission on commissions so that we can straighten up some of these things?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the pending resolution.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. SPARKMAN rose.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, if the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] will withhold for a moment his motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on the river and harbor appropriation bill, I think we can dispose of the matter we had up yesterday evening respecting the immigration bill. In response to the request of the resolution which we passed last evening requesting the Senate to return to the House the bill H. R. 10384, the immigration bill, the Senate has sent it back, and I think the trouble will be cured by striking out the Humphrey amendment, which would then leave the Siegel substitute. Is that the opinion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]?

Mr. MANN. Yes; and I suggest to the gentleman that he ask unanimous consent, all in one request, to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; that it be reengrossed, striking out that amendment, and be considered as passed again.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the suggestion, and I make that request. I think that is a solution of the entire matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the immigration bill, H. R. 10384, was passed be vacated, that the bill be amended by striking out the matter referred to, which the Clerk will report, and as so amended that the bill be considered as reengrossed and passed. The Clerk will report the matter to be stricken out.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 24, after the word "zone," strike out the following: "Provided further, That whenever any foreign country shall by statute, executive order, or otherwise, exclude from its territory any class or classes of citizens from the United States upon grounds different from the grounds for excluding aliens from the United States herein specified, the same class or classes of aliens residing in such country shall be excluded from the United States so long as such exclusion of United States citizens continues."

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

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12193, the river and harbor 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 river and harbor appropriation bill, with Mr. SHERLEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

White River, Ark.: For maintenance, \$30,500.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] may proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] may proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask to amend that request by providing for five additional minutes, to be controlled by myself, and that at the end of that time all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto shall close.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida adds to the request that he may have five minutes, at the end of which time all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto shall close. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, in the course of the debate yesterday on the item relative to the Galveston Channel, con-

tinuing improvements by the construction of a sea wall, the question was asked the chairman of the committee respecting whether or not this might be a new or an old project. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] replied to the inquiry:

It is not a new project in any sense. It was an old project, a project that we adopted in the bill of 1913. It was a project adopted then, but with this item deferred until the first part of it should have been completed.

Since that statement was made I have been making a little search in the RECORD to determine whether or not that is an old project. I have in my hand the statutes, volume 37, No. 1, public laws, Sixty-second Congress, and I find on page 812 two items relative to Galveston Harbor. One reads:

Galveston Harbor Channel, Tex.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance under the existing project.

And that contemplates the building up of some streets, from Fifty-first Street to Fifty-sixth Street, as reported in House document 1328.

The next item reads as follows:

Improving the channel, Galveston Harbor to Texas City, Tex., for improvement and maintenance in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1390, Sixty-second Congress, third session, subject to the conditions therein specified, \$550,000.

With a continuing appropriation of \$900,000 more, making a total of \$1,400,000 for improving the channel from Galveston Harbor to Texas City.

Now, Mr. Chairman, by reference to the map herein, House Document No. 1390, which is the document referred to, which I am holding, we find that the sea wall extends from Galveston city in a direction probably north. I do not see the compass on here, but I presume it is north along the shore, and that Texas City is some distance up the channel, directly at right angles to the sea wall.

And mark the phraseology of the item in the bill, which is:

Improving channel from Galveston Harbor to Texas City.

It has absolutely nothing to do in any way, shape, or manner with the sea wall. It is an entirely different item in the project, and that is all there is on the statute books—the act of March 4, 1913. Since then no river and harbor bill as it has passed this House containing this very item, but has had the phrase "for construction of a sea wall." That is the phraseology that has appeared since, and the law as it was passed was for the improvement of the channel to Texas City.

Now, further than that, we find four different items recommended by that special board. One of them is Texas City Dike and Channel, \$1,400,000, which is the item carried in the bill. Another item we find is the sea-wall extension, \$1,185,000; no connection whatsoever with the channel to Texas City. Further than that, in the report of the chairman, with the appendix we have before us here to-day, on the present river and harbor bill, absolutely not one word is said about the sea wall.

I hold in my hand the engineers' report, and here is what they say about the present project, on top of page 868:

Adopted by the river and harbor bill of March 4, 1913, providing for the widening of the channel to 300 feet on the bottom, 30 feet deep at mean low tide, and the construction of a pile dike on the north side 28,200 feet in length, provided "that a gap 100 feet in width shall be left between the western end of this dike and the Texas City Harbor lines to permit the passage of small boats." The estimated cost of the project was \$1,400,000, with \$50,000 annually for maintenance. (See H. Doc. No. 1390, 62d Cong., 3d sess.) The tidal variation is about 1½ feet.

That is the present project, gentlemen, as adopted in the river and harbor bill of March 4, 1913, and that is every part of it that has been adopted. It is every bit that has ever been estimated on; it is every bit that the engineers have ever reported on; it is all that appears. There is no reference to it whatsoever in the chairman's report to this House in the present session.

Therefore it seems to me absolutely proven that by the inclusion in the present bill of this item for the construction of a sea wall, absolutely separate, understand, from the item that is adopted, you are adopting a new project. If it is the wish of the House to adopt a new project, I have nothing more to say. We have taken votes here time and again that the only new project that we will adopt is the one in connection with New York Harbor. If the House wishes to adopt additional projects, well and good, but let us do it with our eyes wide open and with a knowledge of the fact that this particular project has never been adopted; that the engineers have never estimated for it; that they do not in their estimates and in the report that I have here, and just referred to, in any way, shape, or manner refer to the sea wall. If we put it into this bill at this time, we are not showing good faith by the House as we are adopting a new project in every sense of the word. In addition to that, we are taking on an item that even the chairman of the committee in his report to the House has never so much as referred to.

I submit these facts in connection with the statement that the chairman made yesterday that this project had been adopted in 1913. It never was adopted except in one item, that of going up to Texas City. And in order to make ourselves square we must adopt that project now if it is going into the bill at this time. I would like some explanation in what manner this can be considered an adopted project, when the engineers, the special board, with four items in their report, have never taken up but one of them, and now we come back to another and adopt it as a new project.

I have already said that if it is going into the bill, all right, but it is going in with the information before the House that you are breaking faith in the sense that the committee said that there should be but one new project. This will be a second new project if it stays in the present river and harbor bill. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] can shake his head. I would like him to substantiate that I am making a wrong statement on the floor when I finish. He can not offer any explanation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts no doubt thinks he is correct, but I wish to say to him that he is absolutely mistaken. That project was adopted in the bill of 1913, and in one of the paragraphs which I believe he read a moment ago. I did make a slight mistake yesterday in the reasons I assigned for deferring that particular part of the project to a later date. I stated that it was intended to be deferred until the balance of the project was completed. In that I was in error. I saw that afterwards, and I intended to correct it, but we became involved in other discussions and I overlooked it. The reason, as I recall, for the deferring of that project was that we wanted to postpone it until the city of Galveston should have complied with certain conditions imposed by it. The city has since complied with those conditions, or is ready to comply with them. Those conditions were referred to in the discussion yesterday and the item amended so as to meet certain objections. The document to which the gentleman refers, namely, House Document 1390, Sixty-second Congress, third session, on page 4 says:

With reference to the extension of the Galveston sea wall, it is recommended that appropriation be made for this work when the city of Galveston and other local interests shall have donated the required lands to the Government, shall have quieted all claims to the present San Jacinto Reservation, and shall have given assurance satisfactory to the Secretary of War that it will construct 3,200 feet of similar sea-wall extension.

That is the correction I wished to make yesterday, but I overlooked it at the end of the discussion.

Mr. TREADWAY. Would the gentleman kindly quote the statute as it appears, under which this project is construed to be law—the sea-wall-extension section of the project?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The statute itself did not mention the sea wall specifically, but embraced it by adopting the project without any reservation.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I not ask, Mr. Chairman, if the part of the project adopted referred directly to the channel to Texas City, and whether or not the gentleman construes that reference to the channel to Texas City to also adopt the reference to the sea wall?

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I recall it, it embraced two channels. One of them being the channel up to Texas City. This part of the statute that the gentleman read awhile ago, is, "Continuing improvement and maintenance, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document 1390, Sixty-second Congress, third session, and the conditions therein specified." These were some of the conditions I have just read.

Now, there are two other projects in this bill on all fours with this one. One is the Lake Union and Washington Canal, in the State of Washington. Part of that project was deferred and we have provided for it in this bill. Another is the project at Racine, Wis. A portion of that project was deferred—indeed, only a part was adopted—and we are taking care of the remainder in this bill in precisely the same way that we are taking care of the Galveston sea wall.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cache River, Ark.: For maintenance, \$3,000.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, with all due deference to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, he has not met this question raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

This project never has been adopted. It was not adopted in the act of 1913. The Board of Engineers has recognized that it was not adopted, and the report of the gentleman's own committee recognizes that the project that was adopted in 1913 does not include this sea wall. Referring to this, I hold in my hand the report of the committee referring to the project that was adopted in 1913, and which the gentleman says includes this sea wall. The report says:

The estimated cost of the project adopted was \$1,400,000.

Then \$1,400,000 does not include the sea wall. That is an additional \$1,100,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Nobody has ever said, my friend, that it included the sea wall, because that money was not appropriated or authorized for the purpose of building the sea wall.

Mr. LENROOT. No; but the gentleman does not get my point. I am speaking of what the project was.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think I do; but I do not think the gentleman understands what the adoption of a project is.

Mr. LENROOT. Let us see. Here are three items recommended by the special board, including three entirely distinct things. One is the sea wall, one is the improvement of this channel, and the other is certain dredging outside of these two other propositions; and the law of 1913 adopted but one of those three items. In confirmation of that, I refer to the report of the board itself, where it clearly shows that what the board had in mind as adopted by the act of 1913, because the members of that board say that the total cost of the project adopted was \$1,400,000, and therefore it could not include this sea wall.

Now, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We adopted a project in that bill, as the gentleman will admit?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes. We adopted one of the three projects included in this special report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the act so state that it is one of three?

Mr. LENROOT. It identifies specifically one of the three.

Mr. TREADWAY. The channel to Texas City.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; the channel to Texas City. And let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the item following this is the item for the channel to Texas City, the maintenance of this very work that was adopted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is for continuing the improvement and for maintenance of the project submitted in House Document 1390, Sixty-second Congress, third session.

Mr. LENROOT. Will not the gentleman read the description of the project?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Subject to the conditions therein.

Mr. LENROOT. What was it for? The item in the act of 1913 is "improving the channel from Galveston Harbor to Texas City." That is one of the three projects reported upon by the special board, and that is the project that you are referring to in this act of 1913, and not the sea wall at all.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I want to say to the gentleman that the War Department and the Board of Engineers have differed with him, because they have expended money on the very channel that this sea wall is designed to protect.

Mr. LENROOT. I say that the War Department has not differed with me, and I again call attention to the report of the Army engineers themselves, made this year, where they say specifically that the project adopted in 1913 involved a cost of \$1,400,000, which was exactly the amount, in exactly the same figures, that the board estimated for, outside of the sea wall.

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

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in seven minutes, two minutes to be used by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that the debate may be continued for seven minutes on this paragraph and all amendments thereto. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Is not the position of the gentleman from Florida apparently that if in a report there are a dozen different projects included, and we adopt one, we thereby adopt the other 11?

Mr. LENROOT. That is exactly the position of the gentleman from Florida; and I want to call the gentleman's attention to this: That so far as that sea wall was concerned that report was recommended upon a condition, and if it was the intention to adopt the sea-wall part of that report the condition would have been stated just as it is stated in this bill. This proposition in the bill is complete in itself in accordance with the report of the board, and it is the first time that it has appeared in any bill that has become a law.

Now, I want to call attention to one other thing. In the report of the gentleman's committee, which I hold in my hand, not one single word is found concerning this matter, and the gentleman owes an explanation to the House as to why an item of this kind has been reported, which he now says was an adopted project, when the committee report is absolutely silent upon that subject. I yield to the gentleman to answer.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will answer in my own time.

Mr. LENROOT. Very well.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What was the date when that was adopted?

Mr. LENROOT. March 4, 1913, and the report was made—

Mr. TREADWAY. February 11.

Mr. LENROOT. February 11.

Mr. GOOD. If it is not a new project, why the new language?

Mr. SPARKMAN. What was the gentleman's question?

Mr. LENROOT. He wants to know, if it is not a new project, why the new language. And I will ask further, why did not your committee comply with the recommendations of the board if, as you say, it was adopted in the act of 1913?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If we are to provide for the sea wall at all, we have got to use new language. The language in the bill of 1913 would not care for it.

Mr. LENROOT. Of course not, because you did not adopt it. That is the reason, and it was not the intention to adopt it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this committee and this House seem to be in a position that, irrespective of the facts, they will sustain this Committee on Rivers and Harbors. They started out upon the proposition that no new project would be permitted in this bill except New York Harbor. Now, it is absolutely proven that there is a new project, and not only that it is a new project but that the committee in making their report have not said one single word about this project in the report itself. The committee owe it to themselves, and I want to say to the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Texas, in view of this late discovery they ought to be willing to permit unanimous consent to return to consider this matter and have a vote upon its merits. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I can not say any more than I have already said. This is a part of an old project that was adopted, as anyone will see who reads the report carefully, and, as I said a short time ago, it is in the same class with two other projects to which I called attention—that at Racine, Wis., and that of Puget Sound-Lake Washington waterway. There is practically no difference between them in so far as the question of new projects is concerned.

Now, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors adopted that rule regarding new projects, and under its definition of new projects determined those three projects to be old projects. That classification was acquiesced in so far as the committee was concerned when those items were placed in the bill, and we have not departed from that rule in any particular. This is not a new project within the definition fixed by the majority of the members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. I think that is all I care to say.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. All debate is exhausted. The Clerk will read.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, let us read some of the bill. There will be more opportunity.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. All right.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we may now return to the item, page 18, line 21, entitled "Galveston Channel, Tex.," for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent to return to page 18, line 21, for the purpose of offering an amendment to the Galveston Channel item. Is there objection?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to object to that, because we had that up yesterday and discussed it fully.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman objects. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

St. Francis River and tributaries, Ark.: For maintenance of improvement of St. Francis and L'Anguille Rivers and Blackfish Bayou, \$9,500.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOWELL: Page 22, strike out lines 1, 2, and 3.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation, like numerous others in this bill, during the time this project has been in existence, has resulted in practically no benefit to the public. I want to call attention to the report of the engineers upon this item. This covers three items—the St. Francis and L'Anguille Rivers and Blackfish Bayou. I quote from the report of the Engineer of the United States Army, page 2729:

All operations on these streams during the fiscal year 1915 were by hired labor with Government plant. The snag boat *A. B. Johnson* (hand propelled), which was in ordinary at Madison, Ark., 60 miles above the mouth, resumed operations October 26, 1914. The boat worked down to Blackfish Bayou, 38 miles above mouth, and then upstream to Burr Place, 120 miles above mouth, after which it worked down to Madison, going in ordinary there January 28, 1915. By those operations 684 snags were removed, 7 drifts broken, 289 trees cut and 220 others girdled between Burr Place, 120 miles above mouth, and the mouth of Blackfish Bayou. There were no operations on L'Anguille or Blackfish Bayou during the year.

Further, from the same page, I read the following:

Neither of the tributary streams are navigable during low water, and the main stream—the St. Francis—is navigable by only very light-draft boats at that time. During the calendar year 1914 the St. Francis River in the vicinity of Madison was too low for navigation purposes from June 17 to December 29, and in the vicinity of Marked Tree from June 14 to December 31. Blackfish Bayou, up to the mouth of the Fifteenmile Bayou, was too low from January 1 to 30, June 4 to 25, and June 29 to December 31. On the L'Anguille the periods were January 1 to February 7, July 22 to September 5, October 1 to 18, October 31 to December 17, December 21 to 30.

This project was inaugurated in 1871. One hundred and sixty-nine thousand dollars has been appropriated by the Government for this project.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I want to correct the gentleman there, if he will pardon me just a moment. It may be immaterial, but—

Mr. DOWELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The project was adopted in 1902.

Mr. DOWELL. In 1871, according to the engineer's report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, well, the gentleman has not read the right report.

Mr. DOWELL. I have also read the report of the committee. I have read from page 2729 of the engineer's report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If he will look at page 1007—

Mr. DOWELL. I do not desire to have the gentleman take up all of my time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. He will find it was adopted in 1902.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to ask for more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has not yet expired. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. DOWELL. This report further states:

The improvement has had no material effect upon freight rates, except on freights moving between Marianna and Mississippi River points. On such the river rate is slightly less than the rail rate.

Now, gentlemen, if \$169,000, appropriated by the Government since 1871, has produced absolutely no good results, it occurs to me that it is a waste of public money to make further contribution.

Mr. Chairman, this is not all that is in this proposition. Behind this is another proposition which proposes to dig a canal along this river for 81 miles, where there is absolutely no stream at all. I want to call attention to the report of the hearings before this committee, with reference to a part of this River St. Francis. I read from the hearings before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, dated January 20, 1916, in statement of Hon. THADDEUS H. CARAWAY, a Representative from the State of Arkansas:

St. Francis River for 81 miles has no defined channel or banks. It varies in width—that is, the sunk lands—from a quarter of a mile to about 7 miles. I notice that in the report the engineer states that it is from one fourth to 2½ miles, but having lived for quite a while in the so-called lake or sunk-land section, I am entirely familiar with it, and know that he is in error somewhat. The channel of the river, or what used to be the channel, has almost entirely disappeared. When I first knew the river, as far up as Lake City, through the sunk lands, steamboats of considerable size ran. That was only 15 years ago. Where the wagon and railway bridges cross the lake at Lake City, and which have draws, and were built within the last six or seven years, under these draws there are now islands and willow trees growing, which are tall enough to reach from this floor to the ceiling. The channel is choked with a growth which we locally call smartweed.

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

Mr. DOWELL. I ask for five minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWELL. I want to call attention briefly to a part of this investigation to show what the purpose, or rather to show the idea that the one had who is behind the project when it was presented.

I quote from the chairman of the committee at the hearing:

The CHAIRMAN. I want to call your attention to the fact that the committee does not deal with public lands in any way and really does not deal with the matter of drainage unless it happens to be one of the incidents of the improvement of a navigable waterway.

Mr. CARAWAY. I understand that, and, with all due deference to the chairman, I understand that a great deal of the river and harbor improvement work has commerce only as a secondary incident, though it is the alleged reason for the improvement.

That is what is the matter with this bill. The alleged reason for improvement is different from the actual reason for improvement. When this project is completed it is estimated that it will cost the Government something over \$600,000. It is merely for the purpose of draining 52,000 acres of swamp lands in the States of Arkansas and Missouri, and these gentlemen have practically conceded before the committee that the main purpose was for the improvement of waste lands in these two States. It seems to me the time has come when we should stop drawing on the Treasury of the United States for the purpose of draining the districts in these various States. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa who has just concluded quoted one sentence from a statement I made before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and from that, drawing a conclusion, said that the only object I had in view was the drainage of lands. There is not anything in the language that would warrant the inference and nothing that expresses the idea.

The St. Francis River rises in the State of Missouri. It flows down and forms the boundary line for a short distance between the States of Arkansas and Missouri. It then passes through the State of Arkansas and empties into the Mississippi River at Helena. It is navigable for 235 miles. It carries over 200,000 tons of freight yearly. That portion of the river upon which an expenditure is here asked is known as the "sunk lands." In 1811 an earthquake destroyed the bed of this river for 81 miles. The channel above that is well defined with banks 18 feet above low-water mark, and just below that it has a well-defined channel with banks 23 feet above low water. In this 81-mile stretch destroyed by the earthquake the river is spread out over the sunken land varying in width from one-quarter of a mile to 7 miles.

Even within the last 15 or 20 years there has been considerable commerce through that portion of the river, but it has been greatly impeded by vegetation and other obstructions. The river is broken up into three segments; the lower part, 135 miles in length, has been kept open by snagging and the removal of obstructions. Considerable commerce floats on that part of the stream. Above this, extending from the head of the sunken lands to the mouth of the Varner River in Missouri, there is a depth of about 3 feet at low water, and there is considerable commerce on that section. The middle part is the "sunk lands." The river is broken up in that way into three parts. The project to which the gentleman refers seeks to have the river canalized through the sunken lands. Now, the gentleman ought to have gone a little further in his statement and told the House of the proposition made to the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and that the one adopted by that committee is not ultimately to cost the Federal Government a nickel. He learned that when he read the report.

The proposition is this: That the Government is to improve the river along the lines it one time adopted, for in June, 1880 a bill passed the House providing for the canalization of the St. Francis River through the sunken land. This was to be done entirely at the expense of the Government and in the interest of navigation. While the present project looks to the canalization of the river in the same way, it is not to cost the Federal Government one cent. According to the estimate made by Mr. Whittemore, a civil engineer in the employment of the Government, working under the War Department, there are 52,000 acres of Government land as rich as was ever seen now practically destroyed by this condition. Mr. Whittemore went over this portion of the river last summer. These lands are now worthless. You can not go upon them for any purpose at

all, but he says that for an expenditure of \$610,000 the river could be canalized and these lands reclaimed.

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

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may continue for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas to continue for five minutes?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman's position is that the Government is to advance the \$610,000 for the purpose of digging a ditch or canal through the 52,000 acres of land for the purpose of drainage, is it not?

Mr. CARAWAY. No.

Mr. DOWELL. Is not that what the gentleman said before the committee?

Mr. CARAWAY. No.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it that in effect?

Mr. CARAWAY. No; I did not say that in either those words or in effect. I said this: Congress has adopted this project to improve this broad stretch of river in the interest of commerce. I said that if the Government would carry out that project, advance the money, dig the canal through that part of the St. Francis River, permitting these lands that the engineer says would be reclaimed by that canal to be then sold to actual homesteaders at a price and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior might direct—if this did not return to the Government every dollar that the Government expended in making the improvement, that the State of Arkansas and the State of Missouri by acts of their respective legislatures would empower the Secretary of the Interior to assess benefits upon the adjacent lands and collect enough to repay to the Government any deficit. That is what I said.

Mr. DOWELL. But it is true, is it not, that the Government was to advance the \$610,000?

Mr. CARAWAY. Why, that is true.

Mr. DOWELL. That is what I was asking.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to have the gentleman state whether the St. Francis River and its tributaries are subject to flood.

Mr. CARAWAY. They are. I hope I may have time to explain this condition. The St. Francis Valley is in this shape: There is a high ridge of land extending from Cape Girardeau, in Missouri, running nearly south and touching the Mississippi River again at Helena, Ark. This ridge is known as Crowleys Ridge. The Mississippi River lies east of that ridge, and the valley of the St. Francis River is almost in the center, between this ridge and the Mississippi River. The ridge rises two or three hundred feet in height several miles west of the St. Francis River, the Mississippi banks being 9 or 10 feet higher than the valley and several miles east of it. The valley of the St. Francis is a trough. All of the waters coming down from the ridge flowing east, all of the waters coming out of the Mississippi flowing west, must pass down this valley of the St. Francis. As it now is it is being destroyed. The people in that section have taxed themselves for the purpose of drainage. West of the St. Francis River and between the ridge and the river they have expended of their own money more than \$2,700,000 for local drainage purposes. Those drainage canals are useless, or nearly so, unless this river is made to perform the service for which it was originally intended, namely, to carry these waters from this ridge through its channel. Through this stretch of 81 miles it can not do it. While the present flood waters passing through the St. Francis at the head of the sunk lands is 9,000 flood feet per second, there are drainage projects that empty into this river that will, when completed, increase this amount to 30,000 feet per second. This will put two and a half times as much water in that valley as it now has.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. How many acres of submerged land does the Government own?

Mr. CARAWAY. Fifty-two thousand acres.

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

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Does the gentleman mean that the Government owns this land?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not a fact that under the grant of 1850 all of this land was granted to the States of Arkansas and Missouri?

Mr. CARAWAY. No.

Mr. DOWELL. And that it was granted for school purposes?

Mr. CARAWAY. I know what the gentleman means. Let me answer, because my time is limited. Under the swamp-land grant of 1850 all lands not fit for cultivation, not suitable then for agricultural purposes owing to flood conditions, were granted to the States of Arkansas, Missouri, and other States for the purpose of reclamation.

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

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two minutes, as I desire to ask him a question.

Mr. CARAWAY. Make it five minutes, and let me finish.

Mr. DOWELL. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas may continue for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARAWAY. Now, let me answer the question. Going back, a grant from the Government to the State or to an individual is never a completed transaction until the lands are surveyed and platted, and the Secretary of the Interior—

Mr. DOWELL. So the Supreme Court of the United States has held.

Mr. CARAWAY. It must be platted, and the governor must have signified his selection of this land, and this selection must have been approved by the Secretary of the Interior before title passes. No unsurveyed lands ever passed from the Government to anyone.

Mr. DOWELL. That is, the complete title.

Mr. CARAWAY. No. These 52,000 acres—estimated—were never surveyed. In 1898, under what is known as the compromise act, by which the State of Arkansas and the General Government entered into an agreement affecting these and other lands, the Government released the State from certain obligations and confirmed patents to certain lands that the State had undertaken to pass title to, and in consideration of this upon the part of the Government the State ceded to the General Government its right to any unpatented lands at that time affected by the swamp and overflow grant. The Supreme Court in the case of *Little v. Williams* (231 U. S., October term 1913, p. 335) and approved in *Chapman & Dewey Lumber Co. against St. Francis Levee Board* said that the title to unsurveyed lands remained in the Government, and the State had no right to them even though reclaimed.

Mr. DOWELL. May I just read two lines from the decision of the Supreme Court upon that question of the transfer by the grant?

Mr. CARAWAY. Two lines will not tell us what the court says. Read the entire opinion.

Mr. DOWELL. It will take but two lines to tell you what it says on this question:

When he made such identification—

That is, the Secretary of the Interior, and that was by the survey and by granting a patent—

then, and not before, the State was entitled to a patent.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is true.

Mr. DOWELL. And on such patent the fee-simple title vested in the State.

Now, is it not true that after the grant of this land was made to the State of Arkansas and the State of Missouri, and the survey completed, the State of Arkansas was entitled to receive the patent and the complete title?

Mr. CARAWAY. No, sir. The State of Arkansas relinquished all of its inchoate right that it might have had to unsurveyed lands by the legislature's accepting the act of Congress of 1898, and the Supreme Court passing upon that very question said that the State of Arkansas had no further interest in these lands.

Mr. DOWELL. The language I read—

Mr. CARAWAY. Pardon me. I am familiar with that litigation and I know what it is. You read it and get somebody to tell you what it means. [Laughter.] The gentleman skipped the project that he asked to strike out in order to make an argument against this one we are now discussing. Certainly if it is worth the Government's while to reclaim lands out West and to make homes for its people, it would be as well for it here to improve a navigable river that it has said is worth while to improve in the interest of commerce, when at the same time it will reclaim lands enough to furnish homes to 1,300 families with farms of 40 acres each, which, according to the statement of the engineer who went over it, is the richest land

he ever saw, and which will not cost the Government one cent to reclaim, and at the same time give on this river 235 miles of uninterrupted navigable water. In addition to that—and I am going to be frank with you—it will reclaim other hundreds of thousands of acres of as fine land as you ever saw, land now privately owned. It will also serve the purpose for which they dug drainage ditches that have cost the people \$2,700,000 to construct, and that will remain practically useless if the gentleman's motion prevails. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting the statement I made on Saturday, January 29, 1916, while before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and from which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] quoted, and further to have appended thereto and printed as a part of it the letter received by me from Mr. George F. Whittemore, a civil engineer, who surveyed the river during the summer of 1915.

The statement and letter are as follows:

ST. FRANCIS RIVER, ARK. AND MO.

STATEMENT OF HON. THADDEUS H. CARAWAY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ARKANSAS.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri and I are here interested in the same matter. You will pardon me if I seem tedious in my statement of our wishes. Our project is a little out of the ordinary in river and harbor legislation. We are trying to promote the improvement of the St. Francis River through what is known as the sunk lands, that part of the river which was destroyed, or practically so, by an earthquake in 1811. I have not the number of the bill I introduced. There are two bills, however, one being introduced by Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri and one by myself. They are identical and were introduced on the same day and seek the same relief.

Mr. RUSSELL. My bill is No. 6872. It is identical with Mr. CARAWAY's bill, but not the same number. We introduced the same character of bill.

Mr. CARAWAY. I will state what the matter is we seek. The St. Francis River for 81 miles has no defined channel or banks. It varies in width—that is, the sunk lands—from a quarter of a mile to about 7 miles. I notice that in the report the engineer states that it is from one-fourth to 2½ miles, but having lived for quite a while in the so-called lake or sunk-land section I am entirely familiar with it, and know that he is in error somewhat. The channel of the river, or what used to be the channel, has almost entirely disappeared. When I first knew the river, as far up as Lake City, through the sunk lands, steamboats of considerable size ran. That was only 15 years ago. Where the wagon and railway bridges cross the lake at Lake City, and which have draws, and were built within the last six or seven years, under these draws there are now islands and willow trees growing, which are tall enough to reach from this floor to the ceiling. The channel is choked with a growth which we locally call smartweed. It grows to a height of 15 or 20 feet, and at places I have seen it so thick that it appeared to be land on which you might walk, but if you attempted to do so you would sink in 10 or 15 feet. I knew a very estimable gentleman to lose his life because he mistook that formation of weeds for land. He walked out on it and was drowned.

The river, as a consequence of this formation and other causes, has destroyed, or is destroying, the lands on both sides of it. The waters come down and pile up on this sunk land and do a great deal of damage to lands on either side of the stream, both in Arkansas and Missouri. The people in these localities have expended in the last few years for levees and drainage in attempting to relieve their situation, on my side of the river alone, a little over \$2,500,000, and in many places the territory affected and from which the revenues must be drawn to effect these improvements is not over 5 miles in width. While the soil is fertile, the people are poor. They brought no wealth with them when they came to this section. What they have earned has since been devoted to an effort to protect their lands from this condition and improve their homes. Therefore, they are without resources other than this fertile soil.

The last Rivers and Harbors Committee was kind enough, at my request, to give us a survey of the river, extending from Madison, in St. Francis County, to St. Francis, in Clay County, which is nearer the point at which the river becomes the boundary line between Missouri and Arkansas. At that point the channel is well defined and its banks are sufficient to protect the adjacent country from overflows. Mr. Whittemore, whom I presume many of you know—George F. Whittemore—went over the river in conformity with the provisions of the last river and harbor bill. He was at that time under the direction of the engineer in charge at Little Rock, but is now at Humboldt Bay, in California. When he began to make this survey I asked him if he would, in addition to ascertaining what commerce might be developed on the river and the possible cost of improvement, tell us what, if any, lands might be reclaimed and what would be the probable cost of canalizing the river, so as to reclaim these lands. With that idea in view, he made the survey, and I want to read a part of the letter in which he sets forth his findings. Omitting the first paragraph, he says:

"With reference to your inquiry concerning my estimates of canalizing through the sunken lands, I have to report that the cost would be about \$610,000 for a canal with a top width of channel of 130 feet, bottom width of 85 feet, and mean depth of 15 feet below low water. A specially rigged dredge could place the excavated material 100 feet to one side to form good levees about 200 feet apart to retain the higher waters. The length of the river through the sunken lands is now 81 miles, and when improved, as you suggest, by canalization, would have a length of 75 miles, or 6 miles shorter than it now is. This would reclaim approximately 52,000 acres of the richest land I have ever seen, at a cost not to exceed \$12 per acre. This might be modified to bring the cost of reclamation down to \$8 per acre by reducing the width at bottom of proposed canal to 50 feet and top width of 95 feet."

We are not coming here asking the Government to give us anything, or ultimately to be out a dollar. We are asking that a survey be made to ascertain what the exact cost will be and what will be necessary to

reclaim these lands and render them fit for homes. The depressed bed of the lake, which is anywhere, according to this report, from a quarter of a mile to 2½ miles in width, but in reality from a quarter of a mile to 7 miles in width, is part of the year covered with water and part of the year is as dry as this floor on which I stand. The lands belong to the Government; they have never been surveyed. The idea that we entertain is that if this river is canalized through this section it will reclaim these lands, and Mr. Whittemore says they are the richest he ever saw. We are asking that the Government furnish money to reclaim these lands and then permit the lands to be sold, somewhat according to the plan of the reclamation of the arid lands in the West under irrigation, and we are offering to do this: If you will aid us to reclaim these lands in this way, we will then sell them in tracts of not less than 40 acres and not in excess of 160 acres, the lands to be sold to bona fide homesteaders at prices they are able to pay and on terms to meet their necessities.

We then offer, if the receipts realized from these sales fail to repay to the Government every dollar invested in the project, together with interest, that by acts of the Legislatures of Missouri and Arkansas—and we do not ask you to expend this money except for the survey until we do our part—we will empower the Secretary of the Interior to assess and collect betterments on all lands affected on either side of the river in an amount sufficient to repay this deficit. We can not lift ourselves by our bootstraps; we can not reclaim this country without help. Here is a fertile country. Some of the land has been reclaimed; but, as I said in the beginning, the people on those lands are not wealthy. Most of the holdings are small, and it has required every cent our people could earn to build their homes. They are not asking the Government to give them a cent; they are asking only that it lend its credit to reclaim these lands that are now lying waste, amounting, according to the statement of Mr. Whittemore, to 52,000 acres.

Mr. RUSSELL. Are they Government lands?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; these lands belong to the Government. They are worthless now and will remain so until this improvement is made.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to call your attention to the fact that the committee does not deal with public lands in any way and really does not deal with the matter of drainage unless it happens to be one of the incidents of the improvement of a navigable waterway.

Mr. CARAWAY. I understand that, and, with all due deference to the chairman, I understand that a great deal of the river and harbor improvement work has commerce only as a secondary incident, though it is the alleged reason for the improvement.

The CHAIRMAN. I will say that I think the committee could hardly see its way clear to report a bill or carry an item in the rivers and harbors bill that dealt solely with land reclamation.

Mr. CARAWAY. This does not deal solely with that. I am trying to state the whole case, and in order to do so I probably should have stated it more in detail. The St. Francis River has been an adopted project for the improvement of navigation for nearly 50 years, and every river and harbor bill carries an item for its continued improvement.

Mr. SWITZER. For the improvement of the river at this point?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; this stretch of the river is included in the bills, but, as a matter of fact, in the last few years no work has been done on this part of the river.

Mr. BOEHM. The original project for the improvement of the St. Francis River was carried in the rivers and harbors act of March 3, 1871.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir; and the act of 1880 carried a provision for doing exactly what I am asking now, except under the theory that it was for the promotion of navigation, and was to be done without cooperation. Let me tell you something about the improvement of the St. Francis River. Congress started in about the sunk lands and improved the river for about 80 miles, but recently this was cut down to about 18 miles. It snagged out that part of the river and then shipped 81 miles and commenced again, so that the improvement is broken up into two fragments. There are about 75 boats of one kind or another, but most of them are small motor boats engaged in local navigation in the middle strip, or sunk-land portion of the river, with an average haul of 10 miles, but if this river were canalized through these sunk lands you would have 235 miles of continuous navigation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does that contemplate any locks or dams?

Mr. CARAWAY. No, sir; not one.

Mr. KENNEDY. In other words, it is a ditch through there.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir; that is it. By the act of June 14, 1880, an appropriation was made for improving the river from Wittsburg to Lesters Landing, the project for the expenditure of this appropriation being to cut a channel through "the lake" and clear the river of obstructions by snagging operations. So it is not a new project, and you have carried an appropriation in every bill for the improvement of this particular section of the river, and we are coming to you now and asking you to do what you at one time said you were going to do in aid of navigation. We are offering in addition thereto a repayment to the Government of all it may expend. If you dig a canal through these sunk lands you will reclaim these 52,000 acres. That will furnish homes for 1,300 families, with 40 acres to each family, and it is as rich land as is to be found anywhere in the world. It would furnish homes for about 6,500 people, and this improvement can be made for \$610,000, according to the estimate of Mr. Whittemore, which is \$12 per acre.

I know you can sell every acre of that reclaimed land for \$25 an acre to people who are actually seeking homes, and they would be delighted to buy it. In addition, there are nearly 200,000 acres of land in private ownership which will be rendered suitable for cultivation that is now unsuitable, and a great deal of the country will be greatly benefited, and more than \$2,500,000 worth of private drainage enterprises, to pay for which the people have gone into their pockets and taxed themselves—and which are now in danger of being destroyed by reason of the choked condition of this river—will be rendered safe and usable, and will be made to accomplish the purposes for which they were constructed. For example, one drainage ditch which cost the people of Clay County \$456,000, together with the levees that were erected to aid it, and which drained the country to an average width of 5 to 10 miles, was partly filled up last August when we had an unusually high water, and the people lost \$200,000 of their investment, every dollar of which has to be paid by people who are poor. They have taxed their homes to pay this, and this loss would not have fallen upon them if this improvement had been made. We are not tax shirkers. We pay the regular State and county taxes; we pay a special tax for schools; we pay a special tax for roads, and in addition we pay a tax to build levees along the Mississippi River, which tax is now 20 cents per acre, and goes up about 5 cents per acre every year or two. In addition we also pay 25 to 50 cents per acre for local drainage. We

are but asking that you do your part toward reclaiming this land that belongs to the Government by continuing the project that you adopted by the act of 1880 in aid of navigation. I do not know to what extent the river is going to be used for navigation, but for that purpose it gives great promise, and we want it so improved that the lands also may be reclaimed and be of use to the people.

Mr. BOOHER. The St. Francis River, outside of the section called the sunk-land section, has a well-defined channel?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOOHER. The sunk lands begin in Dunklin County, Mo., below Shipley?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOOHER. Do you know what the width of that strip is; the strip called the sunk lands?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir; I do. The sunk lands vary in width from a quarter of a mile to 7 miles.

Mr. BOOHER. Do you know how much below the surface of the Mississippi River the sunk lands are?

Mr. CARAWAY. I did know that, but I do not recall it now. If you will pardon me, I will make a statement that will give you that information.

Mr. BOOHER. Where the river strikes these sunk lands it practically becomes a swamp?

Mr. CARAWAY. Absolutely.

Mr. BOOHER. For what distance?

Mr. CARAWAY. Eighty-one miles.

Mr. BOOHER. How much of that is in Missouri, in miles?

Mr. CARAWAY. I can tell you that approximately. There are about 36 miles in Missouri.

Mr. BOOHER. And the balance is in Arkansas?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOOHER. In what counties in Arkansas?

Mr. CARAWAY. In Clay, Greene, Craighead, and Poinsett Counties, principally, and just a little corner of Mississippi County is affected by it.

Mr. BOOHER. In Missouri it is in Dunklin County?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir. Sixteen miles above the head of the sunk lands the St. Francis River has a channel with banks 17 feet above the low-water state; 9 miles below the sunk lands, at Marked Tree, it has 18 feet; and a short distance below that, at Madison, in St. Francis County, it has 38-foot banks. Through the sunk lands, in some places, it has a well-defined bank on one side, but on the other the average above low water, I should think, was not over 18 inches, and it may be less than that. In fact, when you approach it at many places you will not know when you reach the river, and the channel winds around through logs and growth and this smartweed, as we call it, and you can actually cross the river and never know it. As I said, where they have built the railroad bridge and wagon bridge at Lake City, and where I have seen steamboats at least 30 or 40 feet in length, there are willows growing up, in some places coming through the flooring of the bridges. There is no sign of a river there, and for three-quarters of a mile up and down stream, where I used to see the river, there is nothing now to be seen but vegetation. However, there is water there, and if you should probe down through this growth you would be apt to find water anywhere from 18 inches to 10 feet deep. If you canalize this river, you make it a continuous navigable stream for whatever uses it may be put, and I think the reports will show that this river carries about as much commerce as the ordinary streams for which appropriations are made, and you will, in addition, reclaim these lands. As I said before, we are not asking that the Government shall ultimately be out a cent. We are willing to pay whatever interest the Government has to pay on this investment, and we will pay back every cent when these lands are reclaimed and sold. We do not seek nor want to open these lands for the exploitation of big corporations. We want to open them for homes for poor people. We want them for those who will live on them and rear families and help uplift and up-build our State. If from the sale of these lands the Government does not get back all money required to make this improvement, we will, by acts of the Legislatures of Missouri and Arkansas, empower the Secretary of the Interior to assess benefits on all lands lying within the basin which have been reclaimed or which may be benefited by the improvement.

Mr. BOOHER. Do you know, from the information you have gathered about that situation, how that land was before the earthquake?

Mr. CARAWAY. No; I do not. The earthquake was in 1811. But you can tell by an examination of the country that the land originally was covered with oak, cottonwood, and black-walnut timber. At the time of this disturbance the land dropped anywhere from 8 to 10 feet, but a great deal of the timber is yet standing.

Mr. BOOHER. Did it not drop as much as 20 feet in some places?

Mr. CARAWAY. I did not understand so.

Mr. BOOHER. How about that, Mr. RUSSELL?

Mr. RUSSELL. About four years ago, which was just 100 years after the occurrence of this earthquake, I placed in the record a letter written by an old lady whose name, I believe, was Eliza Bryan, and she stated in that letter, or at least I got the idea from some one, that the land sunk from 8 to 20 feet in different places, and sometimes more.

Mr. BOOHER. I think I read somewhere that they sunk as much as 22 feet.

Mr. RUSSELL. Probably that much in some places. It varied at different places.

Mr. CARAWAY. All of that sunk land is crisscrossed with fallen timber that has been submerged and yet not decayed. Vegetation has grown up in its bed since that time and has literally choked the river.

The CHAIRMAN. What kind of timber is that?

Mr. CARAWAY. Cypress, oak, cottonwood, and there is some black walnut.

Now, you can take this country just up to where the land was destroyed. The people have gone on it and made homes—most of them poor people, as I said before. They live in very cheap houses, but—

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any dead cypress anywhere indicating that there was a cypress growth before that land sunk?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; millions of feet of it. There are cypress trees still standing in it that I am sure must be hundreds of years old. Some of them are not exactly perpendicular but are set at angles, showing that when the land sank they were standing timber and not of later growth.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a section of Florida to the west of the Apalachicola River that is supposed to have sunk during the same disturbance, and there are large cypress trees there. Of course, they are dead, but they are there, nevertheless. Cypress as a rule does not

decay rapidly and after the long years that have gone by since that section of the country sank, they are still there in that condition.

Mr. CARAWAY. In stretches of this lake where there is considerable water, at ordinary water stages you will not see any signs of trees or stumps, but when the river gets very low its bed looks like a forest has been cut off, leaving the stumps standing where the trees were thrown down at the time of the earthquake.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Reelfoot Lake sank very much more than 20 feet. Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, yes. I think in some places it was 40 or 50 feet in depth. Now, in Missouri, in New Madrid County, there was a greater drop than that in Arkansas. I have seen there near New Madrid a gulch about 20 or 25 feet in depth.

Mr. RUSSELL. Some of the land is planted in corn.

Mr. CARAWAY. I know. If the river is not improved, however, it is going to render the remainder of the land worthless. It is going to destroy it. We have at this time there on the St. Francis River an overflow caused by this situation that will average in width 15 miles. The only railroad in that immediate section has been out of commission for a week. Last August when the crops were standing there came an unusual rainy season, and the whole country was submerged and crops ruined. A great ridge is building across the river. The water now piles up against this and spills out over the country and threatens the homes of all of our people living in that section.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a modification of the present project for the improvement of that river recently reported in House Document No. 60.

Mr. CARAWAY. I have it here before me.

The CHAIRMAN. You are now requesting a survey?

Mr. CARAWAY. That is it.

The CHAIRMAN. And would you be willing to have a survey, merely requesting the engineers to reinvestigate the matter with a view of seeing whether cooperation can be furnished by the people there with a view to coordinating the improvement of the river with the drainage of the contiguous lands?

Mr. CARAWAY. Let me be certain that I understand you. You want to know whether we would be willing to accept a survey and at the time of the survey to ascertain how much, if at all, the people are willing to cooperate in making the improvement?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, in any way. Of course, your idea is one of cooperation?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You present a proposition that you say eventually will not cost the Government anything?

Mr. CARAWAY. I am going to guarantee it will not. We will put millions of dollars' worth of property back of it.

The CHAIRMAN. I was going to ask you whether you would be willing to have such a survey as I suggest?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir; I presume so. Here is what I want. Let me state it briefly and you will possibly know better whether your suggestion and mine agree: The bill asks for \$10,000, but the bill was drawn before House Document No. 60 reached me. I notice that Mr. Wittemore says it will take for a physical survey, in order to determine the very thing I am asking for now, \$25,000; that it will require 1,500 miles of surveying. If you adopt our bill, or any modification the committee sees fit, because we have no pride of authorship in the bill, you would give us this survey, and Mr. RUSSELL could go to the Legislature of Missouri, and I could go to the Legislature of Arkansas, which meets next January, and we could get an act empowering the Secretary of the Interior, after these lands have been disposed of, if necessary then, to assess and collect betterments. I have in my office now a petition signed by 10,000 people interested in this matter. I believe that practically the entire population of that part of Arkansas affected by it are asking this. I know more than 500 from Mr. RUSSELL'S district in Missouri have sent requests to me. Of course, you would have to authorize and make the survey, but before you do more, the bill provides that the Legislatures of Missouri and Arkansas shall empower the Secretary of the Interior, after he has disposed of these reclaimed lands, to assess whatever benefit may be necessary to repay the Government every cent that has been expended.

Mr. BOOHER. Has this land ever been disposed of by the Government?

Mr. CARAWAY. No, sir; it has never been surveyed.

Mr. BOOHER. None of it?

Mr. CARAWAY. Not an acre of this 52,000 acres has had a surveyor's chain on it. In the original survey of this river the meander line of this lake left quite a large section of country that is now under cultivation within the meander line, but within the last six or seven years the Government has reclaimed that land, claiming that there was a mistake in the original survey, and then that part of it was opened for homesteads. We do not want to repossess that; we do not want to oust the homesteader of one cent's worth of his property; we do not seek those lands. These 52,000 acres are practically covered with water nine months in the year, and they are useless to anybody. No one has ever had the hardihood to go on them and try to live on them. There are no vested rights at all. The riparian owners have no claims on them, and no homesteader has sought to settle there.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Now, Arkansas has a law under which the State of Arkansas owns to the center of the lake.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Arkansas law provides that on navigable streams the riparian owner shall own to the low-water mark. The State owns the bed of the stream, but the State of Arkansas claims none of these unsurveyed lands which lie in this marshy swamp.

Mr. BOOHER. In Missouri the swamp and overflow lands belong to the school fund.

Mr. RUSSELL. They were conveyed for that purpose, but that does not include unsurveyed lands.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I do not know about that.

Mr. CARAWAY. That question has been settled by several cases in the Supreme Court of the United States, one of them being the case of Williams v. Little, and another the Chapman & Dewey Lumber Co. v. The St. Francis Levee District. The decisions in these cases were handed down only two or three years ago. I think they set at rest the question of the title to these lands. The lands are lying waste, and Mr. Whittemore, who went over them, said they are the richest lands he ever saw. I am not asking that any corporation shall be permitted to exploit them for profit, but that the man who buys any of them shall do so subject to any condition that the Secretary of the Interior may impose, just as it is done in the Reclamation Service.

The CHAIRMAN. Whatever we do ourselves will be done through the Secretary of War. If there should be reclamation work afterwards as a result of that work, it is quite probable that the land would still remain under the control of the Secretary of the Interior, but so far as we are concerned the Secretary of War will have charge of whatever work we might authorize.

Mr. CARAWAY. I understand the Secretary of War will do the reclamation work, but the levying of taxes and the disposition of the land would be under the Secretary of the Interior. Therefore I drew the bill in the form in which it now is. I tried as nearly as possible to adapt the laws for the reclamation of arid lands of the West to the improvement of this particular situation. You gentlemen realize there are thousands of people who are able to pay a small assessment and thereby eventually pay back to the Government the money it may expend, and in that way acquire and pay for a home. We want to help them by this legislation.

I would like to place in the record a letter and a statement of the cost of private drainage and levee work that we are undertaking.

Mr. BOOHER. You think that the riparian owners in the State of Arkansas have no rights in the matter?

Mr. CARAWAY. I know that under the decision of the Supreme Court they have none. We tested that question out in a case that arose in Arkansas, and the Arkansas Supreme Court held that they had those rights, but on appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States that court reversed our court.

Mr. BOOHER. They held that the riparian owners have no rights at all?

Mr. CARAWAY. Absolutely none.

I wish here to insert extracts from the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States bearing on this question.

With reference to the legal ownership of the lands sought to be reclaimed by the improvement of the St. Francis River, the question is asked whether the lands reclaimed would become the property of the Government of the United States or the State in which the lands may be located. Those in Arkansas, which are possibly three-fourths of the lands herein sought to be reclaimed, are controlled by the decision of *Little v. Williams* (231 U. S., October term, 1913, p. 335). Under what is known as the compromise act, in which the State of Arkansas undertook to surrender its inchoate rights in all lands not then patented, and do other things, the Government accepted these lands and surrendered certain bonds. All the right and title of the State of Arkansas to any unsurveyed public lands was surrendered to the United States. However, the decision of the court without question, while settling the compromise act, lays down the doctrine that swamp and overflowed lands granted to the State by the acts of Congress of 1850 only pass by survey and plats. And the court, in speaking of this, says:

"In view of the finding that the land in controversy was never patented to the State, it will be perceived that a pivotal question in the case is, whether the swamp-land act of 1850 in itself operated to invest the State with the title in any such sense as to be of present avail to the plaintiff. The State court answered the question in the negative, and the correctness of that ruling is now to be passed upon.

"Although the terms of the first section of the act denote a present grant to the State of the 'swamp and overflowed lands made unfit thereby for cultivation,' the second section lays upon the Secretary of the Interior the duty of identifying and listing the lands coming within the terms of the grant and of causing patents therefor to be issued to the State 'at the request of' its governor, and then declares: 'And on that patent the fee simple to said lands shall vest in the State,' subject to the disposal of its legislature. It became necessary in *Rogers Locomotive Works v. Emigrant Co.* (164 U. S., 559) to determine the meaning and effect of the act in the light of these provisions and of prior decisions, and it was there said (p. 570): 'While, therefore, as held in many cases, the act of 1850 was in present, and gave an inchoate title, the lands needed to be identified as lands that passed under the act; which being done, and not before, the title became perfect as of the date of the granting act.' And again (p. 574): 'It belonged to him [the Secretary of the Interior], primarily, to identify all lands that were to go to the State under the act of 1850. When he made such identification, then, and not before, the State was entitled to a patent, and on such patent the fee-simple title vested in the State. The State's title was at the outset an inchoate one, and did not become perfect, as of the date of the act, until a patent was issued.' What was there said has since been regarded as the settled law upon the subject. (*Michigan Land & Lumber Co. v. Rust*, 168 U. S., 589, 592; *Brown v. Hitchcock*, 173 U. S., 473, 476; *Niles v. Cedar Point Club*, 175 U. S., 300, 308; *Ogden v. Buckley*, 113 Iowa, 352; *Birch v. Gillis*, 67 Mo., 102; *Carr v. Moore*, 119 Iowa, 152, 159.)

"As this land was never so identified, and, so far as appears, its identification was never even requested by the State, it follows that, even if at the date of the act the land was in fact swamp or overflowed, the State never acquired more than an inchoate title to it, a claim which was imperfect both at law and in equity."

Inasmuch as the State is declared there to have acquired no more than inchoate title, a claim which was imperfect both at law and in equity, it follows, as a matter of course, that if the Federal Government should make other disposition of the lands the State could have no claim therein.

The same opinion was affirmed in *Chapman & Dewey Lumber Co. v. St. Francis Levee District* (234 U. S., October term, 1913, p. 607).

UNITED STATES ENGINEER OFFICE,
Eureka, Cal., January 12, 1916.

From: Geo. F. Whittemore, junior engineer, 210 Federal Building, Eureka, Cal.

To: Hon. T. H. Caraway, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Subject: Canalization of St. Francis River, Ark., through the Sunken Lands.

(1) Your letter of 3d instant just at hand to-day. Last May I was transferred to the first California district under Lieut. Col. Rees and put in local charge of harbor works at Humboldt Bay. I was much shocked to hear of Maj. Putman's sudden death shortly after I left Little Rock.

(2) With reference to your inquiry concerning my estimate of canalizing through the Sunken Lands, I have to report that the cost would be about \$610,000 for a canal with a top width of channel of 130 feet, bottom width of 85 feet, and mean depth of 15 feet below low water. A specially rigged dredge could place the excavated material 100 feet to one side to form good levees about 200 feet apart to retain the higher waters.

(3) The length of river through the Sunken Lands is now 81 miles, and when improved, as you suggest, by canalization, would have a length of 75 miles, or 6 miles shorter than it now is. This would reclaim approximately 52,000 acres of the richest land that I have ever seen at a cost not to exceed \$12 per acre. This might be modified to bring the cost of reclamation down to \$8 per acre by reducing

the width at bottom of proposed canal to 50 feet and top width of 95 feet.

(4) In this connection, I beg to state that Mr. C. B. Bailey, civil engineer, of Wynne, is very well posted and interested in that section. It is to be hoped that you may be able to accomplish something with the area in question, as it seems worthy of improvement.

(5) With best regards to Chairman SPARKMAN; Mr. EDWARDS, of my old district; and yourself, I am, sir,

Yours, sincerely,

GEO. F. WHITTEMORE.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Florida had some time to yield to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Then I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have a constituency that is very deeply interested in this proposition. That is my apology for adding anything to the able and full argument that has been made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY].

I am very sorry to find that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] is so anxious to jump upon this item in this bill that he has gone from page 22, where we are now reading, to this item, that does not appear until you reach page 39. I want to say in a general way that if there is a single item in this bill that is meritorious above all others it seems to me to be this, because of the fact that it is not to cost this Government ultimately one single dollar.

The St. Francis is a navigable river. Nobody, I think, questions that; but if so, let me call your attention to the fact that this House and this Congress at this session has passed three bills authorizing the construction of bridges across that river that could not be built without that authority. The Government owns this stream. It has heretofore expended hundreds of thousands of dollars for the improvement of this river. In the years 1811 and 1812 an earthquake that has become notorious as an historical event in this country obliterated that river for about 80 miles. It destroyed the channel, by reason of the lands along its banks sinking perhaps 8 or 10 feet. Since that time we have what is sometimes called the "sunken lands," but more generally known as the "spreads" of the St. Francis River. We have a navigable river at the north end of the St. Francis. We have a navigable river south of these sunken lands, the south end of the St. Francis River, but the channel for 75 or 80 miles has been destroyed by the earthquake. It formed an impenetrable lake by reason of the land sinking, as stated, creating a great body of water in that country that has been impassable since that time. It is to-day absolutely valueless, and will be until drained and reclaimed. It is waste land as it now is and not worth a dollar to any man or to the Government, but is a great menace to the health of that country. These lands, I am advised by engineers who have made some slight examination of the conditions, can be successfully drained if this river is straightened and canalized for 75 miles. The Government owns 52,000 acres of that land. The statement has been questioned by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL], but Arkansas has relinquished any claim upon them that are situated in that State, and nearly all of these waste lands are upon the Arkansas side of the river. These lands can be reclaimed, and will be worth more than \$5,000,000 when improved and ready for cultivation. They will be capable of producing annual crops in cotton, corn, and wheat of the value of from \$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000, depending upon the seasons and the price of these staple farm products. And with a family of five upon every 40 acres, which would be easily possible, would furnish homes for 6,500 people.

We are advised by the engineers who have made some examination that this canal can be dug for \$610,000, or about \$12 per acre. All we ask in this bill is that a full and a perfect survey may be made, so that the money may be appropriated later to dig the proposed canal, and when it has been done the Government can sell the land reclaimed for or more than is required to do the work. We have promised and guaranteed in the bills that were introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] and myself that the Government ultimately shall not lose one single cent. We pledge our property to reimburse the Treasury if the Government's land when sold does not pay it. Our citizens who will be incidentally benefited will pay in taxes on their private property any deficit the Government may sustain by reason of the expenditure.

They tell us that this is a drainage proposition, and not a question of navigation. It is both. The river is navigable above, and it is navigable below, and when we dig the proposed canal through these spreads it will connect the two parts of the river and it will then be navigable from the north end to the

south end. This is a question of navigation as well as one of drainage and of flood control.

Mr. Chairman, if I have stated the case fairly and correctly, and I assure you I have tried to do so, it would seem to be almost a criminal neglect for the Government to refuse to promptly lend its encouragement, its aid, and its credit to an improvement so inexpensive, so meritorious, and so important to so many people.

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Missouri want to go on?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. No. I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on this paragraph has closed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the paragraph at the end of line 3 by striking out "\$9,500," and inserting "\$9,600."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 3, strike out "\$9,500," and insert "\$9,600."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, there have been times when I have not agreed with the Democratic Party. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time does the gentleman intend to use?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The usual time for my amendment—five minutes.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I want some time for one matter.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, one-half of my time is taken already. [Laughter.] I say there have been times when I have not agreed with the Democratic Party.

Mr. GOOD. On river and harbor appropriations? [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There have been times, also, when I have disagreed with the President of the United States, but those differences have been on matters of policy relating particularly to political economy and the manner in which the Government should be carried on. But I like to be consistent sometimes [laughter], and therefore, as a party man, I am surprised that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL], who has been criticizing this item of the St. Francis River, should not be more in accord with the party platform that he undertakes, along with the rest of us on this side, to observe.

The Democratic Party in its platform of 1912 stood for the improvement of rivers and harbors, and so far as I have observed, it has stood for it consistently, although its consistency in this regard has been somewhat unique. [Laughter.] But it has stood for the improvement of rivers and harbors, not so much up in my section, perhaps, as in other sections, but I am not raising that question now.

The Democratic Party was elected to power on its platform of 1912, and it is entitled to make the most of it. As a Republican I have been ready to take my medicine, because in 1912 Republicans generally were not sufficiently interested to prevent it. Hence I have not objected in this day and generation of Democratic supremacy, incidental and accidental though it may be, to their building a few post offices, to improving a few rivers and harbors in their own territory, or to providing here and there for the reclamation of land or the redemption of a few swamps. [Laughter.]

I believe it would be a splendid thing all over the South, particularly in the State of Arkansas, if many of the sluggish rivers that prevail there could be made to run free of the snags and overhanging boughs and branches and all those things that impede navigation and impair the growth and health of the people. But I am not going very far into that now. I am too consistent a river and harbor man. [Laughter.]

Now, before the Democratic Party came into power—

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there? Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I can not yield. I can not discuss railroads with the gentleman from New York in five minutes. The gentleman can not interject railroads into my waterway speech at this particular time.

Mr. PLATT. Just for a question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I can not yield to the gentleman; the gentleman wants to prove that railway transportation is cheaper than water transportation. He could not do that to my satisfaction in 100 years.

Mr. PLATT. I want to prove that the gentleman's proposition would be like feeding money to the birds.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; the gentleman can not prove that, either. The gentleman has not been consistent on any proposition in this bill. He is as inconsistent as the Democratic Party has been on its platform at Baltimore.

Mr. MADDEN. I thought the gentleman was trying to be consistent with the Democratic platform.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, no. I know what the gentleman from Illinois wants. He wants \$4,500,000 for a post-office site out there in Chicago, and he thinks that if this river and harbor bill goes through there will not be money enough left in the Treasury to provide for the building; therefore he does not agree with the Democratic Party's ideas on navigation. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I want five minutes after the gentleman closes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman from Iowa stated before that he wanted only two minutes.

Mr. DOWELL. I want five minutes, now.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I think they are speaking in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Florida will state his motion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this paragraph end in eight minutes. The gentleman from Pennsylvania wanted three minutes. I want five.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Do my three minutes begin now?

The CHAIRMAN. They do.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the Chair. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL], who belongs to a newly developed band of Republican reformers following the lead of the gallant gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] in opposition to river and harbor improvements in this country, indicated by his question to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] that the St. Francis River and its tributaries are a sort of drainage ditch. I recall the exact words, "a drainage ditch." It seems to be all wrong to want to clear out a section of the country by a drainage ditch.

Well, the Democratic platform stood for rivers and harbors, and also for drainage ditches, and the clearing of swamps and things of that kind, and the Democrats have been consistent since 1912 on that proposition. But where does the Republican Party stand and where do the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] and his distinguished band of compatriots from that splendid farming State of theirs stand on the question of drainage ditches?

The Republican platform of 1912 had something to say on that subject. I do not know who wrote the ditches plank into that platform. I am sure I did not, because I had some views on that subject myself. But I find in the Republican platform, which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] ought to recognize, this interesting paragraph with regard to rivers and harbors:

We favor a liberal and systematic policy for the improvement of our rivers and harbors. Such improvements should be made upon expert information and after a careful comparison of cost and prospective benefits.

Therefore we are in favor of a rivers and harbors bill.

But as to drainage ditches and as to flood protection, what does the platform of the Republican Party say?

The Mississippi River is the Nation's drainage ditch.

The gentleman has been quoting his own platform without knowing it, and he uses, as an opprobrious term, words which he takes from the platform of his own party. Now, I contend

that there is not very much politics in river and harbor matters, and I am not laying too much stress on what some one man wrote in a platform, for I suspect that both the Republican and the Democratic conventions were swayed by the same influences on this proposition. But there it is in the Republican platform just the same.

The Mississippi River—

Says the platform—I mean the Republican platform—

is the Nation's drainage ditch. Its flood waters, gathered from 31 States and the Dominion of Canada, constitute an overpowering force which breaks the levees and pours its torrents over many million acres of the richest land in the Union, stopping malls, impeding commerce, and causing great loss of life and property. These floods are national in scope, and the disasters they produce seriously affect the general welfare. The States, unaided, can not cope with this giant problem. Hence we believe the Federal Government should assume a fair proportion of the burden of its control so as to prevent the disasters from recurring floods.

We favor the continuance of the policy of the Government with regard to the reclamation of arid lands, and for the encouragement of the speedy settlement and improvement of such lands we favor an amendment to the law that will reasonably extend the time within which the cost of any reclamation project may be repaid by the landowners under it.

As the Democratic plank is not much different, it shows there is little or no politics in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWELL. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] that he can vote for this amendment and not in any manner interfere with the platform of the Republican Party, which he has just read to me. In view of the fact that he has raised this question, I want to read to the House just the kind of a river, or a harbor, or whatever you want to call it, we are dealing with now. I am sure that if my friend from Pennsylvania had even known what he was talking about he would not have read that platform in your hearing, in view of the evidence I am about to read from the statement before the committee of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], who, I assume, knows this river fairly well:

Through the sunk lands in some places it has a well-defined bank on one side—

Now listen to this—

but on the other the average above low water, I should think, was not over 18 inches, and it may be less than that. In fact, when you approach it at many places you will not know when you reach the river.

Does that look as though we were violating the sacred plank of the Republican platform that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is so afraid he is going to violate if he votes for this amendment?

I read further:

And the channel winds around through logs and growth and this smartweed, as we call it, and you can actually cross the river and never know it.

[Laughter.]

That is the language of the gentleman from Arkansas before the committee in the hearings on this identical proposition. I am ashamed of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] that he did not know what he was talking about when he so eloquently pleaded for the sacredness of the platform of the Republican Party. But listen to this. I want to read some more from the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TREADWAY. I want to ask the gentleman if the reason he would not know when he crossed the river was because there was no water in it.

Mr. DOWELL. I will let the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] answer that in his own words before the committee.

I read further from the statement before the committee:

As I said, where they have built the railroad bridge and wagon bridge at Lake City, and where I have seen steamboats at least 30 or 40 feet in length, there are willows growing up, in some places coming through the flooring of the bridges. There is no sign of a river there, and for three-quarters of a mile up and down stream, where I used to see the river, there is nothing now to be seen but vegetation.

Does that look like a river?

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Just a moment. This statement of the gentleman at the hearing is just about as good as anything he will be able to tell us now, and I want to read this first:

However, there is water there—

Now listen to this. I call it to the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]—

and if you should probe down through this growth you would be apt to find water anywhere from 18 inches to 10 feet deep.

You would be apt to find water if you dug deep enough in this place, but it is conclusive from this evidence that there is no river there.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has described this place as a great waterway, and has suggested the violation of the sacred plank of the Republican platform if we vote for my amendment. It is projects of this character that bring criticism to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cumberland River, Tenn. and Ky.: For maintenance above Nashville, \$5,000; continuing improvement below Nashville, \$705,000; in all, \$710,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the figures in line 6, page 22, "\$705,000," and to insert "\$171,000"; and then I move to strike out the figures "\$710,000" and insert the figures "\$176,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 22, in line 6, by striking out "\$705,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$171,000"; and strike out "\$710,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$176,000."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to strike out as nearly as I can ascertain from the reports the money that is to be expended for new locks and dams, leaving in the amounts that are for ordinary maintenance. It is a little over half a million dollars. This is a project—and I will only discuss the amendment, because I will try not to take unnecessary time of the committee—that has been rejected three different times by the Army engineers. Finally it was approved by the Army engineers with a condition. That condition was that the people of the States should contribute one-half of the \$4,500,000, and in view of the condition that was made, there appeared before the Board of Army Engineers 11 Congressmen and United States Senators in an effort to secure the removal of that contribution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What portion of the river is the gentleman referring to? I thought his amendment applied to the lower portion.

Mr. FREAR. No; the Cumberland River above. I am going to read from Document No. 10, pages 3 and 9. As I said, after having been rejected three times by the Army engineers and Col. Black, who is the Chief of Engineers, who placed the condition of the contribution of one-half of the \$4,500,000, these gentlemen that I refer to appeared before the board and secured the removal of this condition.

Col. Black says, and I am reading from page 9:

Of these \$2,250,000—

And yet Col. Black changed his mind inside of a week, and withdrew the condition, so that the Government is engaged in preparing for this \$4,500,000 project. Now, I read from page 1621 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of September 3, 1914, the words of a very distinguished man who knew more about the rivers and harbors than I do. In it he says:

If I could have the attention of the Senate while I present facts and figures, I am confident I could demonstrate that, as regards the higher grades of freight, it would be cheaper to carry every pound that can possibly be presented by autotruck rather than by a canal, and pay interest on the investment.

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

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 22 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that debate close in 22 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, if this was the only river existing in this condition I might not challenge it at this time, but in view of the statement of Col. Townsend that all the rivers of the Mississippi Valley—in view of his proposal that we stop the further canalization of 58 streams until we can try out one or two of them, it occurs to me that we can save \$500,000 by adopting the amendment that I am proposing on the Cumberland River. I realize that whenever this question is raised it naturally reaches those who are particularly interested in the project, and I think I ought to be entitled to a vote of thanks of the House for giving them an opportunity to speak on their favorite projects.

Now, I have no more objection to this than any other river for canalization. I am not going to speak any more of the Cumberland River; but I do ask one thing in justice to a paper that we were discussing yesterday, the Philadelphia Inquirer. I quoted from the Philadelphia Inquirer yesterday, and I ask

unanimous consent to incorporate in my remarks a short editorial from that paper.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. The editorial is interesting in one particular, in that it suggests a change in the present system. It acknowledges the present system is not satisfactory and it believes that certain improvements have been brought about. In all fairness I desire to say that in view of the editorial read yesterday, I desire to express my appreciation of the spirit of an editorial in yesterday's issue, which is illuminating and in which it speaks very hopefully of adopting some further and better system than the one we have to-day. I trust the change in system may soon be reached in order that we may get away from present conditions.

Now, I am not going to take any further time, because the House has been very generous to me, and I propose to leave it where it is.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Friday, Apr. 7, 1916.]

WHAT IS A PORK BARREL?

The "pork barrel" known to Congress is an appropriation bill carrying immense sums in the aggregate, which sums are distributed among congressional districts on the principle of "you tickle me and I'll tickle you."

There are usually two barrels. One contains hunks of appropriation pork for rivers and harbors. The other contains pap for nice little Congressmen who have influence enough to demand and receive all sorts of money for all sorts of public buildings in all sorts of towns and districts.

The abuses which have crept into these two barrels in the past have been extremely serious. Mud flats have been dug out for the benefit of catboats. Expensive buildings have been erected out of all proportion to practical requirements.

There are centers of population where the business of the Government is badly handicapped for lack of accommodations for handling the mails. Philadelphia is an important point. It returns to the Federal Treasury huge profits from the mails and from customs. A much larger post-office building is a necessity in Philadelphia; so is an enlarged customhouse. We mention Philadelphia as an instance only, for other large cities are likewise suffering. But because so many little places are awarded Federal buildings two and three or even half a dozen times too large, and at a cost as many times too great for the business done, the important centers are obliged to get along as best they can for years upon years.

That is what the public-building pork barrel does in the way of evil. It is precisely so with rivers and harbors. Again, we take Philadelphia as an example. Here is a port second only to that of New York. For years it has been fighting for justice. Long ago it should have had a 35-foot channel. The necessity for it was conceded. Congress has been committed to it. But because of the enormous waste on places of no account whatever, the Delaware River has been coming into its own by piecemeal only. And this is not only so with the Delaware, but with other enterprises of general importance.

At last there is evidence that Congress is experiencing a change of heart. Whether it is true and permanent repentance, or whether it is temporary and occasioned by the necessity to economize, is a question for the future to answer. But the fact is that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in drawing up the appropriation bill which has been under discussion throughout the week in the House apparently did its best to get rid of "pork." Enterprises of little account are still coddled, but their number is extremely few in comparison with past offenses. With the exception of a New York scheme, the House has refused to start new projects and has confined itself to enterprises under way. Because of this new policy the important Delaware River is treated decently. For the 35-foot channel the sum of \$2,165,000 is awarded, with an additional \$600,000 for continuing existing contracts. This action is satisfactory. It is also satisfactory that the disposition has been strong to disregard insignificant schemes.

To this Congress must eventually come as a definite policy. It should get down to a systematic plan for development, and it will be done when it becomes possible to blacklist all foolish projects which have been eating up millions upon millions for no other reason than that Members of Congress have been potent enough heretofore to secure "pork" for their districts.

Ports that do a substantial foreign business are worthy of attention. They will get it when the trout streams are given back to the trout.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, have simply served to amplify the fund of misinformation which he undertook to give to the House by way of a minority report, in so far as this particular appropriation for the lower Cumberland River is concerned. The gentleman has been a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for several years. He professes to have given the subject general study, and I do not question the fact that he has given it close attention. He has assumed to come before the House and, by way of a minority report and by the remarks he has made, to give to the House accurate information in regard to many of these projects.

Now, I know nothing about the facts concerning other projects contained in the bill and referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin, but I want to say, with all due deference but with every assurance, that if the statements made in his report with respect to other projects are no more correct and accurate than they are with reference to this particular project, then very little consideration can be given to any of them.

The gentleman, notwithstanding his extended study of this subject, does not seem to understand that there are two projects on the Cumberland River—one the upper Cumberland River project, extending from Nashville to the headwaters of navigation, and the other the lower Cumberland River project, extending from Nashville to the Ohio River, into which it empties. This appropriation is made to carry on the work now under way on the lower Cumberland River project, a project that was adopted by Congress in 1892, providing for seven locks and dams and the dredging of a portion of the river at its mouth, and which was modified in June, 1910, by eliminating one of those locks and dams.

The gentleman in his report says that this project has been rejected by the Board of Engineers. I want to say to the gentleman that that is an absolute mistake upon his part. This project has never been rejected by the Board of Engineers, and I may say in passing that the project on the upper Cumberland River has never been rejected by the Board of Engineers, although work was discontinued or suspended there several years ago. So far as the lower Cumberland River project is concerned, one lock was authorized in 1892 and then work was suspended, but there was no rejection on the part of the Board of Engineers. Congress, in 1910, again took up that work, and made an appropriation for that purpose. Three locks and dams are now under way, and if this appropriation is passed, as I hope it will be, it will mean that the other two locks and dams necessary to complete the improvements on the lower Cumberland from Nashville to the Ohio River will be put under way and soon completed.

The gentleman, by his motion to strike out this item, would have this work stop, and, notwithstanding the fact that the construction of only two more locks and dams is necessary to complete the whole scheme of improvements on the lower Cumberland River, he would deny to the people who are served by this river this improvement which is necessary to make the river navigable during the entire year. And he takes this position in the face of the fact that appropriations have already been made for four locks and dams on this project. In other words, he would, in effect, throw away the money and work already expended and leave a great still-water canal in the middle of the river, with no outlet, during a part of the year for the great amount of commerce, agricultural and timber products which will find their way to the markets of the world by way of this river, if certain navigation is afforded during every month of the year. Certainly the gentleman will not, upon reflection, insist upon that, nor will the House agree to any such proposition.

The gentleman, in his minority report, solemnly tells the House that, deducting the floatable timber and sand, a commerce of only 53,000 tons is reported for the river. Now, I have the highest respect for the gentleman, and I am quite sure he does not intentionally wish to misrepresent the facts. But he is entirely in error about that. As a matter of fact, deducting the great amount of commerce to which he alludes, the tonnage on the river amounted last year to more than a quarter of a million tons. But it is hardly a fair argument to refer to the tonnage and use that as a basis why an appropriation should not be made for the improvement of a river. It is not to be expected that the tonnage will reach anything like its maximum on a river where there can be certain navigation for a period of only eight or nine months in the year, on account of shoals and a low state of water. River transportation can never be developed under such circumstances. We must look to the possibilities and not to the conditions existing before the improvements are actually made.

If I had the time I could point out to you the great commercial possibilities of this river, not only because of the rich agricultural section traversed by it, than which there is none better in the United States, but also because of the timber, coal, and other valuable products which are to be found in reasonable market distance. But improvements of this kind should not be considered wholly from the standpoint of the actual amount of commerce which may be carried. Their potentiality in helping to control freight rates should not be overlooked. In speaking of this phase of the matter, with reference to the lower Cumberland River improvement, the report of engineers states:

The work on Locks B, C, and D will not facilitate navigation until the locks and dams are completed and placed in operation; nor can it be expected that the lower Cumberland River will be continuously navigable until the two remaining locks and dams have been completed. Nevertheless, even in its present condition the lower Cumberland River has a marked effect on railroad freight rates, and the navigable facilities offered by this stream are undoubtedly responsible for the favorable freight rates which Nashville has been granted, as compared with rates between towns not connected by a navigable waterway. The effect of the continuous navigation provided by the

canalization for the 41.4 miles below Nashville was noted from the immediate reduction by about 50 per cent in the rates charged by the Tennessee Central Railroad over that part of its line which parallels the pool of Dam A.

The gentleman has referred to a meeting before the Board of Engineers, and he has asked this committee to believe that that meeting was with reference to the lower Cumberland project, for which an appropriation is made in this bill, and which he is now seeking to strike out. The gentleman is again mistaken, for the meeting to which he refers was with reference to the upper Cumberland, and has nothing to do with this appropriation. I want to say to the gentleman that there has never been any meeting before the Board of Engineers, so far as I know, with reference to the lower Cumberland River project, nor do I know of any question being made about it on the part of the Board of Engineers. [Applause.]

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

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, the items contained in the paragraph sought to be eliminated by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] are composed of two parts, \$5,000 for the upper Cumberland River and \$705,000 for the lower Cumberland River. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] makes a motion to strike out the appropriation with reference to the lower Cumberland and then made a speech on the upper Cumberland. Is it possible that the gentleman undertook to deceive the House by talking about a proposition that is not even cared for in the bill except with a \$5,000 appropriation for maintenance?

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

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. My purpose in that is only secondary. The purpose is to stop all of the work of building these locks and dams pursuant to the report of Col. Townsend.

Mr. BARKLEY. This work on the Cumberland was begun in 1892. Originally it provided for seven locks between Nashville and the Ohio River, but by reason of the canalization of the Ohio, and the building of a lock and dam below Smithland, Ky., just below the mouth of the Cumberland, one of those locks and dams has been eliminated because the backwater caused by the damming of the Ohio will afford navigation for 30 or 40 miles up the Cumberland River from its mouth to a bend near Eddyville, Ky. Ever since 1892 the Government has been building these locks and dams, or has been promising to build them, and yet when we come to the completion of the project including an appropriation sufficient to build locks and dams at a point opposite Cadiz, in Trigg County, and at Eddyville, Ky., the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] wants to stop all work and waste all of the money that has been expended upon them, when, by the completion of the three locks and dams that are unfinished and these three that have not been started, a 6-foot channel will be afforded for yearly navigation to the people along the banks of the Cumberland from Nashville to the mouth. The gentleman has repeatedly claimed that navigation has decreased on these rivers, and I want to point out that while it is true that the report shows there has been a slight falling off on the Cumberland River, from 1912 to 1914, this falling off is due to two causes. First, in 1913-14 we had along the banks of this river one of the most severe droughts that has ever befallen the people of that section of the country, and in addition to that, according to the Engineers' report, navigation is only possible for six months out of the year, and we can not expect men to invest their money in boats where they can operate them only six months out of the year.

There is scarcely a man of any business sense who would invest his money in any project or enterprise or any undertaking where he could only carry on his enterprise one-half of the year. I can assure the gentleman from Wisconsin that the navigation on the Cumberland River, which flows through a very fertile and thickly settled part of the States of Tennessee and Kentucky, if this project is completed and boats are permitted to run 12 months in the year instead of 6, in my opinion, will very greatly increase, not only double, but three and four fold, because of the possibility of being able to navigate it all the year round.

The gentleman undertakes to exclude commerce that he calls "floatable." I presume the gentleman would carry out the same notion in every other adventure of human life, and instead of riding on trains we would go back to the old-fashioned stagecoach to get from one part of the country to another. We have no way to float our commerce down the river except in boats, as it ought to be floated; and we can not float boats without a channel of at least 6 feet, which will be obtained

when this improvement is completed. I hope this appropriation will not be stricken out or reduced. [Applause.]

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, no Member of this House, I think, is in stronger sympathy with honest efforts to promote economy than I am. I commend in the strongest terms the efforts of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] and others to whatever extent they relate to a real purpose to practically economize, as I do all Members in both Houses. But I wish, Mr. Chairman, to take exception to what appears to be the studied effort of some gentlemen to misrepresent the plain facts as they relate to some of these river projects. I hope gentlemen who are or profess to be interested in the matter of economy will give attention to the facts upon which they base their utterances here if they have any remote disposition to be fair or honest in dealing with these items.

Now, my friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] evidently did not know that the Cumberland River consisted of two separate and distinct projects. He offers an amendment here to one project and then proceeds to pour out some vituperation on the other project, a project which is not in this bill at all. I was content to remain silent, because it comes in the list of new projects, which are not to be embraced in this bill, but the gentleman from Wisconsin insists on lugging into this debate denunciation of a project that is not in the bill at all and as to this bill has no connection with the lower section of the river.

Mr. FREAR. I will say that I accept the gentleman's statement regarding this, because I do want to be correct. I simply based what I said upon the statement of Col. Townsend.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I am glad to hear the gentleman accept it, because I was very greatly surprised to see the gentleman bring up this matter at this time.

Now, the facts are, Mr. Chairman, that this project that is not in the bill and which has been attacked was approved by both Houses of Congress for 20 years, from 1886 to 1906. The gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Burton, was one of the supporters of this project. Finally the commerce apparently dropped down to less than half of what it was. The result was that the Department of Engineers not knowing the real facts as to the commerce recommended the temporary discontinuance of this improvement. Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin inaccurately said that this had been turned down three times by the department engineers. The fact is it never was turned down at all. It was only discontinued temporarily, until in 1912 the actual facts were developed with respect to the actual commerce of this river, and then the entire Department of Engineers recommended its restoration to the original plan of improvement. I recall that not only the Rivers and Harbors Committee in the House itself, but the Commerce Committee of the Senate unanimously approved this project in 1914. And I welcome the closest scrutiny of every fact pertaining to its worthiness as a proposition for improvement. I think the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, will testify to the fact that his committee, at least in the main, are favorably impressed with the merits of the upper Cumberland River as a project worthy of improvement, as much perhaps as almost any project in the pending bill. I would like for the gentleman to say whether he and the committee still have that view of the matter or not.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, then I will answer the gentleman in my own time. I will say that project was inserted in the river and harbor bill in 1914. I thought it then a worthy project. In fact, I believed it was among the best projects that went into that bill, and I have had no occasion since to change my mind. I want to say further right there, wherever that river has been completely improved it has shown good results for the money that has been expended upon it. I believe it will continue to do so.

I think that is all I have to say.

Mr. SMALL. May I have the balance of your time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has one minute remaining.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I only wish to ask permission to extend my remarks in the Record by submitting some data and information which I think establishes conclusively the commercial importance of the Cumberland River.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record as suggested by him. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment, and ask unanimous consent to insert a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman further asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by inserting certain matter which he sends to the Clerk's desk. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following is the statement referred to:

CUMBERLAND RIVER, 1914.

[Taken from Engineer's Report, 1915, vol. 2, pp. 2847 and 2848.]

	Tons.
Above Nashville	314, 028
Sand and gravel hauled 12 miles..... tons	100, 925
Logs, ties, and timber..... do	172, 507
	273, 432
	40, 596
Below Nashville	153, 458
Sand and gravel..... tons	38, 976
Logs, ties, and timber..... do	102, 024
	141, 000
	12, 458
Total net.....	53, 054

The Clerk read as follows:

Tennessee River, Tenn., Ala., and Ky.: For maintenance and continuing improvement by open-channel work above Chattanooga, Tenn., \$300,000; for maintenance and continuing improvement by open-channel work between Florence and Riverton, Ala., \$120,000; for continuing improvement by the construction of locks and dams between Chattanooga, Tenn., and Browns Island, Ala., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 360, Sixty-second Congress, second session, as modified by the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors printed in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 1, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, \$500,000: *Provided*, That no contract shall be entered into for the construction thereof until the local interests shall assume and pay all claims for flowage damage or arrange to do so in manner satisfactory to the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That one high dam or two low dams may be constructed according as the local interests may contribute the cost of all claims for flowage damage arising from either type of dams, respectively: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of War shall ultimately determine the type of dams to be constructed; for continuing improvement and for maintenance below Riverton, Ala., \$24,000; in all, \$944,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 9, after the figures "\$300,000," strike out the semicolon and insert "and of this amount not to exceed \$5,000 may be expended, in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War, for the maintenance of the Clinch and Holston Rivers at or near the mouth of said rivers."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I only wish to say that the necessity for that amendment has become apparent to the committee since the bill was reported. If we had had the same information before us at the time the bill was framed, we would have inserted some such provision as that in the body of the bill at the time.

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

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

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

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

Mr. FREAR. I am not going to refer to the Tennessee River or attempt to discuss that. I understand there is nothing here for the Muscle Shoals item, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Nothing at all.

Mr. FREAR. Of course the Army Engineers, as I understand, expended \$90,000 during the past summer under the general survey provision.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. FREAR. Five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will wait. Not much time will be taken.

Mr. FREAR. I am not going to discuss the item, Mr. Chairman, because it is a large one. It carries \$934,000. The last two allotments carried \$724,000 more. I suggest, however, that this is a very proper place in which to apply the principle invoked by Col. Townsend, that if we are going to drop some of these projects

here is a good place to do it; that is, to object to the continuation of these projects.

However, I just moved to strike out the last word because it is impossible to determine, so far as I can gather, just what is for maintenance and what is for improvement, so I shall not attempt it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to get the gentleman's viewpoint with regard to this item and others of the kind. Do I understand that the gentleman's proposition is that where certain locks and dams have been constructed and the commerce does not seem to justify further expenditure the gentleman would stop all work and abandon the project?

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman has asked me a question, and that involves quite an explanation. I am in favor of having some other system by which we can investigate these projects and not waste money, as we are doing to-day, on aimless "improvements," as they are called.

This Tennessee improvement is one of those that has been persistently pressed. The river is no larger than the river that flows in front of my own town, that fails to carry traffic. We have there an open stream a mile wide. The experience in Etrope and here has been that that does not add to the traffic.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] stated a few moments ago that they hoped to have increased commerce on the Cumberland River, and I hope they will, and I hope they will have it on the Tennessee River. But the commerce there to-day is not of a character to give any encouragement as I view it.

The question was asked, Why do you take out floatable timber and sand from the statistics of commerce transported? The sand may be hauled half a mile, and the figures are put in to justify large appropriations. I leave out floatable timber also, because the timber can be floated ordinarily in a very low stage of water. Ordinarily it does not require a 5-foot stage or a 9-foot stage, as has been urged, on many of these streams. That is the reason why we have deducted sand and timber. The sand and floatable timber have been deducted by authorities, generally better authorities than I am on this question. They deduct such items and leave the remainder to serve as the basis of computing commerce. That is done here in other cases.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman stated that the Tennessee River was no larger than the river that flows by his own town.

Mr. FREAR. Yes; I stated that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the gentleman know that more water flows out of the Tennessee than flows down the Ohio River under normal conditions?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; but my river is a mile wide. We have excursion boats there, and, as I once said, we had a larger commerce there than they have in the city of Milwaukee or Philadelphia, but it was all logs and lumber, and now the mills have closed down operations and there is no commerce to speak of there.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert a report of commerce for the Tennessee, making the deductions that I have referred to, and I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws his pro forma amendment and asks unanimous consent to insert in the Record the figures he refers to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following are the figures referred to:

Commerce on Tennessee River.		Tons.
Above Chattanooga		305, 616
Logs, ties, and timber..... tons	57, 873	
Sand..... do	145, 832	
Chattanooga to Florence		124, 872
Logs and ties..... tons	30, 477	
Sand..... do	54, 708	
Florence to Paducah		449, 956
Logs, ties, and timber..... tons	408, 783	
Logs, ties, timber, and sand.....	697, 673	880, 444
		697, 673
Actual net.....		182, 771

My statement was about 200,000 tons. Of the 182,000 tons, 28,418 tons of marble was hauled 5 miles and 50,000 tons of iron ore, valued at a dollar a ton, was hauled 15 miles, or 75,000 tons of cheap freight with an insignificant haul. For that commerce so reported we have appropriated \$11,000,000 in round numbers on the Tennessee and \$944,000 more is carried in this bill.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised that my friend from Wisconsin makes no further objection to the item for the Tennessee River than he does. The National Waterways Com-

mission determined that the Tennessee River was practically the fourth river in importance in the United States, and stated that it had maintained its commerce wherever it was improved, and had increased it.

Now, the rivers that have been improved completely have been of great advantage to the people of the United States. Of course a river can not have a great commerce until it is prepared for that commerce. I realize that I can not undertake to enter into a discussion of the merits of this river in five minutes, because it would take an hour. But I want to make one suggestion that is applicable to the position of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]. He says we have not the commerce. Sir, there is more coal in the six States tributary to the Tennessee River than could be moved by it in a century, so the geologists of this country say, and more than would supply a population of 100,000,000 people for a thousand years. There is marble and timber and agricultural products and iron ore—commerce—everything there.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Not just now. Now, between two of the pools that are navigated in that river there was a commerce valued at \$2,000,000 last year, and the statistics here are utterly incomplete. That was commerce that floated during the times when the obstructions did not prevent it. What other commerce was there during that time that might have been carried but for the obstructions? Six million tons of coal on the upper end of the river, and a distance of 180 miles below 18,000,000 tons of coal might have been carried if that river had been prepared and fixed for carrying it the year around. What is the difference between the water freights and railway freights upon that article? It is the difference between 5 cents and 41 cents; 41 by the railroad and 5 by the river for a given distance.

There is an advantage. There are many millions that might have been saved to the people if this river had been opened.

Now, I want to make another suggestion. This section of the bill is not quite fair to the Tennessee River, in view of the \$25,000,000 of commerce now being carried upon it. It is not fair to it inasmuch as it demands that we shall pay for the flowage rights and all damage done to private property where a public lock is located in the interest of commerce. Yet that provision is in this bill, and our people are going to accept it and pay for this part of the improvement of this river.

There was a section of 33 miles below the city of Chattanooga for which the Government of the United States made but small appropriations. Yet private enterprise, the people of that State and those of other States interested in water power, have improved that section of the river. How much would it have cost the Government of the United States to have improved it? The result of the improvement shows that it would have cost about \$11,000,000; and yet the Government has placed only \$243,000 in it, and the people of Tennessee and the corporations that have developed the water power there to 80,000 horsepower have expended in the interest of navigation primarily \$11,000,000. We are helping to take care of the interests not only of the people there but of the United States. If any river in the world needs encouragement, it is that river, along whose banks the patriotic people look to the protection not only of their own interests but of the national interests. When this river is completely improved, there will be an open waterway from upper East Tennessee to New Orleans and St. Paul. There are more resources along this river and it is a greater river than the Ohio, yet we hear no objections to \$60,000,000 of money being expended in the improvement of the Ohio. We have completed one project at private expense. We have completed two other great projects upon the river at Government expense. The present project is 63 per cent completed, and I do not wonder that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] could find no more objection than he did to this great waterway.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to know that there is no serious objection on the part of any Member of the House to the paragraph now under consideration making provision for the appropriation for the Tennessee River. This is evidence of the merit of this appropriation, as so many projects have been objected to in this bill. As has been stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], who has made so many objections to various paragraphs of this bill, the Tennessee is one of the big and important rivers of the Nation; and when this distinguished gentleman fails to object to the provisions made for the Tennessee River I am sure that each Member will agree that there is merit in each item appropriated for this river.

The Tennessee is indeed a great river. There are only two, I believe, larger in the United States. At Paducah, where the Tennessee and Ohio come together, there is a greater volume of

water in the Tennessee than in the Ohio. The commerce upon this great river justifies sufficient appropriation by the National Government to open it up and make it navigable every month in the year. Every item in this bill, so far as this river is concerned, has been recommended by the engineers of the War Department, and is to be used at different points along the river from Knoxville, Tenn., to Paducah, Ky., a distance of 652 miles.

As there is no motion pending to strike out this paragraph, nor has any amendment been offered to reduce the appropriation, I deem it unnecessary to say anything further, and ask that the paragraph be passed.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to see if we can not arrange for some time on this paragraph. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise mainly for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to the minority report of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] on the Tennessee River. On page 9 of this minority report he uses this language:

Excluding floatable timber and sand, the Tennessee River has absorbed \$11,000,000, in round numbers, in order to develop about 200,000 tons of actual commerce in 1914, of which 78,000 tons of coal was floated 16 miles.

Now, the reports of the engineers show that for the calendar year 1914 there was a total commerce on the Tennessee River of 1,343,709 tons, of a valuation of \$19,723,951.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. In just a moment. Now, deducting from the total commerce timber and sand, which, I take it, is inclusive of the language used by the gentleman, "deducting floatable timber and sand," the commerce as reported on the three sections of the river is as follows:

Above Chattanooga, 134,446 tons; between Chattanooga and Florence, 68,732 tons; between Florence and Chattanooga, 268,791 tons; making a total of 471,969.

Now, that calculation was made by Mr. J. H. McCann, one of the capable clerks of the River and Harbor Committee, and I take it to be absolutely correct. So that when the gentleman stated that there was only 200,000 tons after deducting the timber and sand, he was mistaken.

Mr. FREAR. I have submitted my report, and it is verified by the evidence, except that the coal hauled a short distance and the marble that was hauled a short distance was not taken into account.

Mr. SMALL. The engineer's report makes no mention of any coal having been carried.

Mr. FREAR. I so stated.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. MOON. I want to say that there was an immense amount of coal moved, and about 18,000,000 tons that could have been moved on one section of the river, but which had to go by railroad. It could have gone by river, if it had been opened at the proper time.

Mr. SMALL. I am trying to show by report of the engineers that the minority report of the gentleman from Wisconsin can not be relied upon.

Now, I will read from the engineer's report, page 1101:

In the Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers for 1915, page 1101, it is stated: "The prosecution of the work in various localities and the consequent lack of continuity of the improvement has resulted in no long reach of the river being made capable of uninterrupted navigation during low-water periods, except the stretch of about 200 miles from Big Bend Shoals to the mouth. Not so much benefit has followed, therefore, as would have been secured by advancing the work progressively upstream from the mouth. Nevertheless considerable improvement has resulted, and there is an important local traffic on various reaches of the river."

I will say in conclusion that the evidence goes to show that when the work of improvement shall be entirely completed it will demonstrate, as was well said by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon], that this river will be one of the most important streams for commerce in all the country. [Applause.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to send an amendment to the desk to be read with the view of asking the chairman of the committee for some information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of the last committee amendment the following: "For the construction of locks and dams at Caney Creek Shoals, between Knoxville and Chattanooga, Tenn., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 360, Sixty-second Congress, second session, \$500,000."

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if it is the intention of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to take up this proposition providing for a lock and dam at Caney Creek Shoals?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will say to the gentleman that in some subsequent bill, as far as I am concerned, we propose to take up that matter and consider it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, with that understanding I will withdraw the amendment. I want to say, however, a few words about the Tennessee River. I was born on it, lived all my life on its banks, and traveled over it from end to end. On one of these trips I accompanied the River and Harbor Committee, of which at that time Mr. Burton was the chairman. On that occasion Mr. Burton expressed himself as being satisfied with the merits of the Tennessee River as one of the streams which deserved favorable consideration at the hands of Congress.

The national waterways commission referred to by my colleague, Judge Moon, which made a very careful and exhaustive study of the meritorious rivers in the United States, pronounced the Tennessee River the fourth largest in importance in the United States. That commission was created, as I recall, as the result of the efforts of Mr. Burton, who served as its chairman. There is not a river in the United States having a greater undeveloped wealth than the Tennessee River.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] says something about the transportation of sand and timber on this river. If the Tennessee River was canalized, with slack water all the year, there is more wealth and business for future development than in any section of the United States in proportion to size and population.

Eastern Tennessee is the heart of the great southern coal fields. This field is 1,300 miles nearer New Orleans than the coal fields of Pennsylvania or West Virginia, and we are unable to sell a ton of coal in that market because of the lack of water navigation.

The most valuable and useful marble in this country is the Tennessee marble, quarried on the banks of this river. We have at present over 5,000 men engaged in that industry. If we had the river so we could utilize it, we would reduce the freight on marble to the interior cities at least \$1.50 a ton.

There are three iron furnaces in the district I represent and a number in the district represented by my friend, Judge Moon. If this river was made useful 12 months in the year, as Congress has determined the Ohio River shall be made, we could deliver pig iron at Cincinnati, Louisville, New Orleans, and other points for \$1.50 a ton less. In 1914 for the first time we were unable to compete with our foreign competitors in the sale of pig iron in New Orleans, because they could ship it across the ocean and lay it down for less than we could ship it by rail from the furnaces in eastern Tennessee to New Orleans.

We have the largest zinc mill in the United States in east Tennessee. The Aluminum Co. of America is constructing now the largest aluminum plant in the world in that section of the country. It is hauling its bauxite, its raw material, from the district in Arkansas, represented by Mr. JACOWAY, by rail, and are shipping out aluminum pig to Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and other points by rail. The utilization of this river year in and year out would mean a saving in the transportation of the raw material and finished article to the amount of millions of dollars. That is not all.

The East Tennessee Copper Co., located in eastern Tennessee, and an English company at the same point, are two of the most prosperous concerns of the kind in the United States, and they would be affected by deep-water transportation.

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

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, the largest and most extensive territory of hardwood lumber in this country is in the Appalachian Mountains and can be reached by a development of this river and its tributaries. We are shipping out rough lumber, we are shipping out manufactured or sawed lumber, and we are shipping out furniture, and so forth, made in our factories, and that interest would be affected and benefited by a reduction of transportation rates. We have cotton mills and knitting mills, and we are hauling our raw materials from the cotton fields of the South and shipping out our finished products by rail, and these industries would all be gainers by all-the-year-round navigation, which would make a reduction in the transportation of the raw materials and the finished articles to the markets of the world. There are a million people in east Tennessee. There is a manufacturing city at Chattanooga, with a population of nearly

100,000, and at Knoxville, a city of equal population, and you may search the census returns and you will find no other cities or section of the country which have grown industrially as has the mountain district of Tennessee, filled with iron, coal, marble, copper, hardwood lumber, aluminum, zinc, and so forth.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly.

Mr. MOON. I want to suggest to the gentleman that at Richard City, Marion County, there is a cement plant that cost more than a million dollars within a half mile of the river, and that plant has a right of way to the river, and by reason of the fact that it can not use the river for more than half of the year, during the other half of the year has to pay half again as much freight as it does during the six months when it can use the river.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the gentleman for the interruption. We have commenced and have virtually completed a \$3,000,000 dye plant in east Tennessee to relieve a very serious situation in this country. Here is the best investment for practical, useful river improvement in the United States and where there is a future enormous in the way of industrial development and growth of population which means wealth and wages and prosperity for our country. [Applause.] And the Democratic majority in this House would be untrue and false to the interests of the South if it did not provide for the practical, useful improvement of this river when it has the opportunity. Southern Democrats would be derelict to their duty, and I hope no Republican colleague of mine will ever stand in the way of this practical, useful, and patriotic legislation to improve this great river. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Does not the gentleman think that the developments to which he has referred would also benefit the North quite as much as the South?

Mr. AUSTIN. Why, we are shipping our raw material and finished articles to the North, West, and East and other sections, which would get the benefit of the reduced rate and the reduced cost of these goods, both as to the raw material and the finished article.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor at Toledo, Ohio: For maintenance, \$20,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of discussing briefly this question of anticipated commerce. The suggestion has been made by two or three of the speakers, as of the last project, that if they are given opportunity to complete a certain project commerce will grow very rapidly. I hope it will, and the gentleman at my left, my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. SMITH], who represents the Mississippi River, speaks of the possibility of it; but I desire to call attention to the fact that the anticipated Mississippi commerce has usually been a disappointment. If you will examine the commerce of the Mississippi River from St. Paul clear down to New Orleans, you will find that it has been a disappointment on the streams all along that great waterway. I want to speak of some of the anticipated commerce on a number of streams which was never realized. Of course excuses may be offered one way and another, but these are anticipations of people who are urging the appropriations. Take, for instance, the Arkansas River, which we have had up for discussion. I did not care to present it when the matter was up, but I refer now to page 20 of the report. It was there estimated that 800,000,000 tons of coal are tributary to the river, and yet, after spending \$3,572,000 on the Arkansas River, the reports shows that 900,000 tons of coal were shipped by rail out of the territory adjacent to the river in 1914, and only 2,716 tons were floated 7 miles on the river last year.

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

Mr. FREAR. Just for a question.

Mr. HULBERT. Has this river been sufficiently improved to put it in active competition with the railroads at that point?

Mr. FREAR. I think, unquestionably, because \$3,502,000 have been expended upon it, and it has been navigated for 20 or 30 years, or longer than that. On the Big Sandy River it was prophesied a dozen years ago that by canalizing the river a million tons of coal or more would be floated annually down that stream, whereas after expending \$1,126,125 on the river only 12 tons were floated 20 miles in 1913.

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

Mr. FREAR. Just one moment. I want to finish my statement. Here is a report published by the gentleman from Philadelphia which goes on to criticize me very severely because I

said 12 tons of coal were shipped on the Big Sandy in 1913, and he says he can not find it anywhere. He takes four pages to denounce me, when, as a matter of fact, he did not know where to go to look for it. I stated where it could be found.

On the Hennepin Canal, which has cost the Government \$7,597,781 for 33 locks, freight savings on grain were promised Iowa growers a dozen years ago of \$20,000,000 annually. For five years it has been used and only 5,868 tons of grain were floated in 1914 at a cost to the Government in interest and maintenance of over \$36 per ton. An actual loss in the insignificant grain shipments occurred from 1913 to 1914.

After spending \$21,700,000 on the Missouri River it is now predicted that \$14,100,000 will invite large grain shipments from Kansas City to St. Louis. Yet after squandering a score of millions on the river to date, not one ton of grain was shipped by water from Kansas City to St. Louis in 1912, 1913, or 1914. A total of 5,290 tons of grain was barged 115 miles in 1914, or slightly over one-quarter of the distance between the cities was averaged. This project was recommended for abandonment by the local engineer, but he was overruled by the board.

The above is a statement which is in the report and based on the statistics. Surely none of these anticipations have been realized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I object.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two or three minutes myself.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HULBERT. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if he will make it five minutes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will make it five minutes. Does the gentleman wish two minutes?

Mr. HULBERT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, while I personally doubt the wisdom of improving the Big Sandy, I do not know if I had been a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee whether or not I would have supported it at the time. I do, though, want to protest against the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] libeling and slandering the man who prophesied there would be an immense tonnage of coal shipped out over this stream if it should be canalized. The facts of the matter are that the Government, after building two or three dams on this river—I have forgotten the exact number—stopped improving the Big Sandy River.

By building one or two more dams they would have reached this great coal field, and I have no doubt but that the prophecy of the person who made this prediction at the time the project was adopted would be fulfilled if the Government had carried out the proposition adopted.

I do not know if that is the reason, though another fact is that the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad has a line running from this coal field on the Kentucky side right down the Big Sandy River. I do not know what stopped the improvement of the Big Sandy. As to the gentleman reading a letter saying that the writer does not know where the Big Sandy River is, it seems like a slur on those two great States of Kentucky and Virginia, containing the two greatest coal fields in this country outside of Pennsylvania, and the Big Sandy separating the two States.

Mr. HULBERT. I would like to utilize the two minutes allotted to me for the purpose of propounding to the gentleman from Wisconsin a question which he did not have opportunity to answer while he had the floor. The gentleman has made a comparison of the shipment of coal by rail and water on the Arkansas River. The gentleman made the statement that the river had been sufficiently improved to put it in competition with the railroad.

Mr. FREAR. I did not say that.

Mr. HULBERT. That is the question I asked. I wanted to know if the river had been sufficiently improved to put it in actual competition with the railroad for the purpose of transporting coal from the coal fields at that point, and if the gentleman misunderstood my question I repeat the question now and ask if he will be good enough to answer.

Mr. FREAR. What is the inquiry?

Mr. HULBERT. Whether the river has been sufficiently improved to put it in active competition against the railroad at that point in the transportation of coal?

Mr. FREAR. I will say, judging from all history, that it will never be so. It is the history of every river in the country.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor at Port Clinton, Ohio: For maintenance, \$1,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. A little while ago I put a question to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] as to his attitude, in order that we might more intelligently understand whether or not he favored the cessation of work on projects which had been started and on which much money had already been spent. I do not recall that he made a definite answer to that question. I want to know whether the Government, having spent a large amount of money building locks and dams on a river like the Ohio, should abandon the work and charge it up to profit and loss if, while in progress of construction, it did not come up to the expectations of some waterways expert in the matter of commerce and serviceability?

Now, if that is the gentleman's position, that we should abandon all these existing works, it is a very serious matter, and it affects largely every argument that he has made upon this floor. What the gentleman stated in that relation has been based, as he states, very largely upon his inquiries and studies as to foreign conditions. A while ago he said, with respect to the Tennessee River I think, that the lumber had all been cut off, indicating a falling tonnage.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, no; I was referring to our part of the country.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I apply it, then, to any river that the gentleman might have referred to, where the lumber in the vicinity had been cut away—

Mr. FREAR. I do not know anything about that down there—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And that the necessity of providing transportation by water no longer exists.

Now, if the gentleman is basing that kind of an argument upon foreign conditions, I just want to call his attention to the canals in Europe, particularly those of Germany and France, which are in constant use for the purpose of carrying bulky freight, and where, as to lumber, instead of having their forests utterly depleted and cut away, they are constantly recreating them, as, for instance, in the Sihlwald of Switzerland. I direct the gentleman's attention to that particular section of Europe or to the Black Forest in Germany, because it will help him in his studies of the waterway transportation question. Where they cut down a tree in Switzerland they see to it that another tree is planted to take its place.

That practice has been followed in Germany for years, and it is one of the secrets of Germany's ability to maintain herself to-day that instead of drawing upon her own forests she has been drawing on the forests of Norway and Sweden and Russia, buying her timber instead of using up her own. In Switzerland, where they remove a tree they see that it is restored. Not even an apple tree that is struck by lightning is permitted to go without another apple tree being planted to take its place.

So in those studies and investigations that the gentleman is making of waterways abroad, upon which he bases his proposition that we should abandon great works in the United States, I commend to him the close study of the lumber situation in Europe.

When it comes to rail-and-water transportation in the United States, I want to commend to the gentleman the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission in recent cases, showing that wherever water transportation has had a fair chance it has compelled the railroads to be reasonable in their freight rates. I would not have you understand that I am opposed to the railroads. I am as strong a railroad development man as there is in this House, and I want to see them reach out and penetrate every section of the country. But as in foreign countries the railway is not injured by the waterway, so it should be here; the two of them serving to their full capacity create new business, and each of them does more business under such conditions than it did before. If the railroad men are wise—and some of them in the East begin to realize it—rather than retard waterway development they will encourage it, because where they have been subjected to the congestion such as they have endured during the last few months, carrying the products of the West to the seaboard, they find that it is desirable to have relief, some auxiliary, such as Mr. James J. Hill back in 1907 indicated must be had if the railroads of this country are to give effective service.

The railroads have not been expanding as they should have been, and now that there is a great pressure upon them, they have been obliged in my section of the country to lay an em-

bargo on the transportation of heavy commodities, because they do not have sufficient facilities to carry them.

This has recently developed in the case of the Ohio River. I have in my hand a ruling of the Interstate Commerce Commission permitting the railroads there to lower their rates in order to compete with what, in that section, is superior transportation of products by waterways.

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting an extract from an Interstate Commerce Commission report.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania submitted the following:

FOURTH SECTION APPLICATIONS NOS. 2045, 3965, 1952, 1548, 1065, 2138, 4219, 790, AND 2072—CLASS AND COMMODITY RATES BETWEEN ST. LOUIS AND EAST ST. LOUIS AND OHIO RIVER POINTS AND BETWEEN THE OHIO RIVER POINTS THEMSELVES.

[Submitted Apr. 8, 1915. Decided Mar. 2, 1916.]

The class and commodity rates of carriers operating both north and south of the Ohio River in the territory lying between St. Louis, Mo., and East St. Louis, Ill., on the one hand, and Ohio River points on the other, and between the various Ohio River points themselves, are in many instances in contravention of the long-and-short-haul rule of the fourth section of the act. These carriers ask to be allowed to continue these rates between the river points, which are lower than rates at intermediate points. Upon the facts disclosed by the record; *Held*, That—

1. Water competition justifies departures from the long-and-short-haul rule of the fourth section in rates between points on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, and relief should be granted to the extent prescribed in the report.

2. Authority to continue to charge class and commodity rates between the same points via Chicago and Chicago junctions lower than rates contemporaneously applicable on like traffic to intermediate points denied.

3. Authority to continue class and commodity rates between the same points via the route of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad through Guthrie lower than rates contemporaneously applicable on like traffic to intermediate points denied.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment, and wish to say, in response to the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania—

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph end in two minutes.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman from Wisconsin can take time under the next item.

Mr. FREAR. It is immaterial to me, but it will not take extra time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the pending paragraph may be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that the debate on the pending paragraph be closed in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] propounds so many questions that it is very hard for me to answer them in five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not the rule require that a gentleman rising to address the committee shall confine his remarks to the subject under discussion?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Wisconsin is not discussing the pending question.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I am discussing the very proposition that freights carried by boats are cheaper than freights carried by rail. The gentleman from Florida sat silent and did not object to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, while he was talking for five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, the gentleman should not get worked up.

Mr. FREAR. I am not worked up in the slightest degree.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I notice, Mr. Chairman, that a great deal of this discussion ranges over a wide area.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask for order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will insist that order be observed. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I call attention directly to this transportation question, but the chairman of the Committee on

Rivers and Harbors objects to it. I am undertaking to discuss the question of canalization on the Ohio River and these other projects. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] asked me, "Do you believe in canalization projects?" I believe that, as one of the best engineers says, we ought to stop work on most of these projects until we have made an experiment. We have had the Black Warrior River completed at a cost of \$12,000,000. Let us try and see how far we can go with that, what return can be had, and keep the others in status quo, says Col. Townsend. That is the judgment of other waterway experts. I know nothing about it, except, I say, let us put this in the hands of people who will determine which is the right project to continue, and hold the others back until we ascertain whether or not any complete return will come to the people of this country on the investment we are making.

Now, the gentleman discusses—and it is right in line with this proposition—the question of carrying products in France and in Germany. I have stated those propositions as well as I could in the limited time given me, and I find that even on those canals in France and Germany the judgment of the men who write authoritatively about them is that they are not a profitable investment ordinarily to either France or Germany, although the concentrated populations in those countries make it possible to carry a greater amount of commerce on those canals than here. But the gentleman leaves out of the question the one important proposition that there the Government controls railway rates—in fact, owns the railways—and forces commerce by that means to use the water transportation which we do not do in this country. Now, the gentleman says, touching upon this very question of transportation, "Do you believe that the railroads ought to be allowed to cut down their rates to meet the water transportation?" I do not. Do you? Here is the result the moment you do. Did the gentleman from Pennsylvania favor the 5 per cent increase or any other increase to make it profitable for the railroads to do business? If so, for what reason? It is because they are not making a reasonable profit at the present time.

Now, the moment you cut them down below a reasonable profit at one point in order to get the business at some waterway point, do you not necessarily compel them to raise the rate inland? More than that, you compel those discriminated against to pay the expense of the improvement. You speak of a waterway point down here on the Ohio River where rates will be reduced. We ought to give to the waterway the right to carry the freight, because if we determine on the question of reasonable earnings to the railroads to which they are entitled, it is necessary that some one else must make up the deficiency, and it is the man who lives off the river, who has not the benefit of the waterway competition, who must make it up, and pay the excess rates to meet the deficiency at water-competition points.

I believe we ought to control the rates of the railroads to prevent them driving out the waterway transportation. The gentleman speaks of the growing of timber over in Europe. Of course, they do that there. They do many things better than we do, because we have been lavish with all our natural resources. We have not yet grown timber here. We have not yet controlled railroads, but we are proceeding on an elaborate process of canalization, without knowing where we are going or how far we are going into the Treasury. Until we do work as they are doing in foreign countries it is a useless waste of money at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor at Sandusky, Ohio: For maintenance, \$10,000.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I am very anxious to expedite the consideration of this bill, and I do not want to take up any time in unnecessary discussion of it; but I do not want the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin to go out without any reply at all from those who are familiar with the facts.

The gentleman has stated in round numbers how much has been expended on the Arkansas River and certain other rivers, and then has pointed to the commerce on those rivers during the time in which that expenditure has been made. Now, if the gentleman would make a scientific study of the question of river transportation, he would find that a river, in order to carry freight in competition with a railroad—and that is the modern condition; it must carry in competition with the railroad—must be put into a certain usable condition before it even begins to be able to carry goods profitably. River navigation is greatly different, now that the boats must compete with the railroads, than it was before the day of railroads, when the rivers were the only available channels of commerce. He

would find that up to a certain point sand and timber could be floated down the river. Up to another point coal could be barged upon it. When he gets beyond that point and begins to carry goods—high-class freight that the railroads can compete for—he must have facilities comparable with the railroad facilities.

The mere improvement of the channel is not the only problem involved. The question of development of terminals is one problem involved. The question of the development of routes of trade and through rates and joint rates is another problem involved. The question of the articulation of railroads and the exchange of business is another problem involved. The question of the kind of craft that can be used on a particular stream is another problem, whether barges towed by a power boat or boats operating under their own power. The gentleman assumes that all these problems are going to solve themselves the very minute that the Government causes the expenditure of a sum of money on the channel. The fact of the matter is that if the inland rivers of this country are to be put in condition as arteries of commerce, there are a number of problems that must be solved by the local interests which are concerned, at considerable cost and expense to themselves.

I am not going to discuss the Missouri River, because we will come to that later; but I am going to point the gentleman to the very exhaustive report made by the Board of Engineers on the reexamination of the Missouri River projects, Document No. 463, in which the board say:

The company is making the most thorough attempt within the knowledge of the board to revive river traffic, which has disappeared under railway competition. It appears to be sparing no expense or effort that will contribute to the solution of the problem, and it claims as a result of its experience that success is obtainable if a permanent 6-foot channel is provided.

In that report they are speaking of the Shippers' Boat Line, of Kansas City, Mo. I want to call the attention of gentlemen to the chart which accompanies that report. Our German naval architect, Mr. Von Pagenhardt, worked out the question of how many hours each barge in the employ of that company was engaged in profitable traffic. He wanted to show what the condition of the river was and how much of the time that barge could run in competition with the railroad; and do you know that he found that a barge, provided at the expense of the company and operated by a full complement of men, could only run 30 per cent of the time on a partially improved river that a railroad car can run in the service of a railroad company. All of the black spots and all of the spotted lines in these charts indicate time when the barge is tied up. The black spots represent the nighttime. You can not run at night on an unimproved river, even if you have it lighted by guide lights. You can not afford to risk your goods at night on an unimproved channel. The spotted lines indicate navigation troubles caused by low water and sand bars, and only the clear white squares there represent hours of running time when the barge is actually making money for its owners.

If we could eliminate the black spots and the spotted squares and put the barge in a position of a railroad car by improving the channel so as to be able to carry the freight night and day, and make daily trips on a schedule time, there will be a vast difference in the commerce.

What did the board find? In the last three years commerce had grown between Kansas City and St. Louis in competition with the railroads in high-class freight, 146 per cent every season the boat operated. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor at Huron, Ohio: For maintenance, \$2,500.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Following out the same discussion of water transportation which the gentleman speaks of, this Government has paid some \$400,000,000 on river improvements of this country for waterway transportation, and I challenge the gentleman to point to instances where the commerce has increased.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. SWITZER. How about the Monongahela River?

Mr. FREAR. Well, the Monongahela has held about even. The river has held about even with the same company owning the coal and owning the boat, as I am informed. But it is practically the only river, as I stated in my report, and because of the coal mines at the headwaters. It stands by itself.

Let us come to the Missouri River and the rivers like the Missouri. We have spent \$20,000,000 on navigation. The report of Mr. Deakin says that for the purpose of saving \$10,000 in freight charges in waterway transportation it will cost the Government \$1,100,000 annually.

Mr. BORLAND. Oh, no; the gentleman is wrong about that.

Mr. FREAR. I can prove it by the report.

Mr. BORLAND. But it has been proved that Mr. Deakin was wrong.

Mr. FREAR. The chairman of the Mississippi River Commission, Col. Townsend, confirms him. I speak of that merely to show the enthusiasm and day dreams that my friends have and when they challenge me and ask for reasons for the position I take. Now, in reference to water transportation I am in favor of improvements where we can show any legitimate results, but not where you put the money into useless rivers by canalization. Half of the canals in the country have been abandoned, and we see no legitimate results from this investment. Take the \$7,000,000 Hennepin Canal and the \$12,000,000 Black Warrior River. In what way have you seen any reasonable return for the investment? And yet we are asked to appropriate a large sum of money for all these projects. Let us have a commission that will make an examination of this question and see that the money is wisely expended and not be wasted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor at Cleveland, Ohio: For maintenance, \$65,000.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I asked the gentleman from Wisconsin about the Monongahela River and whether or not the annual tonnage had not increased by reason of the improvement of this stream. I hold in my hand a letter sent to the Committee on Commerce in the United States Senate by the Board of Army Engineers. It has no number, but they give the figures as to the Monongahela. The original commerce on the Monongahela River before it was improved was 4,407,000 tons. The commerce in 1911—that was after it was canalized—was 11,143,000 tons, and so in 1912, or two and three-quarters as much as it was before the stream was canalized, and the report says that the freight rates have been reduced 40 or 50 per cent. I have a letter showing that the coal coming down the Monongahela to a point on the Ohio, which used to cost 44 cents a ton to move, now is being moved for 4 cents a ton.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this item and amendments thereto be closed in two minutes.

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

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I have excepted the Monongahela and Ohio Rivers as showing an appreciable commerce in my report. I wish to say, in regard to the proposition that the gentleman has presented, that the Army engineers state commerce is sometimes duplicated and triplicated and quadrupled. This is because the same commerce is frequently counted several times. I have taken the Ohio River and shown by an analysis of the report of the Army engineers how the report does duplicate. With an open-channel project there was no difficulty in determining improvements, but the moment you get locks and dams there is no determination of the exact amount. In the case of the Ohio River, by investigation and analyzing, I do not see how it can be answered. We have no means of exact determination.

Now, as I have said, I have excepted the Monongahela River, because it is in a class by itself; but out of 100 rivers, does it not seem striking that only 2 rivers show anything toward an increase in commerce after the expenditure of several hundred million dollars in all on rivers?

The Clerk read as follows:

Ohio River: Continuing improvement by the construction of locks and dams with a view to securing a navigable depth of 9 feet, \$5,000,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, in order to give several gentlemen who are present an opportunity to discuss the Ohio River and show some of the good things about it—and I am not going to say much against it—I move to strike out the section; and if I were confident that amendment would pass I might hesitate to make the motion. I do it simply to show the situation in which we are placed. A large number of locks are being constructed to-day on the Ohio River. We have expended over \$50,000,000 on the Ohio River. The project is going to take from \$80,000,000 to \$100,000,000, so far as the estimate of different engineers shows, before the project is completed. Col. Townsend says, "Let us take two streams," and he mentions the Ohio River as one, and also the project of a 14-foot channel from St. Louis to Chicago; and he suggests that they be put in as experimental projects, and that all the others wait in status quo. The difficulty with Col. Townsend's proposition is that he ignores the fact that we have completed certain projects, as, for instance, the Warrior, which has cost about \$12,000,000; the Hennepin Canal, which has cost over \$7,000,000; and some of the other rivers that have been completed—quite a large number of them—as we well know by the records. Let us take

those and see what the result is to-day, instead of going on and putting in forty or fifty million dollars more—that is, in this project, which I believe now is a 53-lock canalization project. Gentlemen have told me, who have run that river—pilots as well as captains—that the traffic to-day is not what it once was. You have a coal traffic there—and, by the way, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in my remarks an analysis that I have made of the Ohio traffic.

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

There was no objection.

The analysis referred to is as follows:

THE OHIO RIVER COMMERCE.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, July 27, 1914.

HON. S. M. SPARKMAN,
Chairman Committee on Rivers and Harbors,
United States House of Representatives.

SIR: I. Referring to the statement of the commercial statistics of the Ohio River, telephoned to you some time since, I have the honor to inform you that a report just received from the district officer states that the commercial statistics which he reported by telegraph have been found upon careful check to have contained some duplication. A corrected tabular statement of the statistics is herewith.

2. As to the reason for reporting the statistics at only six locks, it may be stated that the particular locks were selected with a view to obtaining as complete statistics as possible, and at the same time to eliminate duplication as much as practicable. Boats with through tows are required to report only at the first lock through which they pass. The item for open-river commerce is the local commerce carried on between the various locks and dams.

Very respectfully,

DAN C. KINGMAN,
Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

Ohio River tonnage, calendar year 1913.
[Through lock and open river.]

	Tonnage.	Valuation.	Passengers.
Lock No. 1.....	1,982,257.5	\$3,720,794.35	86,518
Lock No. 8.....	224,080.5	1,085,686.92	5,005
Lock No. 18.....	374,945.0	2,336,645.31	9,421
Lock No. 26.....	796,629.0	2,926,918.65	17,266
Lock No. 37.....	1,988,434.0	9,953,466.24	104,078
Lock No. 41.....	1,537,146.5	6,318,567.53	11,767
Open river.....	1,509,111.5	14,088,452.70	1,086,897
Ferries.....	1,401,519.5	36,086,390.07	2,949,834
Total.....	9,814,123.5	77,026,901.78	4,270,786

A corrected statement of average freight floated on the Ohio, based upon official lock reports, is now presented over Chief Kingman's signature, and invites scrutiny.

When a 63-lock system on the Ohio River has been completed as a monument to congressional waste and engineering complicity "commerce" can then be determined by using 63 as a multiple of lock tonnage. This cumulative method of reckoning is as illuminating as to count the passengers in every car at every street corner in order to determine the total street car traffic. Astounding statistics may thus be produced. Chief Kingman says he has "avoided duplication as far as possible." What is the average haul or tonnage along the river when 1,400,000 tons were ferried across the river? Did the continuous commerce reach 100,000 tons or 50,000 tons, exclusive of soft coal, which has floated down the Ohio and Mississippi for a half century at a yearly decreasing rate?

In an effort to excuse a proposed wasteful expenditure of from \$60,000,000 to \$100,000,000 on the Ohio, according to the varying predictions of Army engineers, our present chief includes in his totals 1,500,000 tons of "open-river traffic" that passes along the river as it always has for 50 years and in much larger quantities before canalization was known and before a dollar was spent by the Government on the Ohio. Was that open-river traffic part of the open-river traffic at each lock? How much freight goes through locks, and how far?

CANALIZATION TO PROMOTE RIVER FERRIAGE.

The limit of imaginary mathematics is reached when to total lockages of freight at a half dozen dams, including open-river traffic, our Chief Engineer adds more "open-river traffic" and finally scores a positive triumph by adding ferrriage across the river, which aggregates 2,949,834 passengers, nearly three-fourths of the total number, valued at \$36,086,390.07. That odd 7 cents is developed through engineering accuracy. Ferrriage valuation is practically one-half of the total value of all tonnage and passengers carried on the river. Assuming that passengers had no value and that freight alone was considered, no further analysis need be made to show the valueless character of valuation statistics submitted by the Chief Engineer to bolster up this \$100,000,000 canalization project.

Approaching 2,000,000 tons at one or two different points, over 95 per cent of which is soft coal, sand, and gravel, a traffic rapidly diminishing in quantity and value, leaves the mouth of the Ohio River at less than a million tons of soft coal, so far as can be ascertained, and then drifts slowly down the Mississippi to be recounted at Cairo, Memphis, Vicksburg, and New Orleans. In other words, a few tons of soft coal that reach New Orleans are first counted at a dozen locks on the Monongahela, then at the locks on the Ohio, and then the same coal, used to swell senseless quadrupled statistics, is sent down and recounted at Cairo, Memphis, Vicksburg, and New Orleans, on the Father of Waters.

It is an interesting system—one that only an able engineer could gravely put across with a wealth of misleading statistics, and one that is frequently used for duplicating and quadruplicating commerce on other rivers and canals.

In order that a better understanding of Chief Kingman's letter may be had, let us take the tables from which he draws deductions.

OHIO RIVER TRAFFIC AT LOCK 1.

Lock 1 is given 1,982,257 tons. But page 2711 says that is commerce which passed through the lock—"and open river"—at that point. The table further shows that of the impressive tonnage reported, including duplications, 1,946,119 tons consisted of soft coal, sand, and gravel that was always floated down the "open river," leaving a commerce of 36,135 tons, including 11,240 tons of floatable logs and ties, or less than 25,000 tons that may or may not have required the services of this \$100,000,000 lock system.

OHIO RIVER TRAFFIC AT LOCK 8.

Lock 8 and "open river" is given 224,080 tons by Chief Kingman, page 2712. Of that traffic, so reported, soft coal and railroad ties, that for a half century were floated down the open river, reached 207,429 tons, leaving 16,651 tons of cement and other reported freight at that point for which a \$100,000,000 lock system is being built under the recommendation of Army engineers.

OHIO RIVER TRAFFIC AT LOCK 18.

Other lock statistics are of the same character. For fear this statement may not be accepted, as based on investigation, I will take the next lock. Chief Kingman's next lock, 18, and "open river" statistics are found on page 2713. He reports a total "commerce" of 374,945 tons, whereas out of an even 50 items reported, 2 items of soft coal and logs reached 342,836 tons. Just what method was taken for shipping some 7,000 tons of oil and 2,500 tons of lumber, found in the remaining 48 items, the report fails to disclose. One thing is certain amid all this attempt to impress Congress with inflated statistics of open-river and lock traffic, the Government is annually paying bills reaching, with the regular and sundry civil bills, from \$5,000,000 to \$8,000,000 for the Ohio River alone, for a comparatively insignificant commerce average along the river, apart from soft coal, sand, and gravel, of less than 50,000 tons at given points, as shown by the official reports.

Similar conclusions were reached in the record of April 10, 1914, when other lock statements were analyzed.

In the debate preceding the defeat of the 1915 bill a prominent Senator called the Ohio River project the "worst of all." It received \$1,769,000 from the first allotment, \$3,200,000 in the 1915 sundry civil bill, and \$3,915,000 allotment from the Chief of Army Engineers April 1, 1915, or \$7,115,000 for 1915, in addition to cash on hand—twenty times the amount that was allotted to New York's inner harbor, which handles fifty times the Ohio's actual commerce.

When a \$100,000,000 Ohio canalization system has been fastened upon us with its annual interest burden of \$3,000,000, and a reasonable maintenance and deterioration charge of \$4,000,000 more annually for sixty-odd locks and dams, if the diminishing coal commerce is retained—a violent assumption—the Government will have little tangible traffic to show for its \$100,000,000 investment and the annual \$7,000,000 charge properly lodged against it.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether this is all foolish work or not, to challenge all of these rainbow statements; but I do it on the judgment of the best experts in the country, and they base their judgment upon experience in Europe and in this country, so far as expenditures have been made. The Mississippi River to-day is as good as you can ever make it. Col. Townsend's proposition to go up to Chicago is impracticable, according to the judgment of the Army engineers, and they have so stated. They think that it is unwise, because not 5 per cent of the traffic that goes to Chicago comes in boats that are under 14 feet draft. Now, if we can stop the waste, let us try to do it, or if we can get any kind of a system that will determine where the money is being profitably expended, let us do that. I do not care where it may be, I have not any objection to any particular item. The Lord knows that, and so do gentlemen who have told me. I am simply trying to get light on this subject, and I suggest projects like this in order that gentlemen may make their statements about their own projects.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, with considerable misgiving and a great deal of humility I rise for the purpose of attempting to correct the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in respect to a statement which he made yesterday. When I was discussing with the other gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] the subject of public buildings, and that gentleman was attempting to show that the upkeep of these small buildings was very expensive, I stated as one of the reasons for that the fact that the Treasury Department paid such extravagant prices for their upkeep, mentioning that they paid for janitors a thousand dollars to twelve hundred dollars a year. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], for whom I have the highest respect, immediately arose and waved his arms and said:

Oh, a thousand and twelve hundred dollars a year, nonsense! The janitors get \$45 a month in most of these places.

I hold in my hand a report made by the Treasury Department under date of March 27 of this year on a proposed public building at Alturas, Cal. The report shows that the census of 1910 gives a population of 916, and it further shows the cost of the upkeep of the building at that place, and as an item of such upkeep charges they have put the janitor service down at \$1,260 per annum.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. In just a moment. I have been accustomed to sit here for several years under the drippings of wisdom as they fell from the lips of my distinguished friend, and I have thought that the old idea that humanity was not infallible had been absolutely annihilated in the personality

of my good friend; but we are told that Homer sometimes nods, and I find now that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois sometimes makes a mistake. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman think that "janitor service" at \$1,200 a year means that a janitor gets \$1,200 a year?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It states for "janitor service," and if that is not for janitor service or for janitors I do not know what it means.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman's statement was that the janitors received a thousand and twelve hundred dollars a year, and I corrected the gentleman, and I correct him now.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. They may have two janitors, or three; but this is for janitor service, and if that is not to pay janitors for service I do not know what it is for.

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman that in Chicago the "janitor service" costs a great deal more than twelve hundred dollars a year, as it does in Washington, and that in New York it costs far more than a thousand or twelve hundred dollars a year.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. But it is not simply \$45 a month in the little towns, when the Treasury Department says that it is \$1,200 a year.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman and I are not far apart at all. Some of these buildings are controlled by the Post Office Department, and the janitors there receive \$720 or \$800 a year, and under the Treasury Department they get \$50 a month.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; but the janitor service at one of these little buildings is \$1,200. Whether they have one or two janitors, I do not know.

Mr. MANN. Not unless they employ two janitors.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. They may do that.

Mr. MANN. If they employ two janitors it goes a long way toward sustaining the argument of my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], in all of which I do not agree.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Which they ought not to do.

Mr. MANN. To show how uselessly expensive these public buildings are.

Mr. ADAIR. Will the gentleman yield to me for just a minute?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to ask that all debate on this paragraph close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman take care of me out of that time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not think I can guarantee it. Make it 30 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida modifies his request and asks that all debate close on this paragraph and amendments thereto in 30 minutes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman state whom he expects to recognize in that time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the recognition would not rest with the gentleman from Florida. The Chair will recognize gentlemen for five minutes each.

Mr. MANN. We would like to have 20 minutes on this side.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will not make any request at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida withdraws his request. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, the district which I have the honor to represent is at the lower end of this great river, so ably represented at its source by my handsome friend from Pennsylvania, Dr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. BARCHFELD. I thank the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. That stream consists of 968 miles from Pittsburgh to Cairo, and along it is a string of the most prosperous, wide-awake, and progressive cities that can be found along any similar stream in the United States. Beginning with Pittsburgh and coming on down through West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, and Illinois, I do not believe there can be found anywhere in this country a stretch of 968 miles of a navigable river on the banks of which can be found a more fertile soil, a more prosperous people, and more progressive cities. [Applause.]

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] has frequently stated, during his numerous addresses to the House

since this bill has been under consideration, that in Col. Townsend's report—and he appraises Col. Townsend as the greatest expert on waterway improvement and navigation in the United States, unless he puts Senator Burton ahead of him—in Col. Townsend's report he says it is recommended that the Ohio River and the Mississippi River be the two streams that the Government shall first improve before it takes up those other 58 rivers that he recommends should be dropped from the list, at least for the time being.

Two years ago, in the discussion of this bill, I made the statement, which I repeat now, that if it is not an economical and wise expenditure of the money for the Government to improve the Ohio River, then we may well doubt whether funds can be successfully expended on the other rivers in the United States.

It is unfair also to judge of the efficiency of the navigation on a river or to judge of the wisdom of an expenditure upon it by undertaking to compare figures during the progress of the work of its canalization. You might as well undertake to judge of the value of a house by undertaking to live in it before the roof is put on it, or of a suit of clothes before you sew up the seams, because the engineers themselves who have charge of the Ohio River improvements in their reports state that the progress has not been sufficient yet to enable them to tell the extent of the improvement in commerce that may be made on the Ohio River after it has been completed.

Originally this project contemplated the building of 54 locks and dams between Pittsburgh and Cairo. The Ohio River can not be considered as a canalized project until the last lock and dam is completed between Mound City and Cairo, Ill. The report of the committee and the report of the engineers state that it takes something like four years to build a lock and dam on the Ohio River, and the figures show that as we go down the stream and the stream becomes wider and wider, until it empties into the Mississippi River, it takes more money to build those locks and dams, and it takes proportionately more time to construct them.

Inasmuch as it takes four or five years to complete one of these locks and dams on the Ohio River, it does not take much of a stretch of the imagination to conceive the idea that the Government ought to begin the construction of these locks and dams in the lower Ohio as soon as possible, in order that the river may be canalized from its source to its mouth.

When this project was inaugurated it was contemplated to have it completed by 1922, with the expenditure of something like \$60,000,000. Unless the appropriation provided for in this paragraph of \$5,000,000 be used for the continuation of the locks already under construction, and for beginning six additional locks nearer the mouth of the river, as contemplated in the Engineers' report, not only will it not be possible to complete this canalization by 1922 but it will be impossible to complete it by 1930 or 1932, because if we are to fall behind the promise of Congress made to the people of the Ohio Valley and the cities along the valley in 1910 what hope have we that future Congresses will not continue to decrease the appropriation so as to dwindle along and spread the canalization of this great stream out over a quarter of a century? Because, as I said in connection with the improvement of the Cumberland River, boats can not run between Cairo and Cincinnati now on an average more than four or five or, at the very outside, six months in the year. I can remember a time when steamships plied the Ohio River and the Mississippi River from Memphis to Cincinnati two, three, and four times a week, making round trips between those cities on the Mississippi and the Ohio River, loaded to the guards with freight every trip they made. Why is it that those boats have been taken off the river? Because they find more profitable navigation in other streams where they can run the year round; and it would be a fool who would invest hundreds of thousands of dollars in the construction of boats and in the equipment of vessels for navigation and be unable to carry on that work for more than six months in the year. Men want to invest their money in enterprises they can operate all the time instead of half the time. And in view of the fact that on this great river, which, after it has been completed, will furnish navigation to the depth of 9 feet for every month in the year, we may hope that there will be a renewal of traffic along the Ohio River not only for coal but for wheat, corn, lumber, and manufactured products coming from Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and Louisville, at the falls of the great Ohio River, or down by Evansville, Paducah, and Cairo, out into the Mississippi River down to the port of New Orleans, and then by steamer through the Panama Canal, which will be one of the greatest boons to trade, and to the development of our country, when it has been completed and its navigation has been assured, that could possibly happen to that

great and fertile section. This is not a temporary improvement, but when this great river has been canalized it will be an improvement that will last for one hundred, two hundred, or an indefinite period of years, insuring, as population increases and as each acre of land is compelled to support more people than it did before, facilities for the transportation of all our commerce. [Applause.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, of course I do not believe that this House will for a moment seriously consider the question of striking out this appropriation of \$5,000,000 for the Ohio River, and I have grave doubts as to whether the gentleman from Wisconsin is really serious in advocating it. I have no quarrel with the gentleman from Wisconsin. I think he is performing a useful public service in calling the attention of the country to the river and harbor bill. Surely no one could object to the shedding of full light upon every project contained in this bill, whether he is personally interested in it or not; and if a serious flaw should be developed in any one of them, no man ought to oppose its being stricken out.

But in this proposition, whether urged seriously or not, the gentleman from Wisconsin is open to the charge of inconsistency. Only yesterday he strongly advocated—at least by implication—the completion of the Ohio River improvement. He eulogized Col. Townsend as the foremost authority on inland waterways in the country, and, after pronouncing his eulogy, declared that Col. Townsend advocated only two of the larger projects. In response to a question I asked him, he replied that one of these two was the Ohio River.

This project stands on a little different footing from any other. It is a complete canalization proposition, for the completion of which within 12 years the United States Government solemnly pledged its word 6 years ago. The question of the present commerce on the Ohio is not essentially determinative of whether the progress of the work so far is or is not a success. We often say that no chain is stronger than its weakest link. By analogy it would be fair to say that the effect upon commerce of the Ohio River improvement is not to be finally decided until the last lock and dam of the 53 is finished. Until then there will not be a 9-foot stage of water in the Ohio River.

But if, as the gentleman from Wisconsin says, the present commerce is a material question, I desire to refer here to a decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission, reported on the 2d of last March. This decision involved class and commodity rates between St. Louis, East St. Louis, and other Ohio River points, and between Ohio River points themselves, and among other things it held, as reported in the syllabus:

Water competition justifies departures from the long-and-short haul rule of the fourth section in rates between points on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, and relief should be granted to the extent prescribed in the report.

During the course of the decision the following language appears:

The record shows that boat lines are operating between St. Louis, East St. Louis, and Ohio River crossings, and that the traffic moving by water is important in amount. It is shown by the evidence that the waterways throughout the territory involved afford not only potential competition but actual competition.

And, further:

There can be no doubt from the evidence that the water competition on both the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers is active in controlling and that the rail rates between the water points have been set at a lower level than they might reasonably be were it not for the effect of this water competition.

Admitting, for the sake of argument, that some doubt may exist as to the permanent and final value of Government investment in the canalization of inland waterways, that is only an additional argument for the speedy completion of the Ohio River improvement. If this shall prove a failure, then no such project can be a success. It is then the part of true economy to proceed as speedily as possible with this improvement, and we of the Ohio Valley are confident in the hope and expectation that it will stand the test.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, the item carried in this bill is \$5,000,000 for the further completion of the project adopted by Congress in 1910. I have no criticism to offer on the gentleman from Wisconsin. I think, in a measure, he is doing this country a splendid work. If there can be any better plan evolved for the improvement of inland waterways and the improvement of rivers and harbors, the people of the country can do it and can only do it by first getting the information and bringing that

information to Congress. I do not believe that he considers for one moment that his motion will prevail to strike out the item. I am not here to criticize this great committee. It is not for me to say that any item carried in the bill is not worthy of consideration; but I do believe that of all the items carried in this bill that is worthy of consideration one of the most worthy is the canalization of the Ohio River.

Surrounded by all the natural resources that go to make up a great country and a great Nation, the people starting with the splendid and magnificent coal mines of western Pennsylvania, with the easy access and easy reach of iron ores mined in that section of the country, it flows on through the richest valley in the world, not outrivalled in riches and prosperity and happiness by even the valley of the ancient Nile.

Mr. Chairman, the question of transportation to-day, in my judgment, is the most serious question confronting the American people. It is of far more importance than the trusts, the tariff, or the financial questions combined. It is so important that the President of the United States, in his annual message early in December, called attention to it and advised Congress to create a commission to study the railroad-transportation problem. I rejoice to know that the great committee of this House which has jurisdiction of that has already reported a bill, now on the calendar awaiting its final passage, to study that identical question. Already our great harbors in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Chicago are crowded with commodities, consisting of produce of the farm, the commodities dug out of the mines, commodities manufactured by various manufacturing concerns of the country. And while the President did not recommend the study of internal improvements in rivers and harbors, yet it is so correlated with the question of railroad transportation and goes hand in hand with it that I hope when the committee is appointed to study the question of transportation it will widen and broaden its power so as to give it authority to study the question of inland transportation of commodities upon our rivers and harbors.

It is a well-known fact that with the improvement of the Ohio River we are in close touch with the Panama Canal. We can transport commodities down the Ohio, down the Mississippi into the Gulf of Mexico, far cheaper than they can be transported by rail to the eastern coast and taken by ships around to the Panama Canal.

I happen to know from personal experience that the Ohio River has had something to do with decreasing freight rates. The little city in which I live is quite a manufacturing center for furniture.

It manufactures office desks. It is 25 miles from the Ohio River and is situated upon the Southern Railway. The city of Tell City, having a population of 4,000, is a great manufacturing center chiefly engaged in manufacturing furniture, and a part of the furniture it manufactures is office desks. The manufacture of desks in the city of Tell City, only 25 miles from Jasper, can ship its desks to any point in the United States at a rate of 25 cents per desk cheaper than the Jasper manufacturer of desks can ship his desks to the same point in the United States. And the city of Tell City is situated upon the Southern Railway, the same as the city of Jasper. This gives to the Tell City manufacturer a decided advantage over the Jasper manufacturer, and the same condition is true on the Ohio River wherever they have water transportation. This is no fault of the manufacturers living upon the Ohio River. It is their fortune to be so situated as to have competition between water and railway transportation. What is true in these instances, and in these localities, is true all over the United States with but few if any exceptions. When the project is completed, as I hope it will be soon, there is no doubt but what river transportation will multiply quick and fast over what it is now or has been for many years in the past, because business will naturally go to points and places where transportation is cheapest and where it can get good terminal facilities.

Mr. BARCHFELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I believe in internal improvements at the expense of the Government. I always have believed that the Government was justified in that sort of an expenditure. The construction of railroads, of canals, and the improvement of rivers and harbors are legitimate if they increase the business of the people of the country. I do not speak now as representing any district that impinges on the Ohio River which this item

proposes to improve. I neither speak as one interested in this particular project, for I am no more interested in this than in other projects, therefore I am free to say that there are some items in this bill that I have not indorsed, and when the opportunity was offered to vote against them I have voted against them. Motions have been made to strike out objectionable items, or at least they so appeared to me. I voted to strike them out. I do not say that in criticism of the committee. I know something of the representations of the claims pressed upon the committee. I doubt not that the committee has done the best it could in presenting its bill here. But that is not of itself a justification of its adoption as a whole. It seems to me that some of the items ought to have been omitted by a vote of the Committee of the Whole, and if not by the committee, then by the House.

On this particular item of the Ohio River I can assure myself in my own way of thinking that while the commerce now is not very great, for indeed the commerce for the year 1914 is just a little more than the combined commerce that is mentioned here in these various projects on the lake that impinges on my own State, that fact would indicate that this wonderful river with the possibilities it seems to me it has—that the commerce is nothing at all now to what it would be under proper canalization. The Ohio River presents all the conditions which under proper improvement are necessary for a great route for transportation. What makes a great transportation line are the termini, not only river transportation but railroad as well. I happen to live on one of the trunk lines connecting New York and Chicago, and I have frequently called the attention of students to the growth of the towns along the railroad trunk lines as compared with the growth of the towns along the Ohio River.

The growth of the former is greater than that of the latter, taking the same number of years. I can understand in a way why that is. The rapid transit and greater convenience of delivery may have something to do with it, speaking now especially of a trunk line such as the great western lines. However, as compared with the Ohio River the Ohio River is not, and never has been, in a condition in which it could be utilized in such a way that it could compete with the railroad lines, and it will not be until this project is completed. That does not mean that it will not be able to compete when it is ready to do so. When you think of the territory through which this river runs, the number of States rich in natural resources upon which millions of people rely, the character of the soil in the territory through which it runs, the productive capacity of this region will suggest transportation possibilities of this river. When you measure the distance from Pittsburgh down to New Orleans—over 2,000 miles—you have not yet taken in all of the route, because when this canalization project is completed the utilization of the upper Mississippi will be a part of the route, just as it will be of the lower Mississippi. It will make possible a water transit yet unknown to this country. Vast areas of rich country, great populations widely separated make transportation facilities available. The 30,000,000 people who live in juxtaposition to this river line, located in widely separated centers, suggest the necessity of this route. Think of the center of a half million or more people in Pittsburgh, and the center of another half million 500 miles or a little less down the river at Cincinnati, and then another center a little over a hundred miles farther down at Louisville, and then still farther on down another center, while you do not touch St. Louis on the downward trip you will make her a part of this wonderful center of distribution along that water line, and then on down to the mouth of the river to what surely must become a great southern metropolis—New Orleans. When we think of all of these centers of possibilities, I think I am justified in quoting the language of the first great President of this Nation when he was urging the country to build a system of canals to connect the upper waters of the Potomac with the upper waters of the Monongahela. He said, in substance, you will start a stream of civilization by a great inland water route, the like of which the history of the world has not yet seen. Washington saw the value of the water routes, though, of course, he would see it then with a little different interest than what we do now, because they did not have the railroad facilities at that time; but I believe, my friends, that here is a project which when completed will have all of the conditions to make a wonderful thoroughfare for transportation beyond the dreams of our first great President.

Mr. PARKER of New York. Was not that true of the Erie Canal?

Mr. FESS. Yes; and that will be by way of correction. That was true of the Erie Canal. It was started really before the railroads were completed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And that connected the Great Lakes with the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. FESS. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I would vote without any hesitation for an improvement like we are making at the Soo Canal. I have just been looking over the wonderful commerce that goes through that waterway. It is vastly beyond what we now have on the Ohio. I would vote without a moment's hesitation for an improvement such as we are making at New York, for I believe that that is not only justifiable from the standpoint of the coast, but from the standpoint of the inland States. The growth of any great center is of importance to my State, because it is important to the Nation, and what helps the one helps the other. Likewise I will vote for improvement of the Delaware, because of great trade that passes over it. I will vote for any project that has promise of great inland water-borne commerce, whether on the rivers which run to the sea or to the Lakes, whether for cities on the seacoast, Lakes, Gulf, or rivers, and I will do it in case I live upon either or in case I live upon neither, but beyond a State that is bordered by either, because I believe it is a good policy for this Government to pursue. The one thing needful in this legislation is to separate the worthy from the unworthy projects. Therefore, I rise simply to say that while there are some items in this bill that ought not to be in it, there are projects that call loudly for the support of this House, whether we have an inclination to criticize the general work or not.

If the opportunity is afforded to report this measure, either directly from the committee or by way of recommitment, omitting items clearly of questionable value and including those only of unquestioned worth, I shall give my support most willingly. It is most unfortunate to load down the bill with such items and compel their adoption at the cost of defeat of the valuable items. There must be some way to avoid this sort of legislation. It gives some color to the already too well pronounced suspicion of the country of the sincerity and character of the Congress—a suspicion that I do not believe is warranted.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to note that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FEAR] concedes that the Ohio River proposition is a worthy one, and that he admits beyond question that the Monongahela has been a worthy one. I have no doubt that in a few years to come—the next 5 or 6 or 10 years—he will concede that many of the propositions that he has been criticizing in the last two or three days down in the Southland are equally as worthy as the Monongahela and the Ohio. Last May I had an opportunity to take advantage of the invitation to the committee to visit the wonderful region on the Tennessee from Knoxville down to Sheffield, Ala. While I do not profess to be much of a prophet, yet I came to the conclusion at that time—and I believe now—that that will be the second Pittsburgh region of this country. The Tennessee is 652 miles long. The Government, I think, up to this time has expended something like \$11,000,000 upon it, and the people at Chattanooga and one man, who has since died in New York, put \$10,000,000 in one dam across the Tennessee River. That dam is something like 48 feet high, and is called the Brady Dam; and I simply call attention to this in order to direct the attention of those who voted for the 25 per cent proposition of Representative Goon, upon the estimated cost, to the fact that when they started in to build this dam it was thought it would cost two and a half millions of dollars or less; but before they got through with it it cost \$10,000,000; and the larger part of that money—something like seven or eight million dollars—was put up by Mr. Brady, of New York City, showing that private interests had confidence in the Tennessee River. I believe that to be a worthy project.

I do not know that it is necessary to say much more about the commerce on the Ohio River, but I have in my hand here a home paper, the Gallipolis Tribune, of Gallipolis, Ohio, under date of April 4, and it states in that paper that at the Island Creek coal terminal, near Huntington, W. Va., to which I referred in my speech made here about six weeks or two months ago, the Pittsburgh Coal Co. has one contract, to load for delivery on the Mississippi, of 400,000 tons of coal. As to the benefit that this will be to those along the river, I will say that there is a chair factory in my town, about 250 miles from Pittsburgh, and when the packets are running chairs and furniture manufactured in my town can be sent by boat to Pittsburgh and put on the floor of the furniture stores in Pittsburgh in less time than you can send it there by rail. What is true in that instance will be true, of course, when we come to send the freight to Cincinnati. The gentleman has spoken on occasions of the fact that there are not many craft on the river. The Department of Commerce furnished me the following statement: Steam tugs, 202 in number, with a tonnage of 33,420 tons;

and there are also steamboats to the number of 129 and gas towing tugs to the number of 110 upon the Ohio River.

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

Mr. LIEB. Mr. Chairman, in a minority report made by my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], a member of this committee, he tries to make you believe that tonnage on the Ohio River is only about 2,000,000. I would like to read a quotation from his report:

Less than 100,000 tons of continuous commerce now remains, apart from soft coal, that has always floated downstream, reaching in 1914 between 1,000,000 and 2,000,000 tons of continuous traffic.

Now, in this report here he is trying to make this House believe that the entire commerce is only 2,000,000 tons. Why, the Kanawha River alone brought down 1,700,000 tons, which was towed into and down the Ohio River. I ask here to insert the commercial statistics which have been kept by the Government engineers and can be inspected at the department.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIEB. The following are the statistics referred to:

The nature of the commerce in recent years remains about the same, and no material change in lines of transportation has been made so far as known. About 45.5 per cent of the tonnage for the calendar year 1914 was coal and the remainder miscellaneous freight.

	Short tons.	Value.	Passengers.
Partcalendar year 1912 (Apr. 1 to Dec. 31):			
Through locks and open river.....	6,998,747.3	\$34,617,358.81	1,203,674
Ferries.....	1,619,621.7	36,446,870.87	2,628,615
Total.....	8,618,369.0	71,064,229.68	3,832,289
Calendar year 1913:			
Through locks and open river.....	8,412,603.8	40,940,511.71	1,320,952
Ferries.....	1,401,519.5	36,086,390.07	2,949,834
Total.....	9,814,123.3	77,026,901.78	4,270,786
Calendar year 1914:			
Through locks and open river.....	7,589,161.5	38,068,685.74	1,307,728
Ferries.....	1,941,148.0	55,225,794.14	2,648,183
Total.....	9,530,309.5	93,294,479.88	3,955,911

It has been charged on this floor that the construction of locks and dams on the Ohio has resulted in no reduction of freight rates. As assertions of this character might have a tendency to be misleading, I again wish to quote from the report of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, as follows:

Effect of improvement: The work of canalization of the Ohio River is not sufficiently advanced to have any appreciable effect on freight rates, but the probable results of the improvement are discussed at some length in House Document No. 492, Sixtieth Congress, first session. The great future benefit of the improvement will be felt only when the slack-water system has been extended far enough downstream to permit of continuous navigation at all times (except when interfered with by floods or ice) over a considerable section of the river. It should be noted, however, that a comparison of the cost of delivery of Monongahela River coal by rail and by river to points in the pools above Dam No. 6, where slack water has been available for a number of years, shows a saving of from 30 to 50 cents a ton in favor of water transportation.

Proposed operations: It is expected that the funds available July 1, 1915, will be exhausted June 30, 1916. It is proposed to apply the funds for which estimate is made in continuing the construction of Locks and Dams Nos. 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 24, 29, 31, 35, 39, 41, 43, and 48, for which \$4,450,000 will be required, and commencing the construction of six additional locks and dams, which will cost \$6,300,000. Since the construction of a lock and dam will require about four years, it is not necessary that more than \$5,000,000 be made immediately available, but the remainder of the amount estimated, viz, \$5,750,000, should, for economical work, be covered by a continuing-contract authorization.

Now, the total amount of tonnage on the Ohio River is 9,530,300 tons. You can see from Mr. FREAR's report, heretofore referred to, that he is trying to belittle the Ohio River. All this is a matter of record. Here is the report. Here are the statistics of the engineers, and I say that the gentleman has made a statement which is untrue.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIEB. I will not yield. My time is limited. The records are here, and the gentleman can examine them for himself.

Mr. FREAR. I have them.

Mr. LIEB. Well, they are here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LIEB. I ask for one minute more.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has no time to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thought I had 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DIXON] has five minutes, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] five minutes additional, and the gentleman now speaking has used five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has spoken before this division.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has spoken five minutes more.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the gentleman will permit me, my five minutes was not taken out of any arrangement for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that 15 minutes have been used out of the time, but without objection the gentleman from Indiana may proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. LIEB. I will read an article from the Evansville (Ind.) Courier that was printed on March 30, 1916, as follows:

FIRST BARGE TO PASS CITY APRIL 6—NEW FREIGHT CARRIER COMPLETED AND WILL MAKE MAIDEN TRIP TO NEW ORLEANS.

The first of the self-propelled barges to be operated on the Ohio by the Inland Navigation Co. will pass Evansville April 6 or 7 on her maiden trip to New Orleans. This is the information brought to the city yesterday by Givin Fowler, freight agent for the new river transportation company. Mr. Fowler talked to Evansville shippers yesterday. The barge is named *Inco No. 1* and is of 1,500 tons capacity. Two other barges, one of 2,000 tons and one of 3,000 tons, are building in the Jeffersonville yards.

Fourteen men are required to operate each barge. The company's plans call for 36 of these barges, which can operate on a minimum draft of 3½ feet when the river is low. The freight for the first trip amounts to three times the barge's capacity, says Mr. Fowler, one shipment of 3,000 bathtubs for New Orleans being refused. Evansville shippers, by using the new barge line, can put freight on board direct for New Orleans.

Each barge is equipped with a steel weatherproof cargo box and is propelled by means of four internal-combustion engines. This quadrupling of power makes it practically immune against a breakdown, and since the cooking and heating are done by electricity and all lighting is electric, there is no fire on board. This not only makes the barge a very safe carrier but also gives a low insurance rate, which is carried by the company.

The barge is further equipped with four watertight bulkheads, dividing it into five compartments. She is further equipped with wireless, permitting constant communication with headquarters. It is also equipped with an electric traveling crane with a telescopic boom, which may be extended outboard on either side for as many as 70 feet, enabling it to lift a load of 3 tons at a time.

It is expected at first to maintain a three-weekly service between St. Louis and New Orleans, and as each additional barge shall be completed, the frequency of the service will be increased accordingly.

The company expects to be able to carry freight to and from the river by rail, issuing in each instance a through bill of lading, absorbing loading and unloading charges, switching charges, car rental, and the like; the bill of lading to also cover insurance. Thus shipments are insured from the moment they are received until they are delivered.

The rates of freight will be, in round numbers, about 75 per cent of the all-rail rates, and in some cases less.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor of refuge at Grand Marais, Mich.: For maintenance, \$10,000.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Ohio River.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, in two former Congresses I have spoken at length upon the Ohio River improvement, and there are few things I can add to my former statements or in addition to what has been said here this afternoon; and I observe that no one, outside of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], has had aught to say against this great improvement.

At this time capitalists from my own State are arranging to build additional tipples at Huntington for handling Guyan Valley coal; also to build barges in which to transport the coal to markets down the Ohio and Mississippi and to supply the tributaries of these rivers.

It is also worthy of most careful note that contracts have been prepared providing for the construction of 150 steel barges of not less than 2,000 tons capacity for the transportation of coal to New Orleans and the Panama Canal.

These boats will be ready when the Government has executed its contract to give a dependable stage of 9 feet from Pittsburgh to Cairo.

I append a statement showing the number of vessels now operating on the river, together with the gross tonnage of each, as furnished by the Bureau of Navigation.

Vessels of the United States documented on June 30, 1915, at the ports of Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Louisville, Evansville, Paducah, and Cairo.

Port.	Steam towing.		All other steam.		Gas towing.		All other gas.		Barges.		Total.	
	Number of vessels.	Gross tons.	Number.	Gross.	Number.	Gross.	Number.	Gross.	Number.	Gross.	Number.	Gross.
Pittsburgh.....	115	22,782	47	7,599	31	330	45	468	17	1,264	255	32,443
Cincinnati.....	31	4,930	31	7,631	38	404	24	292	5	436	129	13,691
Louisville.....	22	2,084	27	3,540	24	314	55	612	3	93	131	6,643
Evansville.....	20	1,959	16	3,143	10	143	45	923	7	639	98	6,807
Paducah.....	11	1,519	5	510	7	67	26	264	3	410	52	2,770
Cairo.....	3	146	3	734	29	291	1	447	36	1,618
Total.....	202	33,420	129	23,157	110	1,258	224	2,850	36	3,289	701	63,974

The above table does not include, of course, the number and tonnage of many barges, undoubtedly, which are engaged in carrying coal and not under document.

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

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

This morning when that matter was up as to whether or not the Galveston sea wall was a new or old project, request for unanimous consent was made to return to that item and that was objected to by the chairman of the committee on the ground, as he stated, that the matter had been thoroughly debated yesterday. I desire to take exception to that statement in the fact that there was practically no debate whatsoever as to whether or not it was or was not a new item. The question was asked the chairman whether it was or was not, and he said it was, and we in the House here accepted his statement in good faith.

But, it has been very thoroughly proven that it was a new project, and therefore we should have had an opportunity to return to the item with that information before us and consider it from that standpoint. I do not understand why that permission was not granted. I maintain there was no discussion before the House whether it was a new project or not. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. EAGLE] was very frank in his statement when he said that he did not himself know whether it was or not.

Now, I want to submit this fact further, Mr. Chairman, that we not only had no discussion of the question of whether it was a new project or not, but when one of these four times under the special report was adopted in 1913 there was absolutely no discussion of it then. The item under which the chairman and the men advocating this appropriation claimed that the whole project was adopted—and it was not, and he can not prove it and no other man can—was part of the special report made to Congress on February 11, 1913, and on February 18, 1913, that separate item for the channel to Texas City went into the bill in the Senate without a particle of discussion, and was agreed to in conference here. The item has never been before this House.

Mr. BURGESS. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. TREADWAY. No; let the gentleman prove that I am mistaken. I wish the gentleman would. He is the one gentleman that I would like to hear argue this point. The gentleman sits by and does not argue the point; perhaps he will tell how it was voted into the bill in the committee; but we do not hear the gentleman from Texas getting up on the floor and explaining these provisions or when the project was adopted.

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

Mr. TREADWAY. No; not now. I hope the gentleman will take his own time and prove to this House that I am mistaken. He is the one man I would like to have prove it—but in his own time. I have only five minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. No; I can not yield now, but I am very glad that for once I have gotten a rise out of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS]. He is mighty good in getting "pork" provisions into the bill in the committee, but not in defending them on the floor. But we are not bringing up questions of "pork" now. We are debating the question whether the Galveston sea wall is a new item or not, and I maintain that it is new, and that it was not considered as an adopted project.

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

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the motion to strike out.

When the Ohio River item was before the House I thought I had arranged with the chairman of the Committee on Rivers

and Harbors that I should participate to the extent of five minutes in the discussion of that item, although I did not propose to speak in opposition to the item of \$5,500,000 for the improvement of the Ohio River. But I did desire to avail myself of the opportunity at that time to make a comparison between the amount of money which has been expended and which is being appropriated for the Ohio River in this bill and the amount which has been expended and appropriated in this bill for the East River in New York.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on page 274 of the report of the chairman of the committee it is shown that the total number of short tons on the Ohio River is 9,530,000, having a value of \$93,000,000, and the total number of passengers carried on that river during the year 1915 was 3,955,000. Within that same period of time upon the East River in New York the total amount of commerce was 46,533,000 short tons, having the value of \$1,537,239,000, and the number of passengers carried on the East River during the year 1915 was 22,436,000.

Mr. BURGESS. Over the ferries?

Mr. HULBERT. No; not over the ferries. The people of New York go across the East River on the four bridges, which were built at the expense of the city, at an expense of \$100,000,000. That is the way we make improvements in the city of New York, and that is not the way the Federal Government makes them in the city of New York.

In the period from 1868, when the project for the improvement of the East River was adopted—and I quote from page 30 of the chairman's report—there has been appropriated by the Federal Government \$6,104,000, while during the same time there has been appropriated by the State of New York and by the city of New York and by local interests in the city of New York a total of \$39,235,859. And upon the Hudson River, I want to tell this House that in all the time you have been making those \$850,000,000 of appropriations all over the United States you have not given a million dollars to the Hudson River at New York City—not a million dollars in all the time that you have been appropriating; and yet, within that same period, the State and city and the local interests in New York have contributed for the improvement of the Hudson River \$105,504,217.05.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] stated the other day that he understood my colleague [Mr. BENNET] to say that the amount expended was not \$105,000,000 but \$203,000; and that illustrates the care which some gentlemen give to the consideration of some of the items affecting New York, because the \$260,000—not \$203,000—that my colleague spoke of was money to be appropriated, not for the improvement of the Hudson River, but for the East River, and it was a single item representing the contribution that the city of New York had to agree to make last year in order that it might get the Federal Government to contribute half of that amount for the improvement of Coenties Reef. [Applause]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor at Muskegon, Mich.: For maintenance, \$7,500.

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

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I notice, Mr. Chairman, by reading the report of the committee and quoting from the report of the engineers, that whereas \$12,500 is recommended for the maintenance and dredging of the harbor of Muskegon, the committee recommends and the bill contains only \$7,500. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee why this reduction in the recommendation was made.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That reduction was made on the recommendation of Col. Taylor, from the office of the Chief of Engineers. I will say to the gentleman that we had Col. Taylor with us quite frequently while framing the bill and whenever we considered his presence necessary. It was he who made the recommendation regarding each item where the amount of the estimate was increased or reduced. When we reached this item he stated that the project could get along with \$7,500 instead of the larger amount.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In the figures contained in the report, the figures furnished by the engineers, \$7,500, the total of this appropriation, is to be used and is thought necessary for the use of one dredge, *General Meade*. Now, if the engineers are to do any work at that harbor except dredging—dredging at the beginning of the season and to keep it dredged during the year—it will be necessary to have more money than is provided, because that entire amount is for the operation of one dredge.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They have, or did have when this item was inserted in the bill, an amount of money on hand. As I said a moment ago, when we reached that item Col. Taylor, who had gone over the estimates very carefully, stated that the amount we have appropriated here was all that we needed for the purposes of the maintenance of that harbor.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I was hoping, Mr. Chairman, that the committee would make an appropriation for the improvement of that harbor and the repair of it. I called the attention of the committee to it when a former bill was being prepared. There is a gap on the one side of the pier, where the waves, coming in from the lake and reaching that point, spread out and are tearing away portions of one of the streets of the city.

I was told at first that the committee paid no attention to damages of that kind, and that the expense of them must be borne by the municipalities themselves. But the same bill carried appropriations for repairing highways that had been damaged as a result of harbor improvement, or by the action of water at harbors that were improved and maintained at the expense of the Government; and I was hoping that this appropriation might be large enough to enable the engineers to make some improvement to stop the damage which results from the defective work and from the failure to fill the gap. It would take only a few hundred dollars to make that improvement, and even if money enough for dredging is available, it seems to me there ought to be a slight increase, so that the damage to this street of which I have spoken may be repaired and further damage prevented, a line of work which the chairman of the committee and other members of the committee now say is proper. A suggestion on my part to that effect made some time ago was rejected, but now members of the committee approve it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall be glad to answer the gentleman in so far as I can. I do not just understand the gentleman's complaint. That is, I do not understand his statement regarding the class of work he thinks ought to be done there, and that he says we are not doing.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. This harbor is a passageway between Lake Michigan and Lake Muskegon, with piers on each side of the channel, which is about a mile long. At one place in the south pier there is an opening. There has never been any pier there. The waves come in from Lake Michigan, and, rolling along the channel, when they reach this gap they break and spread out.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Was that gap left by the Government in the original work it did there?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It has never been filled. I do not know whether the original project included the filling up of that gap or not, but it is there; and the effect of the waves is what I have stated to the gentleman. There is a street of the city that runs probably from 50 to 100 feet south of the south line of the channel, and the waves coming to that opening spread out and tear away the street. An effort has been made to have the Government take care of it, but for want of an appropriation it has not been done, and the expense has been borne by the city.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me ask the gentleman to what extent have the parties interested made any effort to have the Government take care of the matter?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I have not lately appeared before the committee, because I have understood that that kind of work

was not provided for, and that where the Government makes an improvement and damage results to municipal property the Government pays no attention to it. But last year this bill carried a provision for repairs to a highway injured by a waterway in the State of Florida. At that time I called attention to what I believed to be a discrimination.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think that was something quite different from this matter to which the gentleman is referring. In the Florida case the Government cut a channel across a highway that belonged to the county. It was a county highway, and the Federal Government has always made good that kind of damage; and it ought to do it. Now, I am not clear as to whether the work that the gentleman wants done is a class of work that Congress has been accustomed to appropriate for; but I would like to suggest to the gentleman that if he thinks it ought to be done by the Government he have a survey and examination made by the War Department through the engineers, and let a report be made to Congress, and then we will know just what ought to be done and how much it will cost.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It seems to me when the attention of the committee is called to it, and the result is known, the committee ought to take some action.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the gentleman has admitted that he has not called anyone's attention to it before this.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I have called attention to it before, and I think if the amount of this appropriation were left as first recommended by the engineers it would be sufficient to enable the Government to make those repairs. It needs only a little sheet piling.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There might be plenty of money, but unless the engineers were authorized to use it in that way it would not be used.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. If it is put in there with the understanding that it is to be used for that purpose, without the specific direction—

Mr. SPARKMAN. We can not make appropriations in that way, I will say to my friend. We must have the estimate of the engineers and know where it is to be used. Otherwise we might find ourselves involved in expenditures that would reach up into the millions.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In the particular matter that I have called to the attention of the committee I dislike to see the appropriation for dredging reduced, because I know how often they are short of money for that purpose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would have no objection to increasing it if the engineers would tell us they need it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ship channel connecting waters of the Great Lakes between Chicago, Duluth, and Buffalo: For maintenance of improvement through Lake St. Clair, \$25,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am very glad this appropriation is being made for this ship channel connecting the waters of the Great Lakes between Chicago, Duluth, and Buffalo, because it makes a connecting link through the existing Erie Canal with the Hudson River and the Atlantic Ocean. If all the coastal waterways were connected, it would not only bring the Great Lakes to the sea but would also connect up with the Atlantic coast inland to Florida. Some gentlemen have ridiculed the idea of the intercoastal waterway, but they always do it in good humor and through lack of information. Our distinguished and eloquent historian from Ohio, Dr. Fess, has referred to the broad view of George Washington more than 100 years ago, in contemplation of a western development through waterway arteries. It may be said that the same illustrious American foresaw the possibilities of the opening up of the channels along the Atlantic seaboard; because in his day the present great West was unknown, and anything beyond the Mississippi was feared, not only in the commercial but also in the pioneer sense. It was George Washington who surveyed Lake Drummond, which feeds the water into the Dismal Swamp Canal to-day—a rather phenomenal condition which even some of our scientific friends have not explained. The waters of Lake Drummond, surveyed by Washington with a view to establishing a canal in that section, are 20 feet or so above the canal itself, so that a natural and steady flow is assured by nature to the canal supplying a valuable aid to transportation between the North with the South.

For many years—nearly a century—the old Dismal Swamp Canal has been in operation. The serviceability of the old canal is underestimated by some, because the only information they

have is derived from Tom Moore's beautiful poem of "The Firefly Lamp." An odd basis for refusing appropriations with respect to a great public improvement, yet it is about equal to the wisdom of those who, when I came here 10 years ago would curtail appropriations for the Delaware River on the ground that all they knew about it was due a picture of George Washington crossing the Delaware to capture the Hessians at Trenton. And yet it is by such arguments as these that our great commercial interests are sometimes determined in the House.

We have now come to the connecting link of the Great Lakes, and I call the attention of our Great Lakes' friends to the fact that by reason of this connecting link of the Great Lakes they are connected with the Atlantic Ocean by the Erie Canal, which the State of New York alone constructed, beginning back in 1812, when the Congress of the United States, acting very much as it does with respect to some of the waterways improvements today, refused to join in the great enterprise. It was that Erie Canal which made it possible to develop the great West, and which did develop the metropolis of New York, which in prior days was not in the running with the first maritime city of the Nation—Philadelphia. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Cox). The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a few observations about this bill before it is passed, and it is probably as appropriate for me to make them now while the Michigan items are under consideration as at any time.

It seems to me that Prof. Moulton in his work on "Waterways versus Railways" arrives at a correct conclusion and announces the principle which ought to govern Congress in enacting rivers and harbors legislation when he declares that "waterway development in the United States must at best be confined to a few particular projects where conditions combine in a very favorable manner." This bill does not, in my opinion, follow that principle and for that reason I shall vote against it.

This bill is a depleted Treasury, war times rivers and harbors appropriation bill, yet it carries 271 items of appropriation, aggregating a total of nearly \$40,000,000, besides authorizing 84 surveys in order to provide an additional supply upon which to expend the Government money in the future should by any chance any of the present rivers and harbors become exhausted for that purpose.

If one-half of the statements in the minority report and of the critics of the bill made on the floor of the House about the extravagance and waste of these appropriations is true, then the bill ought not to pass and there should be a radical change in the policy of the Government, as far as rivers and harbors legislation is concerned. I doubt if this or any similar bill could pass if it was not for the fact that it carries an appropriation for so many different congressional districts and the natural dislike of the Members representing those districts to vote against it on that account. In fact, it carries an appropriation, recommended by the engineers, for a harbor in the district which I represent, but I do not think that I should be called upon to swallow a \$40,000,000 appropriation for that reason or that the people of the district want me to do so. I know of no way to stop the practice as exemplified in this bill unless the majority of the Members of Congress stand out against it.

In my opinion a large part of the money expended by the Government in the past on inland rivers, especially in order to stimulate navigation upon them, has been wasted. This is evidenced by the fact that in many cases after spending several hundreds and sometimes millions of dollars in order to make them navigable they are now totally abandoned.

I do not believe that appropriations for the improvement of rivers and harbors generally on the scale in which they have been made for the last few years can be justified any longer on the plea that they are an aid to navigation. Notwithstanding the enormous and ever-increasing size of these appropriations, the evidence is practically universal that the commerce on our rivers is gradually and constantly diminishing, and the best students of the question seem to be in general accord on the proposition that the tendency will be the same in the future. Modern conditions of transportation do not seem to

permit of inland river traffic. There are many reasons why that is so. Among them are the cost of construction and maintenance; the lack of uniformity in the depth of rivers and canals; the limited territory that can be served by river navigation; the fact that it is confined to the natural valleys and the level portions of the country; the cost of transshipment, loading, and reloading; the fact that river navigation in the North, at least, is impossible for several months in the year on account of the ice; the development of our railroads; the necessity for the speedy delivery of most commodities; and the fact that river navigation is confined very largely to such commodities as coal, timber, ore, building material, and so forth. As Prof. Moulton states it:

The ability of the railways to extend their lines to every point of the compass, to develop a very network of branch and spur lines which can carry traffic from the most cut-of-the-way source to any destination whatever, can not be matched by any system of waterways that could be developed.

The extravagance and waste in these appropriations have been such and the commerce on some of our rivers is so small as compared with the annual appropriation for their improvement and maintenance as to justify Mr. Burton, formerly Senator from Ohio, in declaring that it would be cheaper for the Government to buy the commerce on them and burn it than to spend what it does annually for their improvement and maintenance, to say nothing of the comparatively insignificant cost of transportation for carrying that commerce.

I sometimes wonder if Congress, following the lead of previous Congresses, does not get into the habit of voting large appropriations year after year without fully realizing the enormous sums that are actually being appropriated.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. I find 19 items in the bill for the State of Michigan. Will the gentleman point out one of those items that he would be willing to strike out of the bill.

Mr. MAPES. There has not been a single objection to any Michigan item by any Member of the House, and every one was recommended by the engineers. The most of them, such as the appropriation for the improvement of St. Marys River and the harbors on the Great Lakes, can not be compared with the appropriations for a number of the inland rivers in this bill. There is no comparison between the harbors on the Great Lakes and the river legislation carried in this bill.

Mr. BOOHER. Is there a single one—

Mr. MAPES. I can not yield further unless I am given more time.

The \$40,000,000 carried in this bill, for example, to be expended in the next fiscal year, would build 1,000 miles of railroad, at a cost of \$40,000 per mile. It is said that \$850,000,000 have been appropriated by the Government altogether for rivers and harbors, enough, at the same cost, with which to build 21,000 miles of railroads. What is there to show for all this enormous expenditure of money?

The last Congress authorized the building of a railroad in Alaska at a cost of \$25,000,000, a trifling amount as compared with the total amount spent on our rivers and harbors, and a little over one-half the annual appropriation for that purpose.

The creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the different State commissions, with authority to regulate railroad rates, has destroyed the force of the old argument that the possibility of river transportation has a tendency to keep down railroad rates, even though little commerce is actually carried on the rivers. But even if river and harbor appropriations did have a tendency in that direction, \$40,000,000 to \$50,000,000 per year expended on rivers and harbors in addition to the expense of these different commissions would be an enormous amount to pay for railroad regulation. It would be cheaper for the Government to build competing railroads and give them to private individuals to operate. In fact, the maintenance cost of rivers per mile after they are improved, contrary to general belief, is greater than the cost of maintenance of railroads per mile.

I am not opposed to all river and harbor legislation. In fact, I favor the proper expenditure of money by the Federal Government for the improvement of them, but I am opposed to expending it on the rivers and harbors of the country indiscriminately and regardless of whether they can ever be made use of for the purpose of navigation or not. It should be confined to the development of a few "particular projects."

The distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], who is now presiding over this committee, in a very able report, recently made, on the fortifications appropriations bill, calls attention to the act of Congress approved March 3, 1885, which authorized the President to appoint a board to examine and report at what ports in the United States fortifications or other defenses were most urgently required and the character and

kind of defenses best adapted for each. The board authorized by that act of Congress, after making a thorough study and report on the subject, named the 27 different places which in its opinion ought to be fortified. Since that time Congress has had the benefit of the report of two other commissions on that subject, and has followed, in the main, in its fortifications appropriation bills the recommendations of those commissions. As a result the fortifications of the United States are as good as any in the world.

It seems to me that some such commission made up of experts ought to be appointed to study and report the rivers, harbors, and canals in the United States which ought to be improved and for which Congress would be justified in making appropriations, and after receiving such a report Congress should then confine itself in its rivers and harbors appropriation bills to the projects recommended by such a commission. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

St. Marys River at the falls, Michigan: Continuing improvement by the construction of a fourth lock, \$800,000.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee why the bill differs from the recommendation of the engineer. I observe on page 292 that the engineers recommend the expenditure of \$1,300,000 on the fourth lock. The work has been started and I am taking his recommendation for it, and I assume that he knows what he is talking about.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A portion of the \$500,000 is to be taken care of in the sundry civil bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Let me understand the gentleman. The balance of the \$500,000 which does not appear in the bill is to be taken care of in the sundry civil bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. It was not estimated for in this bill, but in the sundry civil bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] proposes that a commission be appointed, a commission to consist of persons other than Army engineers. Let me read what a great expert said concerning a similar proposal. Senator Burton was chairman of the National Waterways Commission, which, in Europe and in America, made an exhaustive study of the question of waterway improvements, and filed its report in the Senate in 1912. On page 78 of its final report—a report which it is well understood was prepared mainly by Senator Burton, its chairman—that commission says:

Numerous propositions have been made for the creation of a board of public works or other body which shall decide upon the feasibility and desirability of propositions for expenditures on rivers and harbors. The commission is unwilling to recommend a change of this kind, and points to the fact that the past recommendations of the Engineer Corps have been carefully prepared and with a degree of expert knowledge and comprehension of the commercial needs of the country which could not well be supplied by any other body or organization. The advantages which attach to the Engineer Corps are obvious. The members are in the permanent service of the Government and are free from those influences which would inevitably be brought to bear upon men in civil life. Those engineers now engaged in the work are carefully trained in the planning and execution of these improvements and have special qualifications for judging the feasibility and the cost of proposed river and harbor projects.

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

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MAPES. Is it not true that under the present system the responsibility is divided between Congress and the Engineers, and do we not in this very bill, in which the committee has reported what is a small number of projects for survey, 87, as called attention to by the minority report, in a great many instances instruct the Engineers to report upon one of two different propositions, thereby making it practically mandatory upon them to report in favor of one of them?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has evaded the proposition somewhat or has failed to notice that in answer to his proposal I read the opinion of the great national commission who traveled over Europe and over this country to study the general subject of river and harbor appropriations, and that they were unanimously and strongly opposed to such a commission as the gentleman advocated in his speech.

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

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Has the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] read that with approval or disapproval?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I read it as the opinion of the distinguished expert on river and harbor improvements, Senator Burton, and his fellow members of the national commission.

Mr. FESS. Is that the gentleman's answer to my question?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. My own idea is that those splendid officers like Col. Taylor and his associates in the office of the Chief of Engineers, and also the other fine men in the Engineer Corps of the United States Army, are just as free from political or other influence, just as dependable to

do what is right as would be such a commission as was proposed here to consist of three gentlemen appointed to Cabinet positions, all members of one party, and all confirmed by the Senate. [Applause.]

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

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does that meet the question of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say—

Mr. FESS rose.

Mr. MAPES. I would like to say that I did not advocate any such commission as the gentleman has suggested.

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

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I want to do that in order to reply to the second question of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] as to whether the bill does not propose that there shall be new surveys. Yes; but that does not require the engineers, after they have made the surveys, to report favorably upon them. On the contrary, the engineers can exercise the discretion which they have heretofore exercised and refuse to recommend for improvement any project which they may have been called upon to survey.

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

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is it not a fact that under the law the engineers are required not to report upon a project in detail or as to the surveying end of it until they have first found that commercially it is desirable?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes; and I thank the gentleman from Illinois for asking the question.

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

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I can not yield now. I want to read what Senator Burton said on another occasion.

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

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I can not yield now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin declines to yield.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Senator Burton addressed the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at its convention in this city in December, 1909. I have here the official report of the proceedings of that convention. Here is what Senator Burton said:

My friends, the president of this congress will say to you that we have known no North, no South, no East, no West in the years we have been together. [Applause.] We have taken up projects according to the measure of their merit, and I can vouch that members of the committee in many instances—

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

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I can not yield now to the gentleman. I want to continue the reading—

and I can vouch that members of the committee in many instances have leaned over backward where their own localities were involved, and have given closer attention to projects in other places.

I have found many observant and intelligent men—

And this applies to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES], as I infer from his remarks—

who have an idea that a very large share of our appropriations go for insignificant creeks and streams. Now, perhaps I might point out the benefit of improving many of these minor streams, a benefit which proportionately is often greater than even in the case of large rivers.

Observe that important statement of the Senator. Referring to the benefit from improving many of these minor streams, he says that it is—

A benefit which proportionately is often greater than even in the case of large rivers.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I can not yield, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MAPES. I would like to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I object, Mr. Chairman. I do not desire to disoblige, but I have a duty to Senator Burton that I wish to perform. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I read further from the speech of Senator Burton to the great waterway convention:

You have had to meet the idea that there is a "pork barrel" somewhere. Whenever there is a man of superficial information on this

subject, or one who has had some project that has been turned down, and turned down hard because it had to be turned down, that man begins to talk about the "pork barrel."

[Applause.]

"That is correct. You got that in at the right place. It says "applause" here. [Laughter.]

I will now read what he says immediately following his remarks about gentlemen with superficial information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

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

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The Senator continues:

There has been no line of appropriations made by this Government more carefully guarded than appropriations for rivers and harbors.

Now, I ask the especial attention of the gentleman from Michigan to a statement of the distinguished Senator on that occasion, which affords a complete answer to the question propounded to me by the gentleman a little while ago, and in which question he seemed to exhibit a fear lest there might be something wrong about the proposed surveys.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I can not. If the gentleman will please remain in status quo, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] wants some of these projects to remain, until I finish this, then I will yield. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. After declaring that—

There has been no line of appropriations made by this Government more carefully guarded than appropriations for rivers and harbors—

The Senator says—and I think this information will be interesting to the gentleman from Michigan:

In the first place, before anything is undertaken, there is a preliminary examination which is ordered by legislation; there must be a preliminary examination. Then, if that is favorable, a more detailed examination. Before the project is presented to Congress it must pass before a so-called board of review. By the time it gets to Congress it has had to pass through a pretty long gantlet. Then, when it reaches the Rivers and Harbors Committee, it has a still more severe experience—perhaps some of you think so, anyhow.

There has been no logrolling, no "pork barrel," no regard for individual prospects, or anything of that sort. [Applause.] No regard for any particular locality in the country.

Speaking of the advantages to be derived from adequate transportation facilities by water, the Senator remarks:

Then there is a second class of advantages that are arbitrary, due to their lowering of rates to drive waterways out of business. The best illustration with reference to that which I know is a case where a barge line on the Mississippi was carrying freight at 25 cents a hundred very profitably. The railways put down the rate to 10 cents a hundred until the barge line was driven out of business; then the railways put up the rate to 50 cents a hundred, where it has remained ever since. Now, that ought not to be allowed.

He then expresses the hope that the waterways and the railways in some way will agree to work together; that to work together would be for the interest of both.

It is really for the interest of both to work together. [Applause.] The time is coming when they will both see it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] has expired. [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would like to inquire of my colleague how much time he wants?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I would like five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto end in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like five minutes. Can the gentleman from Florida make it 10?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We have another paragraph to read in a moment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Then I will wait until another paragraph is read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very much pleased to know that the committee did not make any mistake in reference to one item, anyway; that is an item in the district represented by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES]. Even he approved it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] explicitly approved that item, and said that was a good item.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Well, in doing that he has only done what everybody else in this House has done. I am still waiting to see one man stand up and attack or condemn his own project.

Now, we are coming to the State of Wisconsin, and I am wondering whether some gentleman from that State will stand up and condemn some of those items.

Mr. Chairman, there are some more things that I want to call attention to, and one of them is that in the attempt to demonstrate that there has been a waste of appropriations because traffic on certain waterways has decreased, it does not necessarily follow that that is so, because there are three stages in waterway improvement. The first stage is before you have the railroad improvement, and then after you have it paralleled with a railroad improvement the waterway may be no longer valuable. But the time may come again when the waterway will again be very valuable.

I can cite one instance in my own State, the Columbia River, from Wenatchee to Kettle Falls. We have appropriated for several years for this part of the river, and I know that the distinguished chairman of this committee will agree with me when I say that there was no appropriation ever made that brought a greater return for the amount invested than that for the upper Columbia. That has been discontinued, because now it is paralleled by the railroad. But that does not mean that the money that was invested in that improvement was money wasted. The time may come again when it will be worth while to once more improve the Columbia River. So that the arguments made to that effect do not necessarily prove true. The people who make that argument ought to point out the particular items to which they refer.

My distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] was laboring under a wrong impression in regard to these surveys. Seventy per cent of the surveys that have gone into these bills in the last year or two have, if I remember correctly, been reported on unfavorably. And there never was, in my judgment, a greater mistake than to say that we ought to take the power of reporting upon these projects away from the engineers and give it to some commission. [Applause.] The moment you do that there will be politics in the appropriations.

I agree with what former Senator Burton said, read by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], that the Government engineers by training, by occupation, and by the positions which they hold during life are the best fitted of any body of men that we could possibly secure to pass upon these projects. I have never yet heard a just criticism leveled against the conduct of the engineers, except in particular cases, and I think I am well within the facts when I say that I never heard a Government engineer severely criticized on the floor of this House as to any project unless it was by some gentleman whose project had been unfavorably reported upon by that engineer.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Cox). The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Black River at Port Huron, Mich.: Completing improvement and for maintenance, \$25,000.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order that I may have time to reply to statements that have been made.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I approve what the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] has said, that this work ought to be left to the Corps of Engineers, made up of the men best fitted in this country to do this work. I have had considerable experience with them. They are the highest class of men, and, in my judgment, they are the most capable men who could be called upon for this work; and while they have differed from me, and while I have not been able to get from them the favorable reports that I wished, I have no criticism whatever to make of them. I believe they are men of splendid character, men of ability, without local bias, and as free from improper influence as any who can possibly be engaged for the work. It would be folly to organize a commission. It would be or become a political body and subject to or suspected of yielding to local influence and prejudice.

Now, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER], a member of the committee, asked the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] if there were any provisions in this bill for harbors in

Michigan which he would wish to have stricken out. Evidently he thought that because small sums mostly were given for Michigan, nearly all for dredging and maintenance, we ought to object to some of them, because we object to projects where they have to go several feet deep in order to find water in the bed of what they call or wish to make into a river; that because we object to projects where they build a harbor because it touches a great automobile road, where the men from the cities using automobiles can stop at the so-called harbor and reach their yachts; because we object to such projects as these we are told we ought to object to all or to some at least of the improvements in the State of Michigan.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I can not yield. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] rose to speak as the item relating to Grand Haven was reached. At Grand Haven there were 645,804 tons of freight last year. It is a great harbor which ought to be properly maintained.

I am particularly interested in three or four projects that are located in my district. One is at Muskegon, of which I have already spoken, my home city, where the item in this bill is only \$7,500, altogether for dredging, where the business last year was 119,811 tons; and that is one of the very few projects mentioned in the committee's report concerning which it appears that the business is increasing year by year. I am sure it will increase even more rapidly in the future. Only a few years ago it was the greatest lumber town in the world, making more lumber than any other place in the world. Now it does not make a foot of lumber, and still, by unusual and commendable energy and thrift and public spirit, the people are building a city upon the ruins of the lumber business, and it is now one of the most prosperous cities in Michigan, having a population of about 35,000.

I am also interested in the harbor of Luddington, in my district, for which there is an appropriation in the bill of \$250,000. The freight there last year was 1,510,437 tons. You do not have to bore into the ground there to find water for a harbor. It is perhaps the greatest ear-ferry point in the world.

And I might speak of Manistee, another splendid harbor in my district, at which more salt is produced than at any other place in the United States; but that project, having been approved by Congress, the appropriations for its completion are carried in another bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will when I get through. Wait a moment. I am interested also in the harbor of Frankfort, where the report shows that last year there were 737,248 tons of freight. The appropriation for that point is only \$5,000.

Do gentlemen accuse us of inconsistency if we do not object to those very moderate appropriations for those very worthy projects simply because we object to some in other parts of the country which we think are grossly improper? The fact has been spoken of, Mr. Chairman, that nearly \$50,000,000 has been appropriated and has been used for improving harbors in the State of Michigan. I have not exact figures, but am safe in saying that three-fourths at least of that money was used for building locks and otherwise improving St. Marys River and for improving Detroit River. All of it ought not to be charged to Michigan; but if it were all so charged, the expenditure of every dollar was proper. In the year 1913 about 80,000,000 tons of freight passed through the St. Marys Canal; the value of that freight was nearly \$1,000,000,000. There was paid for carrying that freight \$44,380,000, and the value of the boats which carried it was about \$4,500,000. The number of boats passing through the locks of St. Marys River in 1913 was nearly 24,000, and the net registered tonnage of them was nearly 58,000,000 tons. The total amount spent on St. Marys River is in the neighborhood of \$25,000,000—\$13,000,000 on the locks and \$12,000,000 on the river itself. The Suez Canal, of which we read so much and which is generally thought to be a wonderful waterway, carried last year only 5,085 ships, of net registered tonnage amounting to a little more than 20,000,000 tons, or about one-fifth of the number at the Soo Locks and of little more than one-third the tonnage. And the Suez Canal is open all the year, while the St. Marys Canal is open only eight months of a year.

The Detroit River is a part of the boundary line between Michigan and Canada, and carries the immense commerce of several States, the commerce being strictly interstate and not chargeable to Michigan or to be credited to that State alone, although we would like to claim it if we could properly do so.

Our Government has expended several million dollars—I do not know how many—on this river, and every dollar so used has returned profit of a hundredfold to the people of this country.

In 1913 the vessels passing through that river, not including ferryboats, railroad ferries, or other local craft, numbered 37,473, of net registered tonnage of 62,092,149 tons, carrying freight to the amount of \$5,376,705 tons and of the value of \$927,191,076.

A glance at these figures or a moment's thought to what they mean as representing the amount of business done on these two great waterways will justify all expenditure the Congress has made for their improvement and maintenance.

We are not to be charged with inconsistency in supporting appropriations for these projects, as we support other appropriations for Michigan that I have referred to, while we oppose, as we feel we must, some items in this bill that we believe are unjustifiable. We are real friends of rivers and harbors, believing in Federal aid to worthy projects, and we therefore oppose measures which bring reproach upon proper and legitimate river and harbor legislation. We will not stultify ourselves by approving an entire bill which contains appropriations for anything and everything, even if it does provide money for projects in or about our own State, every one of which is properly taken care of.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes and that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] have that five minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want two minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I should like one minute.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I believe I have been recognized. I want only two minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in eight minutes, two minutes to be used by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], one minute by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], and five minutes by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in eight minutes, two minutes to be used by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], one minute by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], and five minutes by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I just simply want to say that I am absolutely in favor of this bill, and expect to vote for every item in it. If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], who would not yield to me a moment ago, will point out in this bill a single river where the testimony shows that you have to dig 10 feet into the bed of it to get water, I will vote against it. The gentleman ought not to make such a statement as that, which is absolutely and entirely at variance with all the facts.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. For a question only.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman vote against the bill if we can point out a river where the Member of the House who lives in the vicinity says you are likely to cross the river at some point before you know you have reached it?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will not, because I would rather take the testimony of the gentleman who lives on the river than to take the testimony of a gentleman who lives miles away. I know the river that the gentleman refers to, and I can not yield further; but I want to say that gentlemen ought not to make such statement as that, because there is not a word of truth anywhere about any item in this bill which shows that any river is so dry that you have got to dig 10 feet into the bed of it to get water. It is preposterous, it is ridiculous, and it is unworthy of any gentleman upon this floor.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] wanted to know about our Michigan items, and seemed to think that because some other items in this bill have been criticized, therefore the Michigan items should be criticized. I have here a memorandum which states that the report of operation of the Panama Canal for the first 10 months and 15 days shows practically 5,000,000 tons of freight carried, at an operating expense of about \$5,000,000. As my colleague [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] has said, the Soo Canal has received about \$25,000,000 out of the \$45,000,000 charged to our State. The

Soo Canal carries in 15 days as much freight as the Panama Canal carried in more than 10 months, at an operating expense for the Soo Canal of about \$10,000. And the same freight that goes through the Soo Canal in 15 days, equal in amount to that which goes through the Panama Canal in 10 months, goes on down through the lakes and rivers that are appropriated for and charged to Michigan in this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. BOOHER. There can not very much freight go through the Panama Canal now, because it is closed by slides, and almost any river can beat it, as far as freight is concerned, now.

Mr. CRAMTON. These figures do not apply to the time when the canal has been closed by slides.

Mr. BOOHER. I am very sorry that the simple question I asked the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] has stirred up such a tempest. There was nothing in it to excite anybody. The gentleman had stated that there were many projects in this bill that were unworthy and ought to be stricken out. I only wanted to find out whether there was one of these unworthy projects in the State of Michigan, where there were 19 different projects, with nearly \$1,500,000 appropriated for them, but he had not paid enough attention to the bill to know whether there was an unworthy project in Michigan or not. How, then, can he say he has paid enough attention to the bill to know that there is a single unworthy project in the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri to the fact that Michigan is not so wonderfully above the others. I call his attention to the first item in the Michigan projects, on page 23, lines 17 and 18:

Harbor at Ontonagon, Mich.: For maintenance, \$9,000.

For maintenance, \$9,000. Now, they had a tremendous commerce there last year of 12,032 tons. Can you find many projects in the bill where there is any greater amount spent for maintenance in proportion to the business that is done? [Laughter.]

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I did not ask the question for the purpose of irritating the gentlemen from Michigan or stirring them up. I wanted to know if the gentleman had so carefully examined the bill that he could point out a single item in Michigan that was unworthy. That was all there was to it. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] flies into a passion because the question was asked and says they are all good projects. I do not know whether they are or not. The engineers report favorable on every one of them, and every one is carried in the bill, and no one, not even the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, has raised his voice against it. I do not know why.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Are there any items in the bill from any section of the country which do not have the recommendation of the engineers?

Mr. BOOHER. If there is one I do not know it. I would be glad for the gentleman to point it out.

Mr. CRAMTON. I was seeking information.

Mr. BOOHER. If there is one I would be glad to have the gentleman point it out. I do not know of one in the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. How about the Arkansas River?

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman is a member of the committee that reported this bill, and I will ask him if the appropriations for the rivers and harbors in any other State have been passed over without criticism from any Member of the House as they have in the State of Michigan?

Mr. BOOHER. No; and I am glad there has not been any criticism of the Michigan items, but they are no better than the other items in the bill; but I do not know whether the gentleman from Wisconsin will pass them entirely or not. We can not tell. The gentleman ought to have been able to tell us whether any of them was objectionable, or that they were not objectionable, but he would not say either way. He could have answered my question yes or no. As far as the gentleman from Iowa is concerned, who asked about the Arkansas River, it has been recommended favorably by the engineers from time immemorial. The memory of man does not go back to the time when the engineers have not indorsed it, and they asked for more money than they got.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Has the gentleman read the last report?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes; I have.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Where it says that all the money has been thrown away, and they recommend the discontinuance of it.

Mr. BOOHER. Oh, no; the gentleman is mistaken. If he will sit down and read the report to get what there is in it and not what is outside of it, he will find he is mistaken. The River and Harbor Committee has not reported a single item that is not recommended by the Board of Engineers.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clinton River, Mich.: For maintenance, \$1,500.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to enlighten the House on this question relating to the commerce of certain ports. I wish to call attention to some statistics which have been prepared for me by the Department of Commerce. They throw a great deal of light on the general meaning and significance of river and harbor work. Unfortunately, we have been unable to obtain statistics covering the coastwise trade. Time and again efforts have been made to induce Congress to authorize appropriations for this purpose, but none have been made. The Secretary of Commerce has asked for appropriations to obtain them, but he has not succeeded.

The gentlemen from Michigan are particularly proud of the tonnage that passes through the Soo. They do not discuss, or very lightly, the enormous appropriations that have gone to the State of Michigan in order to provide them with the Soo and their other waterways. They should not be modest about it, for their record in that regard is one of the very best amongst the 48 States of the Union. They have not missed much in the matter of appropriations.

I have in my hand the record submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury, which indicates that up to the two last river and harbor bills Michigan had taken out of the Treasury a little in excess of \$48,000,000 for the purpose of improvements within its own limits. It is fair to assume they have gone to \$50,000,000 since. Therefore it does not seem entirely generous of the gentleman from Michigan to belittle the smaller projects throughout the country and find fault with certain sections for endeavoring to get appropriations for the improvement of their rivers. Michigan has been beautifully taken care of; due, of course, to the activity and energy of her Representatives in Congress. They are entitled to all the credit that comes to active, hustling Representatives, who hate the pork barrel, but who desire to take back home something to show their people.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I can not yield. I have said something about the sums going to Michigan approximating \$50,000,000, I believe, and Michigan is only one State in the Union. They have taken \$50,000,000 up to date substantially, and yet the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES], finding everything pretty well covered at home, sees no special reason why anybody else should be considered—leave it to Michigan, "Dear old Michigan," they are certainly all right up in Michigan. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, I have no fault to find with their having gotten what they have got—I am glad they have it—but I do question whether they ought to prevent anybody else getting what is needed elsewhere. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] on several occasions has indicated that the greatest tonnage of the world passes through the Soo Canal. I give him credit for that statement. I can not get the coastwise statistics, so I will not dispute domestic figures with him just now; but I know that the tonnage that passes through the locks is made up very largely of iron ore and copper ore and coal; it is not the most valuable tonnage in the world, but it is great for weight; it is splendid for showing tonnage. I am going to produce some figures about foreign tonnage, however.

Mr. STAFFORD. What about the wheat?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, there is some wheat there, and we buy it and consume it, and we pay Michigan and other Western States well for it. I am glad we have the money once in a while to do that, because it helps make Michigan prosperous.

Mr. LONGWORTH. What about automobiles?

Mr. GOOD. And Fords?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, we buy them when we get the money, but we can not buy them as numerous as you do in Michigan or in Iowa or in Nebraska. It is the farmers mostly that buy automobiles.

Mr. GOOD. Why not ask for them in this bill? You get most everything else.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We are waiting for the Agricultural bill; we will ask for automobiles in the Agricultural bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOOD. But it is easier to get them in this bill. All you have to do is to ask for them.

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

Under leave previously granted, Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania inserted the following table of statistics:

Number and net tonnage of sailing and steam vessels entered and cleared in the foreign trade of the United States during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914.

[By geographical divisions.]

Geographical divisions.	Entered.		Cleared.		Total entered and cleared.	
	Ves-sels.	Net tons.	Ves-sels.	Net tons.	Ves-sels.	Net tons.
Atlantic.....	10,489	26,401,314	10,084	25,491,836	20,573	51,893,150
Pacific.....	5,319	6,042,347	5,236	5,798,238	10,555	11,840,585
Gulf.....	4,697	7,608,628	4,986	8,453,138	9,683	16,061,766
Great Lakes.....	20,512	13,336,288	19,344	13,440,197	39,856	26,776,485
Total.....	41,017	53,388,577	39,650	53,183,409	80,667	106,571,986

Total values of imports and exports into and from the United States during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914.

[By mode of transportation and geographical divisions.]

Geographical divisions.	Imports.	Exports.	Total imports and exports.
Water borne:			
Atlantic.....	\$1,360,519,398	\$1,299,062,457	\$2,659,581,855
Pacific.....	130,767,796	125,991,894	256,759,690
Gulf.....	120,983,430	570,139,028	691,122,458
Great Lakes.....	104,996,047	52,565,775	157,561,822
Interior.....	20,441,982	705*	20,442,687
Total water borne.....	1,737,708,653	2,047,759,859	3,785,468,512
In cars and other land vehicles.....	156,217,004	316,819,289	473,036,293
Total.....	1,893,925,657	2,364,579,148	4,258,504,805

NOTE.—The above tables cover only the commerce of the United States with foreign countries. No data are available for the domestic coastwise commerce.

Mr. CALLAWAY rose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CALLAWAY. Why, I have not spoken to-day. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor at Green Bay, Wis.: For maintenance, \$18,000.

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

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is now almost 5 o'clock. I would like to get the attention of the House for a moment. The House sat this morning at 11 o'clock. While it did not proceed immediately to the consideration of this bill, the delay this morning was not long. We have read to-day three pages of the bill and three or four more paragraphs. Very few of the paragraphs that have been read to-day have been contested. While the discussion has been interesting and illuminating, most of it has been in reference to matters not involved in the paragraphs which have been read.

I had hoped that it might be possible to finish the bill to-day, but that, evidently, is impossible. I hope that gentlemen of the House on both sides will endeavor to restrain themselves a little bit, so that we can make more progress with this bill before half-past 5 o'clock; but it is not unlikely that we will have to remain here Monday until we finish it. While I am not anxious about too great expedition, still I think we ought to get through with this bill sooner or later, and I hope gentlemen will appreciate the condition. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor at Two Rivers, Wis.: For maintenance, \$3,500.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I will do a great deal to comply with the wishes of the minority leader. I wish to say that I have not, as a rule, discussed anything except the items under consideration.

A few moments ago the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] invited my attention to the fact that the Wisconsin items were about to be approached, and he wanted to know what my attitude would be with respect to them. If I wait

until these items are finished, and remain silent, I have no doubt he will call attention to that fact. The members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors will bear me out in the statement that I have not asked for the inclusion of one of these items in the bill. Members of the committee nod their heads. The engineers have approved these items, and they speak for themselves. I have stated that I have nothing at stake. I think as much of one side of the State of Wisconsin as the other, and I say that for the reason that I could not be bought for any amount of money that might be put in this bill. I am now about to make a statement which I have never made before, that gentlemen came to me here in my office from my home town, appointed by the governor of the State of Wisconsin, to get me to indorse an item of several million dollars for a project which would go past my own home. It was to go to the engineers. Gentlemen here are aware of the facts. I told them they could not secure my support; that I did not believe it was a worthy project, and I told them so.

Wisconsin has the second largest commerce of any State in the country, unless you count that which goes through the Soo Canal. Three harbors that I can name carry 60,000,000 tons. They are named right in this minority report, and they get \$53,000 in this bill. It would make no difference to me whether they got more or less. It is not a question of the amount. I do not agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] that it is a question of fighting for your State or fighting for your project. I believe it ought to be allowed without a fight if it is a worthy project. The commerce in the place where I live was larger at one time than that of the port of Philadelphia, because the boats were constantly moving by, with great rafts. To-day it will float the largest boats upon the Mississippi River, but it has no commerce. I am not urging any project. I would not urge a project, and I could not be influenced by that argument. I do not believe you can buy any man in the House. I do not want that conclusion put upon his actions. I know gentlemen here are trying to represent their constituencies. I have made no criticism of anyone heretofore, and I do not propose to make one now. I say this, that in the criticisms I have made of these different projects there has been no personal reasons for what I have said. I ask the committee to bear me out in that. I have simply told the conditions that surrounded the project, according to the facts shown by official reports.

The Brazos River gets \$390,000 and carries a commerce of 1,080 tons annually. We get for the whole State of Wisconsin, I think, \$308,000 for over 60,000,000 tons. But that does not make any difference. It does not make any difference if it is \$1,000,000, or if it is nothing at all. The question ought to be determined on the merits of each project.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, one trouble with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] is this—and I say it in all kindness—in his treatment of this subject of rivers and harbors he takes himself too seriously. When he indicates that anyone would suggest that he might personally be bribed, or, for that matter, that any other Member of the House might be bribed or "bought," in the sense that he would be unduly or corruptly influenced to act for or against a measure, he is unfair to himself and to the House. No one has made any such insinuation with respect to him or his purposes. I think I have read the gentleman from Wisconsin as closely in the matter of his characteristics as any man here. I know him. I like him. I believe him to be honest, and it is unnecessary to say that I believe him to be sincere; but I believe him to be misled with respect to his agitation against a river and harbor bill. Some men are influenced, not as he has indicated, by the governor or influential men of a State coming to them, but some men are influenced in another way, and it is most unfortunate. It indicates the vanity that sometimes bubbles up in an individual, and I do not wish to impute it to the gentleman from Wisconsin. But some men are unduly influenced more by what appears in the newspapers or in the magazines than by any other influence.

I suspect when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] delivered his interesting speech here that he had it in mind that the public sentiment was drifting against the river and harbor bill; not that his project was not worthy, nor, for that

matter, that the gentleman from Wisconsin's projects are not worthy, but because it might be a little more beneficial from the public or political viewpoint to appear at least to be standing against what, after all, you are really for. Why should we play two sides in a matter of such importance? Why not be more direct? It is true as gospel, and your constituents expect it, that you stand for those things which your constituents desire you to stand for. Otherwise, what is the purpose of coming to Congress? If you do not come to represent your constituents, what are you here for?

The gentleman from Michigan would not go back to his constituents in good countenance if he protested against an item for his district. The gentleman from Wisconsin, challenged by the gentleman from Washington, will not now oppose or say that he will oppose a single item for rivers and harbors in Wisconsin. He stands for these items, notwithstanding the governor of his State may have come to him on his bended knees and pleaded with him to vote for something in his State.

Mr. FREAR. I do not wish that statement to go unchallenged, for the governor has never said a word to me about it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I amend my remarks to that extent. But the gentleman does not rise in opposition to any proposition from his own State. Even the gentlemen from Michigan who have taken inspiration from our inland friend of Iowa—even the gentlemen from Michigan who have joined in the opposition to certain projects—have no word of protest to the projects in their own State, notwithstanding they have mounted up to nearly \$50,000,000. And yet this wonderful tonnage of which they boast—and upon which I congratulate them—so far as the foreign-tonnage part of it is concerned, is only a half of what it is along the Atlantic seaboard, and only one-sixteenth in value.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. ADAMSON.

'Tis sweet to hear the watchdog's honest bark
Bay deep-mouthed welcome as we draw near home.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is. While that is old, it is good and appropriate.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, we were asked if there was any project in Michigan that ought to be stricken from the bill, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] rises and speaks of Ontonagon. I want to say that no Michigan Member asked to have that put in the bill, and it was put in by the committee of their own accord.

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor at Green Bay, Wis.: For maintenance, \$18,000.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] who last had the floor is mistaken about the fact that Members are opposed to this bill, or different sections of it, because the newspapers throughout the country, or the magazines, say that there is pork in it. I shall not vote for this bill, but not because the people of my district would reflect upon me if I did. I am not a candidate for renomination to Congress, as I do not care to return and would not come back under any circumstances. I have been in Congress in past years, and in this Congress and my present term is as long as I want to come. [Applause.]

I am opposed to this bill for one reason, because the Government can not afford to pay the money that is being appropriated in it. There is about \$20,000,000 in this bill that I would like to vote for. I would like to vote for the project which appropriates money for the rivers and harbors in the vicinity of New York City, some \$2,000,000; I would like to vote for the appropriation for the Delaware River, some \$2,500,000; I would like to vote for the appropriation for the Ohio River, some \$5,000,000; I would like to vote for the appropriation for the Mississippi River, some \$6,000,000; but when I come to vote for those I have to vote for some twenty-odd million dollars more provided for in the bill that I do not believe ought to be appropriated.

The country needs the money and will need it badly before this Congress meets again in 1918. That is why I shall vote against the bill. I do not know whether there is any pork in it, but I presume there is by what Members have said on the floor, but I believe that some of these sums ought not to be appropriated. In the early part of the year 1915, I received letters from a committee of business men in the Mississippi Valley asking my support for a proposed appropriation for the Mississippi River. I answered the letters saying if you will have a fair bill prepared and introduced as a separate measure for the improvement of the Mississippi River, and only ask for what you ought to have, I will vote for it, but if you put the appropriation in the river and harbor bill, where there are

millions of dollars included with it that ought not to be in it, I will not vote for it.

I regret that this House can not have a separate vote on these worthy measures. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] stated in his remarks that when one of the large battleships, costing some \$18,000,000 and carrying a crew of 800 men, passes from the lower bay past Governors Island to the navy yard, at one point in the channel for a long distance there is but 1 foot of water under the keel of the vessel. An appropriation is asked to deepen this channel and is included in the \$2,000,000 appropriation above referred to. It should be granted. It should be presented to the House in a separate bill; and the same should be done for the appropriation for the Delaware River, the Ohio River, the Mississippi River, Galveston Harbor, and the appropriation for the harbor and rivers and improvements at Chicago. If that was done there would be no logrolling; no pork could get into the bill, and the Government would save \$20,000,000 this session as it saved that amount in the last session of the Sixty-third Congress, and an equal amount in the first session of the Sixty-third Congress through the help of Senator Burton, of Ohio.

I shall therefore vote against this bill on final passage. I withdraw the amendment I offered.

Mr. FOCHT rose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] has asked for five minutes, and I would like to have one or two.

Mr. FOCHT. Oh, I will give the gentleman one of mine.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not think that would be quite satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will amend my request so as to make it five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida amends his request to five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, it is a well-known fact that Pennsylvania never yet had any appropriations out of this bill that are at all commensurate with the importance of the tonnage carried down the Delaware or from Pittsburgh, and the people of our great State have often wondered why it is that there was not some accomplishment with respect to a greater port in Philadelphia; but I will allow that matter to be taken care of by the gentlemen who represent Philadelphia, Mr. MOORE and others. However, in the matter of these little mulligrub, skipper streams they have been talking about here on the floor, I desire to say that I have, throughout my political career, freely voted for every conceivable kind of charity, public benefaction, and improvement and betterment, but I would like to know from those of you who have bills here providing for an appropriation of untold thousands of dollars for the improvement of little streams, such as has been referred to here, into which you must dig 10 feet before you can find any water, streams over which railroads and wagon and highway bridges are constructed, under and through which grow willow trees, I would like to know whether it is not almost impudent to ask intelligent, fair-minded men to vote for any bill containing such measures as those when the allegations have not been disavowed on this floor. Until they are I am not going to say that I can vote for the bill. [Applause.]

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

Mr. FOCHT. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I simply rise in response to the gentleman's challenge to disavow that statement.

Mr. FOCHT. The gentlemen who made them have not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania can find any such streams as he has mentioned, I shall not disavow it.

Mr. FOCHT. Oh, a member of the gentleman's committee [Mr. CLARK of Florida], makes the allegation, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] makes the allegation, and other gentlemen here have made even broader impeachments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. CLARK is not a member of the committee, and he made no such statement.

Mr. FOCHT. I heard what he said and what others have repeatedly alleged, and that is why the measure is discredited throughout the land as a "pork-barrel" bill. They take the

worst, of course, and believe the rest is the same. Clean it up and we will all be glad to vote for it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The claim of "pork" comes from such reckless statements as the gentleman has just made.

Mr. FOCHT. It is not a reckless statement; it has been made countless times before, and the Record is written full of allegations of reckless waste and extravagance in appropriating to make navigable dry creeks and so-called rivers in this evident old-time logrolling process of attack upon a Treasury already empty. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to endorse the statement of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], that it is due to such statements as that just made, unwittingly I am sure, by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT], that this Congress of the United States sometimes fails to attend to its own business, but tends to yield up its prerogative to the whim of some cartoonist or editorial writer. Congress ought to be big enough to do the business which it swears it will do when it meets at the beginning of the session. It ought not to yield constantly to what is written in the skyscrapers of New York or Chicago and by men who do not know or can not know the facts. Why should Congress disbelieve its committees and tremble every time it hears the cry of pork? The trouble is that gentlemen are trying to inject politics into this bill. I deplore it, for there is no politics in a bill in which all parties are interested. These provisions come with the approval of the engineers; they come to us here through a committee of this House, and gentlemen who are attending to other business in which they expect to be trusted can not consistently and justly criticize a great committee like that on rivers and harbors, because it is presumed to be as well informed as any other committee which brings a bill into the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. All time has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor at Milwaukee, Wis., including harbor of refuge: For maintenance, \$11,000.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I only want to make some general observations respecting the criticisms that have been offered. Most of the general objections are to the alleged fact that we are appropriating for worthless creeks. I took occasion some time ago to examine into the bills for four years, and I found that the appropriations for the creeks that were included in the bills for those four years amounted to a little less than a million dollars and that the tonnage floated on these same creeks during those four years was valued at \$1,000,000,000. The tonnage carried upon the creeks appropriated for in the bill annually—and I hope the gentleman who criticized these creeks will listen to me; I see that his attention is directed elsewhere—

Mr. FOCHT. What is that?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The tonnage carried on the little creeks about which the gentleman complains amounted in those four years to twice as much as has ever been estimated for American commerce passing annually through the Panama Canal.

So much for the creeks.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I decline to yield.

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

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I can not yield. This is the first time I have taken the floor during the progress of this debate, and I want to talk facts now rather than to deal in fancies.

The tonnage carried by the little rivers provided for in this bill—and this does not include the Delaware River, or the East River, or the rivers that connect the Great Lakes, or the Mississippi River, or the Ohio River, just the little rivers that are provided for in this bill, and the creeks—last year amounted to more than 100,000,000 tons, and that was all American tonnage.

Now, let us take some standard by which to measure that. When we undertook to build the Panama Canal, or, rather, when we had completed it and undertook to ascertain the facts upon which to predicate the tolls that should be charged upon the tonnage, the President, Mr. Taft, selected Prof. Emery Johnson as an expert to ascertain about what tonnage would pass through the canal.

His estimate was that the tonnage through the canal would probably be ten and one-half million tons a year. That included coastwise tonnage and foreign tonnage—all the tonnage that would pass through the Panama Canal in a year. The little rivers provided for in this bill carried last year more than 100,000,000 tons, ten times as much tonnage as it was estimated

would pass through the Panama Canal in any one year, foreign and domestic both included.

Now, in view of these facts it does occur to me that gentlemen ought not to indulge in general criticisms of the bill and charge the committee with wastefulness in making these appropriations. I do not know very much about the various items in the bill. I was a member of the committee for a number of years, though I am not on it now. I know there is no railroad on the face of this earth that can carry a billion dollars' worth of merchandise at a cost of \$1,000,000 for maintenance, for instance, and that is what the creeks alone provided for in this bill carried in four years. I submit that these criticisms, except as they may be directed to particular items—these general criticisms—are misleading. Upon them are based the criticisms we hear in the country. Now, so far as "logrolling" is concerned and the "pork barrel" and it being a "bill of thieves," these criticisms, in my opinion, it is not necessary to reply to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HULBERT. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. HULBERT. Reserving the right to object—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. HULBERT. No; I do not object.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I served on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for 13 years, 6 years under the chairmanship of Mr. Burton, 2 years under the chairmanship of Mr. ALEXANDER, and the rest of the time under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN].

All three framed their bills along identical lines.

My opinion is that the criticisms generally against this bill are wholly unfounded. I do not believe, for instance, that the criticisms which I hear sometimes from my colleagues on this side that during the past the Southern States did not get fair treatment is just. The fact of the business is, so far as the rivers of this country are concerned, the Southern States have had and will continue to get the bulk of the appropriations made for rivers. That is not merely because of any sectionalism. It is because when God made the rivers he put them in the South. Any man who will look at the map of the United States will see why the large part of the appropriations go to the southern rivers. And the Republican Party during its administration has been equally as just and equally as generous to the items of the South as the Democratic Party has been since it has been in power. [Applause.]

I never have heard a sectional question raised in the committee. I never had one man in my 13 years of service, either on the committee or off of it, directly or indirectly, make a proposition to me that he would vote for the projects I was interested in if I would vote for the projects he was interested in. Frequently, yes, very frequently, when projects were proposed that I did not agree to, that I did not believe ought to be put in the bill, I have stood in the committee and fought them, and every other member of the committee has done the same thing, but I realized the fact that nobody but the uncivilized man insists upon having everything exactly as he wants it. That is the difference between the civilized man and the uncivilized man. The savage insists upon having everything he wants, "he wants what he wants when he wants it," and if the other man has it he knocks him on the head and takes it away from him. It is the civilized man that recognizes the futility of such proceedings. You must yield to the judgment of other people sometimes and recognize their rights.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I thought it not entirely out of place that I should make these observations. I am interested, of course, in one of the projects carried in this bill. Perhaps that will be stated as the reason why I defend the whole bill. But the interest which I represent particularly is a project which I have for many years pleaded to have presented to Congress as a single item, to take the judgment of Congress upon it as a single project; and I hope that in the near future we shall have that opportunity. [Applause.]

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the motion, merely to put into the Record a statement of fact, that one of the creeks included in the list that the gentleman referred to in New York, namely, Newton Creek, had a tonnage in 1915 of 5,541,116 tons, valued at \$228,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor at Racine, Wis.: Continuing improvement, \$200,000.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] made a speech in

which he objected to the incorporation in the bill, although it had been incorporated, of the sea-wall project for Galveston, Tex. The gentleman claimed that the Galveston sea-wall project is a new one, and that under the rule adopted by the committee it ought not to have been included in the bill. Thereupon, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], in replying to the gentleman from Wisconsin, said that the provision for the sea wall at Galveston was on all fours with the provision for Racine, Wis.

That means, as I understand, that the provision in this bill for Racine is for a new project. Is that it, I will inquire of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. SPARKMAN. What is the question that the gentleman asked?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman say that the project at Racine is a new project?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I do not.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] claimed that the project for a sea wall at Galveston is new, never adopted by Congress, and he seemed to demonstrate the truth of his contention.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not share in the gentleman's opinion of the demonstration. [Laughter.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Well, as I understood the argument of my colleague from Wisconsin, I thought the project for the sea wall a new one.

Now, as to the project at Racine Harbor, I wish to show that it at least is not a thieves' proposition. [Laughter.] Racine, as many gentlemen know, lies between Chicago and Milwaukee, on the shore of Lake Michigan, about an hour and a quarter's ride from Chicago and half an hour or less from Milwaukee. With its compactly built suburbs, it has 45,000 or more of population. It is one of the greatest manufacturing cities of its size in the United States.

The old project for the harbor consisted of two parallel piers running east from the mouth of the river into Lake Michigan, one called the south pier, the other the north pier. Always during storms from the lake, especially northeast storms, there was great trouble caused by the wind driving the water up between the piers and along the docks, far into the city. To remedy this serious condition Congress, on March 2, 1907, adopted a new project providing for a north breakwater and a south breakwater, both to extend to the shore, and for the removal of both of the old piers. Two years later Congress appropriated money to complete only the north half of the project, but with the express understanding that if after it was completed experience should show the necessity for the construction of the south half, then it also should be completed.

Experience soon demonstrated the necessity for the completion of the south half of the project.

I was at home in December, 1913, and saw the storm described in the letter which I am about to read. The letter is from one of the lake captains who were caught with their vessels in the harbor in that storm.

Before I read the letter gentlemen should know that the steamer mentioned in it was up around a bend in the river and three-quarters of a mile or more from Lake Michigan. The letter is as follows:

RACINE, WIS., November 12, 1913.

Hon. H. A. COOPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to state that on November 6 I arrived in Racine at 4 a. m., loaded with 2,826 tons of coal consigned to the Carroll Coal Co. The weather being fine, I arrived at the Carroll Coal Co. dock at 7:30 and ready to start unloading. I started unloading at 8 a. m. and continued unloading Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, and on Saturday noon it started to blow quite hard from the northeast and continued increasing. At 4 a. m. Sunday all hands were called on deck to get out more lines, as considerable sea had made and steamer started parting her lines, caused by the undertow. We worked continually from that time until Monday afternoon, when the wind shifted to the westward, which caused the sea to moderate.

We parted every working line we had several times, then we got out our 9½-inch brand new hawser. We got two parts out of each end of the boat, which she snapped like shoestrings. After using up 1,000 feet of our hawser, or, in fact, the whole line, we could do nothing but start working our engine. We had made junk of \$650 worth of lines and we had no more, so we started working our engine ahead and astern. About every five minutes, as our steamer would rush ahead, we would back the engine, and when she would rush astern would work ahead.

All this time we lay in the middle of the river and did not know what moment our steamer would rush into the bridge ahead of us. All this time our anchor was down at the bottom, but would drag wherever she went. I must also say that the Carroll Coal Co. dock is three-fourths of a mile from the mouth of the river and around a bend, and that at normal stage of water their docks are between 4 and 5 feet above water, and must say that the sea rolled at least 2 feet over the docks, causing our steamer to roll and pound, in which we were afraid that our rudder and shoe would be damaged. On Monday morning while we were still in midstream I called Mr. George T. Caystle, manager of the Carroll Coal Co., and asked him to call our agent, D. Sullivan & Co., Chicago, on long-distance phone and ask him to send us 120 fathoms of 6½-inch new line by express in order to have

something to tie our steamer up to the dock with. This arrived at 3 p. m. Monday afternoon and cost us \$145 more. By 6 o'clock Monday afternoon we were once more alongside of the dock.

Under the conditions at Racine at present I hope I never will be asked to fetch another load there, and think that after our owners received my letter stating conditions here I am satisfied they will not send us here again unless conditions are improved.

GEO. A. MONTGOMERY,
Captain of the Steamer Nyanza.

I received a letter also from another captain describing his equally dangerous and costly experience in the harbor during the same storm. His letter was printed in the Record in the last Congress.

The engineers find that the completion of only half of the project is entirely insufficient, and they recommend that the other half of the Arrowhead project be completed by the construction of the south breakwater and the removal of the south pier.

A provision to carry out this recommendation of the engineers was incorporated in the bill two years ago. A similar provision was incorporated in the last bill. It passed the House without an adverse comment. When it reached the Senate, Senator Burton put the provision in the bill which he offered as a substitute.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to correct if possible an erroneous impression that seems to have been much upon the mind of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], although I may not be able to do so.

I stated this morning all that I had to say at the time and all that I deemed necessary as to the status of the three items I then mentioned in so far as their relation to new projects was concerned. The remarks I made were mainly on the Galveston item, and were intended to show that it was an old project. I said there were two others in the same class, making three in all, the one at Racine, Wis., being one of them. Now I wish to say that while I do not think the rule we established regarding new projects was strained in any one of the cases in order to get those three items into the bill, yet if it was strained at all it was in the case of the project at Racine. I think, however, indeed I am sure, that project was clearly within the rule and was no exception to the same. It was postponed originally until an experiment could be made showing its necessity. Later on the engineers reported the work as necessary, and recommended that it be done, just as they did with reference to the sea wall at Galveston, work on that part of the project having been postponed until certain conditions were complied with. When those conditions were met, that part of the already adopted project was ready for an appropriation, which is carried in this bill; they came forward and recommended that the work go on. They did the same thing with reference to the Lake Union & Washington Canal. Certain work was postponed there until other work was done. We had by appropriate legislation adopted the project, and when this work was done the engineers came forward and recommended that the deferred work go on, and we have made provision for it in this bill.

Now, that in brief is the history of the three projects, and I was correct this morning when I said that there was no exception to the rule concerning new projects in either one of these cases.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to ask the gentleman whether he examined the adoption of the project at the port of Racine?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I examined it very fully.

Mr. LENROOT. Does not the gentleman know that every part of that project in the engineer's report was expressly adopted by law, and in Galveston Harbor it was not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know anything of the kind. I have stated the facts correctly, the gentleman's assertion apparently to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. SPARKMAN. 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. SHERLEY, 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. 12193, the river and harbor bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ASHBROOK for three days, on account of important business.

To Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan, indefinitely, on account of illness.

LOUISIANA.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of the geographical description of the State of Louisiana.

Mr. BARNHART. I would like to ask if it relates to this bill.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Yes; it is cognate to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON MONDAY.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the Ohio River project.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to return to the House of Representatives, in compliance with its request, the bill (H. R. 10384) to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 5016. An act to authorize the reconstruction of an existing bridge across the Wabash River, at Silverwood, in the State of Indiana.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, April 10, 1916, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to advertise and sell abandoned customs boarding stations Pass a l'Outre, South West Pass, and "the Jump" (H. Doc. No. 1005); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, submitting estimates of appropriation, "Building, Bureau of Engraving and Printing laundry, Bureau of Engraving and Printing laundry machinery" (H. Doc. No. 1006); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of appropriation to pay for services of special counsel in the civil proceedings against the Capital City Dairy Co., of Columbus, Ohio, for recovery of taxes on oleomargarine out of which the Government was defrauded (H. Doc. No. 1007); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, together with a copy of a report from a special board of officers of the Corps of Engineers, on preliminary examination of waterway from Lake Superior to the Mississippi River, also a copy of report by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on reexamination of this waterway (H. Doc. No. 1008); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. STOUT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 600) to validate title to the town site of McCabe, in the State of Montana, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 511), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. 11903) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Boyd; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11568) granting an increase of pension to William Lendemann; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 14387) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Fox River at Geneva, Ill.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 14388) to create in the War Department and the Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as "the Civil War Volunteer officers' retired list," to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 14389) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to license establishments for and to regulate the preparation of viruses, serums, toxins, and analogous products for use in the treatment of domestic animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 14390) to transfer certain beats in St. Clair County, Ala., to the Anniston division of the northern judicial district of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 14391) authorizing the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Madison, Wis., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAGUE (by request): Resolution (H. Res. 196) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to ascertain and transmit to the House of Representatives certain information relative to Anglo-French bonds in the hands of national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COLEMAN: Resolution (H. Res. 197) to authorize and empower the Secretary of the Interior immediately to investigate a certain substitute for gasoline, and to authorize an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 14392) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe Keiser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 14393) for the relief of the estate of Richard J. Jarnagin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 14394) granting an increase of pension to Matthias Gates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 14395) granting a pension to Louisa Schatzel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLEMAN: A bill (H. R. 14396) granting a pension to Eliza J. Reed; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14397) granting a pension to Andrew J. Woomey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 14398) granting a pension to Alfred Rogers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 14399) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Hartie, Norwich, Conn.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14400) granting an increase of pension to Caroline P. Young, of Chaplin, Conn.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14401) granting an increase of pension to Charity A. Vooris, of Eastford, Conn.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 14402) for the relief of George E. Pickett, 3d; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 14403) for the relief of Charles Funk; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 14404) granting a pension to John Buckelew; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 14405) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of John C. Warren, alias John Stevens; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 14406) granting a pension to Martha A. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14407) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Dupes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 14408) granting an increase of pension to Alem Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14409) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Stanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 14410) granting an increase of pension to Washington M. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 14411) granting a pension to Elizabeth Collier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 14412) granting a pension to Elizabeth Pfoender; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 14413) granting an increase of pension to John N. Havlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 14414) granting a pension to Susan E. Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 14415) of the relief of O. W. Lindsley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STAFFORD: A bill (H. R. 14416) granting a pension to Henry Hertzler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 14417) granting an increase of pension to Madison B. Mann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 13930, for relief of Philip McKinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill 13993, for relief of William A. Griner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

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

By Mr. BAILEY: Protest of D. D. Bauch, T. J. Clinefelter, Charles Rigby, Albert Tilley, S. M. Wilson, T. S. Tilley, C. J. Smith, G. M. Marsh, C. W. Cole, W. L. Kauffman, J. M. Trefts, Arthur E. Oldham, George Lees, and Harry Jones, 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 Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Petition of Lincoln Lodge, International Order Good Templars, of Corona, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Corona, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the second district of New York, protesting against the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of Holy Name Society of St. Sebastian, of Woodside, Long Island, indorsing House bill 6468; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. COLEMAN: Petition of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER: Petition of Association for the Relief to Riparian Owners of Eastern Bank of Mississippi River relative to control of the river; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of citizens and employees of the Elgin National Watch Co., of Elgin, Ill., against passage of bills to amend the postal law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of members and friends of the First Congregational Church of Geneva, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petitions of Philip Hiss, John J. Amory, Walter C. Burrell, and Richard Henry Gatling, favoring adequate preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Henry Steers, of New York, against House bill 8036, relative to eight-hour law for officers, etc., on tugboats; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of women voters of the State of Washington, demanding immediate and favorable report of Susan B. Anthony amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DILLON: Memorial of National Wholesale Lumber Dealers' Association, favoring House bill 651, relative to charges

by common carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Grand Valley Rural Credits League, of Lincoln County, S. Dak., against rural-credits bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of C. E. Griggs and other citizens of Alameda County, Cal., against passage of bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of C. E. Griggs and other citizens of Alameda County, Cal., against passage of the Sunday observance bill in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the National Wholesale Lumber Dealers' Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 651, relative to recovery of charges by common carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens and organizations of Wisconsin, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of Henry Stiers, of New York, against House bill 8036, relative to eight-hour law for officers, etc., on tugboats; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petitions of Walter C. Burrell, John J. Amory, Richard Henry Gatling, and Philip Hiss, all of New York, favoring adequate preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREEMAN: Petitions of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of Connecticut, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Lyman Briggs and 15 others, of Eastford, Conn., against passage of bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of F. H. Plumb, of Stafford Springs, Conn., favoring censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of Somonank, Ill., favoring a tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of United States penitentiary guards at Leavenworth, Kans., relative to increase in pay; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of citizens of Boston, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GANDY: Petition of citizens of Hot Springs, S. Dak., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of H. H. Myers and 11 other citizens of Cleveland, praying for enactment of House bill 5792; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HASTINGS: Memorial of Methodist Episcopal Sunday School of Gore, Okla., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of J. L. Ealy, camp commander United Confederate Veterans, Camp Stand Waite, Stilwell, Okla., favoring passage of House bill 11078, relative to pensions for Confederate veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Petition of Mrs. Ollie Frank and 15 other citizens of Phoenix, Ariz., against the passage of House bills 6468 and 491; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Mr. R. E. Kalfus and 39 other citizens of Phoenix, Ariz., opposing the passage of House bill 652; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Mary L. Beloat and 48 other citizens of Buckeye and Liberty, Ariz., favoring the adoption of a prohibition amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINDS: Petition of 17 citizens of Sanford and Trinity Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, of South Portland, Me., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of the Ohio State Automobile Association, Cleveland, Ohio, asking that the high cost of gasoline be investigated and measures taken to reduce the same; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Seattle and Oakville, Wash., against passage of bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: Petition of sundry citizens of South Dakota; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of 20 citizens of South Tacoma, 14 citizens of Cowlitz County, and 6 citizens of Carrolls, all in the State of Washington, against Sunday observance bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of Washington, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Skamokawa Grange, No. 425, of Skamokawa, Wash., favoring House bill 13882, for the construction of a military highway between Vancouver Barracks and Fort Canby, Wash.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of 20 citizens of South Tacoma, Wash., against passage of bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of Rhode Island, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of San Diego County Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. H. E. Ricksecker and 123 others, favoring the Chamberlain-Hayden bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Fortuna Woman's Civic Club, Mrs. R. R. Smith, president, and Mrs. H. A. Biller, secretary, of Fortuna, Cal., favoring bill for national-park service; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Peter G. McIver and 8 others, of Redlands, Cal., favoring prohibition of liquor traffic in the District of Columbia, Hawaiian Islands, and Porto Rico, also national prohibition; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of Mrs. Florence E. Survant and 3 others, of Needles, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Association of Collegiate Alumnae, Southern California Branch, Mrs. Henry Goodall, president, of San Bernardino, Cal., favoring Keating-Owen bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of Nellie R. Short, of Victorville; Virginia E. Messick, of Victorville; Mrs. M. B. Messick, of Victorville; and Percival Thompson, of Coronado, all in the State of California, favoring national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Charles Saleman; of San Diego; W. P. Buck and Peter J. Becker, of San Diego, Cal., favoring strict neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of W. M. Healey, assistant secretary Pacific Religious Liberty Association; Mrs. M. E. Waldron and 4 others; Emmet S. McCollum and 36 others; Mrs. O. C. Smith and 12 others; Mrs. Viola L. Speers and 8 others; P. E. Switzer and 5 others; W. C. Perrin and 3 others; Mrs. G. H. Smith and 13 others; Mrs. Wetherber and 12 others; Thomas J. Sutherland and 13 others; Thomas Roach and 12 others; Mrs. Elsey Endsley and 13 others; Mrs. Annette Rowe and 9 others; Mrs. F. Knorr and 13 others; P. E. Mass and 35 others; H. E. Tallaut and 16 others; J. M. Pease and 12 others; and Edgar A. Stopher and 12 others, all of San Diego, Cal., protesting against House bills 6468 and 491, to amend postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Edgar A. Stopher and 12 others, of San Diego, Cal., protesting against bill to permit the erection of a monument in Arlington National Cemetery to the nuns who served as nurses in the Civil war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Edgar A. Stopher and 12 others, of San Diego, Cal., protesting against a bill to make October 12, Columbus Day, a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Harriett E. van Schaick and 10 others and P. H. Reed and 20 others, all of Colton, Cal.; N. A. Stevens and 1 other, of San Diego, Cal.; Mrs. Annette Rowe and 9 others; Mrs. Elsie Endsley and 16 others; P. E. Mass and 37 others; and H. E. Tallaut and 15 others, protesting against House bill 652, 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.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petitions of sundry citizens, indorsing House bill 6915, providing for an indefinite leave of absence at half pay for superannuated postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens, indorsing House bill 11168, providing 30 days' annual leave to United States employees of the Naval Gun Factory; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of C. C. Barnes and 20 other citizens of Big Rapids, Mecosta County, Mich., favoring passage of the

Susan B. Anthony amendment enfranchising women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of Jesse Walls and 118 other citizens of Kent County, Mich., against passage of bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petition of eight citizens of St. Louis, Mo., favoring an embargo on arms, etc., for belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Delaware: Memorial of mayor and council, of Wilmington, Del., favoring passage of House bill 6915, granting indefinite leave of absence to certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends, against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring establishment of Government institution for treatment of leprosy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. OAKEY: Petition of citizens of Hartford County, Conn., for the passage of woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POU: Petition of 15 farmers, of Franklin County, N. C., relative to rural credits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Rev. H. A. Pease, Rev. C. A. Steucke, E. J. Carpenter, and sundry other citizens of Ithaca, N. Y., opposing the passage of Senate bill 645 and House bill 642, providing for the closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Reading Grange, No. 50, and Schuyler County Pomona Grange, Mrs. J. W. Jennings, of Watkins, N. Y., secretary, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Christian Endeavor Society of the First Congregational Church, of Ithaca, N. Y., E. R. Smith, president, favoring the passage of all measures relating to the prohibition of the liquor traffic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of James C. Moore, G. A. Thorp, and sundry other citizens of Hornell, N. Y., opposing the passage of the postal bills introduced by Mr. FITZGERALD and Mr. SIEGEL; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of W. T. Kellogg, L. A. Baker, Rev. H. A. Pease, Rev. C. A. Steucke, Rev. J. C. B. Moyer, and other sundry citizens of Ithaca, N. Y., opposing the passage of the postal bills introduced by Mr. FITZGERALD and Mr. SIEGEL; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial of Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, Cal., against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of United Brethren Sunday School, of Puente, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition of citizens of Bexar County, Tex., against passage of Senate bill 645, relative to Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Bexar County, Tex., against passage of bills to amend postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Memorial of Commercial Club of Lewiston, Idaho, favoring House bill 10400, for appropriation for construction of roads through forest reserves; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Coolin and Gilbert, Idaho, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of Herbert E. Linscott, of South Merrimack, N. H., approving House bills 6468 and 491; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petitions of citizens of Snyder, Fort Morgan, and Loveland, Colo., against the Sunday-observance bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Snyder, Loveland, Berthoud, and Fort Morgan, Colo., against passage of bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WALSH: Petition of George B. Haskell and 35 others, indorsing the Gillett bill, House bill 10924; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Massachusetts State Federation of Woman's Clubs, indorsing Gillett bill, House bill 10924; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.