

SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 3, 1917.

(Legislative day of Friday, February 2, 1917.)

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

| | | | |
|-------------|------------------|-------------|--------------|
| Ashurst | Gallinger | Oliver | Smith, S. C. |
| Beckham | Gronna | Overman | Smoot |
| Brady | Husting | Page | Sterling |
| Brandeggee | Johnson, S. Dak. | Pittman | Stone |
| Bryan | Jones | Polindexter | Sutherland |
| Chamberlain | Kenyon | Pomerene | Thomas |
| Chilton | Kern | Reed | Thompson |
| Clapp | La Follette | Robinson | Tillman |
| Colt | Lane | Saulsbury | Townsend |
| Culberson | Lodge | Shafroth | Underwood |
| Curtis | Martin, Va. | Sheppard | Vardaman |
| Dillingham | Martine, N. J. | Sherman | Walsh |
| Fernald | Myers | Smith, Ga. | Williams |
| Fletcher | Norris | Smith, Md. | Works |

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I rise to announce the absence of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] owing to illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. PITTMAN. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] has been detained from the Senate for several days by illness.

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

SENATOR FROM MARYLAND.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the credentials of JOSEPH IRWIN FRANCE, chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Maryland a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1917, which will be printed in the RECORD and placed on the files.

The credentials are as follows:

STATE OF MARYLAND,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1916, JOSEPH IRWIN FRANCE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Maryland a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1917.

Witness his excellency our governor, Emerson C. Harrington, and our seal hereto affixed at Annapolis, Md., this 31st day of January, in the year of our Lord 1917.

EMERSON C. HARRINGTON, Governor.

[SEAL.]

By the governor:

THOMAS W. SIMMONS,
Secretary of State.

SENATOR FROM MINNESOTA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the credentials of FRANK B. KELLOGG, chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Minnesota a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1917, which will be printed in the RECORD and placed on the files.

The credentials are as follows:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
ST. PAUL.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1916, FRANK B. KELLOGG was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Minnesota a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1917.

Witness his excellency our governor, J. A. A. Burnquist, and our seal hereto affixed at St. Paul, this 28th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1916.

J. A. A. BURNQUIST, Governor.
JULIUS A. SCHMAHL, Secretary of State.

[SEAL.]

GOVERNMENT OF PORTO RICO.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask unanimous consent that House bill 9533, to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes, be made the special order for Monday evening at 8 o'clock. I think we can finish it clearly at that time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, ordinarily I would have no objection to that, but just at this moment I do not think I could agree to make anything the exclusive business of the Senate at any particular moment for any considerable length of time. I understand the request embodies the idea that nothing else shall be considered.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will withdraw that part and just make it a special order for Monday evening.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There may be matters arising of very vital importance, and it may be very advisable—

Mr. SHAFROTH. I withdraw that portion of the request. I ask that the request be submitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What is the request now?

Mr. SHAFROTH. The request is for unanimous consent that House bill 9533, to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes, be made the special order for Monday evening at 8 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That, the Chair understands, is what the Senator from Mississippi objected to.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I understood that there was coupled with that that nothing else should be considered. He objected to that portion of the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then, just what will it be?

Mr. SMOOT. I shall object if that is left out.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I move that House bill 9533, to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes, be made the special order for Monday evening at 8 o'clock.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will ask unanimous consent that nothing else shall be considered that evening, I have no objection.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I can give that personal consent, but we have just heard the objection made by the Senator from Mississippi. He will not consent to it if that is made a part of it.

Mr. SMOOT. Then let the Senator incorporate that in his motion.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; that can not be done. That is the difficulty. A call for a quorum would end the session if any business would interfere with it, and the Senator would not be willing to consent to that. This is a bill which has been before the Senate now for more than six months, and I have been trying time after time to get it up for consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. Why does not the Senator move to take it up during the day?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Because we can not get time during the day. Here is an appropriation bill before us now the consideration of which is going to last longer than Monday night. I can not get the bill through except in this way. I ask that the motion be put.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado moves that on Monday evening at 8 o'clock what is commonly known as the Porto Rican civil government bill be made the special order of the Senate. It requires a two-thirds vote. [Putting the question.]

On a division, the motion was not agreed to.

WILLIAM LOWELL HILL.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from South Carolina will allow me, I desire to ask for a recommittal to the Committee on Naval Affairs of the bill (S. 7283) providing for the appointment of Chief Boatswain William Lowell Hill as a commander in the United States Navy. It is a report I made from that committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The unfinished business is before the Senate.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19359) making appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, when we laid aside the agricultural appropriation bill yesterday afternoon we had under discussion the appropriation for the investigation of diseases of the pecan. I wish to explain that appropriation. The question was raised as to why the amount had been increased, and it seemed confusing on the face of it.

On page 19 appears the appropriation—

For the investigation of diseases of orchard and other fruits, \$76,415: *Provided*, That \$8,000 of said amount shall be available for the investigation of diseases of the pecan.

On page 25 there appears—

For the investigation and improvement of fruits, and the methods of fruit growing, harvesting, packing, storing, handling, and shipping, etc., \$112,200: *Provided*, That \$14,000 of said amount shall be available for the investigation and improvement of the pecan, and methods of growing, harvesting, packing, and shipping of same.

Then, on page 55—

For investigations of insects affecting deciduous fruits, orchards, vineyards and nuts, \$83,380: *Provided*, That \$9,600 of said sum shall be available for the investigation of insects affecting the pecan and method of control of same.

It appears by adding those specially provided items the amount exceeds \$20,000, which it does, but the present law provides that \$3,000 under the first head shall be used for pecans. We simply add \$5,000 on the first page. For cultural

investigation the present law allows \$4,000, and we added \$10,000. For the last item, under the Bureau of Entomology, the present law allowed \$4,600 in reference to the pecan, and we added \$5,000. So the real increase over what was specially provided last year is exactly \$20,000.

Mr. JONES. I do not understand that it is an increase over the last appropriation, but the question is what the appropriation is in this bill. I understood yesterday that it was really the idea of the committee to appropriate \$20,000 for this specific purpose.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is exactly what was the specific purpose, in excess of what was specifically provided last year.

Mr. JONES. Of course, that is quite different. The House apparently made no special appropriation for beginning the investigation for which this bill, as a matter of fact, appropriates over \$30,000 for this special investigation.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Including last year's appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. JONES. Last year's appropriation has already been made.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I understand.

Mr. JONES. This does not incorporate that. This appropriates \$30,000 additional.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; it does not. There is now provided in the bill \$14,000 for that specific work.

Mr. JONES. In what bill?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. In the old bill and in this.

Mr. JONES. Yes; in the old bill. That is an appropriation distinct in itself, and now you appropriate \$30,000 more.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. We do not. Let me explain it to the Senator. The Agricultural Department sent a letter. I will just read the letter and then the Senator will understand thoroughly just what we have done:

It is evidently the purpose of these amendments to provide for an enlargement of the investigational work of the Bureau of Plant Industry on the diseases of the pecan and the improvement of pecan varieties and cultural methods, and for the work of the Bureau of Entomology on the investigation of insects affecting the pecan by providing increases for these three lines of work as follows—

Now, here is the table:

Bureau of Plant Industry, present annual expenses, pecan diseases, investigations, \$3,000.
Proposed increase, \$5,000.

Mr. JONES. You propose to appropriate \$3,000 and then \$5,000 more.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Surely.

Mr. JONES. That makes \$8,000.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I was speaking of the Senate committee amendment.

Mr. JONES. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. But the Senate committee amendment does not appropriate \$8,000.

Mr. JONES. It says \$14,000 of this sum shall be used for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. There was already \$3,000 set aside by the department for this special work.

Mr. JONES. And this is \$14,000 more. You have included that \$3,000 in this \$14,000, for that was a separate appropriation.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. There is a lump sum, out of which for this special investigation \$3,000 will be set aside, whether this \$8,000 is appropriated or not. We simply specialize it; we take the \$3,000 which was appropriated last year, and which will be used again this year under the general terms of the bill, and make it specific. So the Senate committee only raised the amount that is going to be used anyway \$5,000, in the first instance, plus \$3,000. The department have indicated to us that they are going to use half of the amount provided for in this general appropriation; they say they are going to use \$3,000.

Mr. JONES. Out of the lump-sum appropriation for the current year the bill sets aside a certain sum for the investigation of the pecan. This bill takes care of the next current year, independent of the present current year, and this item, as I understand it, has nothing to do with the present current year.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Let me call the Senator's attention to this language:

For the investigation of diseases of orchard and other fruits, \$76,415.

If the Senator will notice, he will see that we have merely raised that \$5,000, the House having appropriated \$71,415. I ask the Senator to examine the bill on that point.

Mr. JONES. That does not make any difference.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The point I am making is that the Secretary of Agriculture says that out of this general appropriation for the diseases of orchard and other fruits he has set aside and will set aside out of this \$76,415, as he did

last year, \$3,000. There were subsequent facts brought to his attention that justified him in recommending to us that the Senate committee increase what the House had allowed in the lump sum by \$5,000 in the first instance, in order that there might be \$8,000 available for the pecan investigation.

Mr. JONES. For the next year?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; for the next year.

Mr. JONES. So that the amount we are appropriating, then, for this purpose is that full amount; it is in addition to the appropriation for the current year.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I have not disputed that.

Mr. JONES. That has nothing to do with this appropriation.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I am simply saying that the Senate committee has not increased the total amount \$30,000.

Mr. JONES. I am not talking about that.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That was the bone of contention.

Mr. JONES. What I am talking about is that the committee is setting aside for the pecan industry for the next current year over \$30,000.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is what it is doing; but it has not increased the general appropriation by \$30,000.

Mr. JONES. I am not talking about the general increase. What I am trying to get at is, What has been set aside for the pecan investigation? Are you taking of the lump-sum appropriation \$30,000 for that purpose?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. We have taken the \$11,000 available this year, and have added \$20,000 for the pecan industry, making \$31,000 in all. That is exactly what we have done.

Mr. JONES. You are setting aside over \$30,000 for the pecan industry for next year, and taking it out of this lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; but we have not increased the House provision by \$30,000; and that was the point as to which I was confused in my mind. I did not know just exactly what the Senator from Washington was trying to get clear.

Mr. JONES. What I am trying to get at is the exact amount we are setting aside, especially for the pecan industry.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is correct; but the contention was made yesterday that the Senate committee was increasing the amount \$30,000. It had only increased it \$20,000, but had made a specific appropriation of \$31,000, as the Senator says.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the Secretary of Agriculture has a right, out of the lump-sum appropriation, to set aside \$3,000, why has he not a perfect right to set aside \$8,000 of the appropriation and simply increase the amount appropriated? That would be the proper way to do it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; I beg pardon.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Secretary of Agriculture has a right to set aside \$3,000 for this purpose, under the provisions of the bill he can set aside \$50,000.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Surely he could; but he ought to use his discretion in the expenditure of a lump sum.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly he ought to use his discretion.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. There are other things that need to be looked after. He could only, in justice to those other objects, set aside \$3,000, and that is what he has done. That is perfectly clear.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not saying what he will do; I am saying what, under the provisions of the bill, he could do.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Oh, surely, he could refuse to spend any of it, for that matter.

Mr. SMOOT. What I am trying to get clear here, if the Senator will permit me, is, if the Senate committee had increased the appropriation from \$71,450 to \$76,450, that would have been an increase of \$5,000, and there would have been no necessity of inserting the proviso here—

That \$8,000 of said amount shall be available for the investigation of diseases of the pecan.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Suppose the Senate committee, as suggested by a Senator near me, thought it was wise to specify the particular plan, which it did, because of the peculiar conditions, which I do not think it necessary to take up the time of the Senate to explain, what then? A new disease has occurred. This industry is growing by leaps and bounds; it is getting to be a very important one. They have now discovered that by a new process of grafting they can take the paper-shell pecan and graft it on to the little common stock, and in a year or two they will have a tree bearing the finest nut, as against waiting for six years' maturity if the seed are planted. These are things of importance to us. It is coming into the realm of our oil-bearing fruit. It is essential for those who have millions of dollars invested to know what is the best

method by which they can increase this wonderful production of American horticulture. We thought that it was proper, as this is a new disease which has arisen, to specifically divide this appropriation and put these specific amounts where they would do the most good, and, exercising our judgment, we did it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I will yield to the Senator in just a minute.

Mr. President, these appropriations are made for specific purposes; that is, the appropriation of \$8,000 is for the investigation of diseases of orchard and other fruits. The Secretary of Agriculture has no authority whatever to use the money for the purposes mentioned by the Senator from South Carolina. He has a right under this bill to expend it for investigating diseases of orchard and other fruits. Then, on page 55, he is given authority to make an investigation of insects affecting the pecan. That has nothing whatever to do with what the Senator has just said the appropriation was for. Then, I notice here an amendment offered by the Senator from Texas to this very bill providing—

For investigation and improvement of the pecan industry and eradication of diseases peculiar thereto, \$25,000.

That, of course, has not yet been adopted, and I do not know whether or not the Senator from Texas expects it to be adopted; but the only appropriation that there is in this bill for the investigation and improvement of fruits is found on page 25.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, there is no use of the Senator from Utah trying to belittle this matter. The Senate Committee on Agriculture certainly had sense and judgment enough to know that in connection with the question of improvement would also be involved the question of grafting and of diseases. If the Senator knows anything about the hickory tree or knows anything about this particular nut-bearing tree, he knows also that there is a little worm that in the spring cuts off the fruit-bearing ramifications or the branches that bear the fruit. There is also a disease of the tree not caused by an insect, but a disease in the tree that affects its life, its circulation. That is a question of such importance to this country that we, in our judgment, thought we should follow the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture and should appropriate the \$20,000 and divide it between these three important items in order that the whole question might be specifically provided for.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah does not want to belittle the appropriation made in this bill for the investigation of the diseases of orchard and other fruits, which, of course, would include the pecan; nor does the Senator from Utah want to belittle the appropriation for the investigation of insects affecting the pecan; but the Senator from Utah noticed that both of these items—and no one will suggest that there should not be an appropriation for these purposes—amount to the same sum that is appropriated on page 25 of the bill for the investigation of methods of harvesting, packing, storing, handling, and shipping; in other words, there is \$10,000 appropriated for this purpose, only \$5,000 additional to what the department had last year for the investigation of the diseases of the pecan, and \$5,000 for the investigation of insects affecting the pecan.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. On page 25, did the Senator read the word "growing"? That is the most important feature of all.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; it includes "growing."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The investigation of methods of "growing" is the most important feature of it.

Mr. SMOOT. It is the most important feature. The only feature that the Government ought to interest itself in is to try to show the pecan grower how to eliminate diseases of the tree and how to eliminate insects affecting the tree. I do not think we ought to appropriate money to investigate packing, storing, handling, and shipping. I think that is going too far entirely.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That comes under the general head of "growing," and that is what we had reference to. Now, let me ask the Senator from Utah, is he opposing the appropriation? We are appropriating millions of dollars for the improvement of corn seed; we are appropriating millions of dollars for the improvement of different food crops; and this is right along the same line. It is a rich food crop. The Senator from Utah, I think, had an amendment on one of these bills appropriating money to treat diseases of wild ducks on a lake in Utah. I want to know who is going to get the ducks?

Mr. SMOOT. But we did not have any appropriation for investigating how to kill them or how to ship them or how to take care of them or how to pack them.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I presume we were merely getting ready for all that.

Mr. SMOOT. That appropriation was made to eliminate disease. The Senator from Utah does not object to any appropriation that will tend to teach the farmer how to get rid of a disease affecting a tree or to teach the farmer how to get rid of insects, just as appropriations of millions of dollars have been made for the eradication of the boll weevil.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. These amendments are placed in the language and at the places suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture. We have exactly followed his recommendations upon the subject. I have his letter in my hand, and I will repeat that we took his exact language and his exact recommendations and followed them.

I agree with the Senator in one respect. I do not like the way these bills are made up; but we are not in a position to change them at this session. If we act at all, we have got to act under the old plan. It is my purpose to take up with the Secretary of Agriculture during the coming vacation, if we have a vacation, the possibility of some system of consolidation and doing away with what seems to be a scattering method of appropriation.

If the Senator will yield to me for just a moment further—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We determined, for illustration, that \$300,000 ought to be appropriated to fight the disease of the white pine. That was recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture; but instead of putting that into a general appropriation, we specified that he must use it for that purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. That was proper.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then we concluded that \$20,000 more, in addition to the \$11,000 that is being spent under the existing appropriation, could with propriety be spent upon the pecan tree. We had an appeal for an additional appropriation to study the problems of grafting. I do not think it will be a continuing appropriation. I think they will soon complete that work; but the department has expressed a desire for such an appropriation and also for \$10,000 to handle a new disease which has made its appearance in the pecan tree. The pecan industry is one that is growing rapidly. It is being found that pecans can be raised successfully in cold climates wherever the hickory-nut tree grows. At first I was indisposed to help, but after conferring with the department I became satisfied that it was a wise appropriation, and I will read the Senator just what the Secretary said.

Mr. SMOOT. I think it has been read, and I think perhaps the Secretary was correct in it; but what I want to call attention to is this: The Secretary of Agriculture called this matter to the attention of the House, and the House did not think it was necessary to put in these words, specifically naming pecans, and I do not believe it is necessary now. If the Senate Committee on Agriculture desires to increase the appropriations, well and good, and as long as the Secretary of Agriculture says that he wants the increase for that purpose, why, let him have the increase. Let him decide as to whether this increase should be spent for this particular purpose.

I say that for this reason: Suppose we appropriate the \$20,000 and specifically say that it shall be spent for this purpose, and for no other purpose. Conditions may arise under which it would not be necessary to spend that amount of money. I think the Secretary of Agriculture ought to have the authority, and he has under the increased appropriation in a lump sum; but in this way he would have no authority to spend the money for any other purpose than is named in the proviso. I think it is a poor way of legislating.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, we did not wish to give the additional \$20,000 unless it was needed for this purpose. We would not have increased the appropriation except for this particular purpose; and if the Secretary finds he does not need it for this purpose then we expect him to turn it back into the Treasury.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, Mr. President, that may have been the case; but here on the very first item you have increased it \$5,000 and instructed him to use \$8,000 of it for this purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Because he already uses \$4,000 for this purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. No; \$3,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Three thousand dollars, as shown by his classification of expenditures. He asked for the additional sum to be used for this purpose, and he asked us to do it in this language—I read from his letter:

Page 18, line 16, strike out "\$71,415" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "\$76,415: Provided, That \$8,000 of said amount shall be available for the investigation of diseases of the pecan."

That is the very language of the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. SMOOT. I see it is.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Now, we were willing to give him the additional \$5,000 for this purpose, but not for any other. We thought he had enough for the other purposes, but if he needed this sum for this purpose we were willing to give it to him.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, the House thought he had enough without the increase.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. When we know what we want it for, I think it is always wise to tell him to use it for what we want it for. I really take just the other view from that suggested by the Senator, and I think he has, usually—that if we know what we want money spent for we had better tell them to spend it for that purpose than to turn it loose indefinitely.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true wherever the whole amount of a lump sum can be segregated; but in this amendment we take \$3,000 that has been set aside already out of a lump sum by the Secretary of Agriculture, add to that \$5,000 upon his recommendation, and then take it out of a lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will allow me one minute, I will state that that matter was subsequently brought to the attention of the Senate committee after the bill had left the House. It was not brought to the House committee, but was brought to us as a pressing emergency. That is the reason why we authorized this specific work, under the advice of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator will find also that we have in a number of other places, from large lump funds, specified that certain parts should be used in a certain way. For instance, we determined that it was desirable to make some sheep tests in Idaho, and we said, as to the lump sum: "Provided, however, That a certain amount of this shall be used in this way," because we wanted it used in that way.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that is perfectly correct where it is a new item entirely, as, for instance, in the establishment of the sheep investigation in Idaho. I think \$12,700 was the amount provided in the bill for that purpose.

Mr. BRADY. Twelve thousand seven hundred and eighty dollars.

Mr. SMOOT. Twelve thousand seven hundred and eighty dollars. I forgot the \$80. That is a new item entirely. The appropriation is increased just that amount, and I think that in that case it ought to be specified, and that the committee did perfectly right. But here it is entirely a different proposition. However, I shall say no more about it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I believe that we understand this question, or, rather, we understand what the Senators think about it, and I suggest that we vote on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 19, beginning on line 7, the following amendment is proposed:

Strike out "\$71,415" and the semicolon and insert "\$76,415: Provided, That \$8,000 of said amount shall be available for the investigation of diseases of the pecan."

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President, there has been so much discussion about this item that I simply wish to ask the Senator having the bill in charge a question relative to the real increase. As a member of the committee, after hearing all the discussion that took place before the committee, my understanding is that the intent of the committee was simply to increase this appropriation \$20,000, and that in increasing the appropriation \$20,000 we assumed the right and responsibility of specifying where the appropriation should be used. Am I correct in that?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. BRADY. For that reason, Mr. President, I think it is only fair to say that the committee gave this item very careful consideration; and after discussing the matter it was the unanimous judgment of the committee that the appropriation should be increased, and that the money should be used as specified in the bill.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 10, to insert:

For applying such methods of eradication on control of the white-pine blister rust as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary, including the payment of such expenses and the employment of such persons and means in the city of Washington

and elsewhere, in cooperation with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations, or individuals as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, \$300,000, of which \$150,000 shall be immediately available; and, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, of the remaining \$150,000 no expenditures shall be made until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by State, county, or local authorities or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of such purpose: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, in the first line of that amendment manifestly the word "on" should be "or," as the Senator will see if he will look at it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; I ask that that amendment be made.

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

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to change the word "on" before the word "control," in line 11, to read "or," so that it will read "of eradication or control."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to say just one word about this amendment. This is the only really large increase that the Committee on Agriculture has added to the House bill. The evidence satisfied us that the white-pine blister rust had become a very serious menace to the white pine; that it had seriously injured them in the northeastern section of the country; and that it was spreading on toward the Mississippi. It was the opinion of the department that steps might be taken to prevent it from passing the Mississippi and to check it in its tendency toward the middle Northern States, and perhaps even lessen it in the Northeastern States. While the appropriation is large, we believed that the importance of the subject justified it, and it was the unanimous decision of the committee that this large appropriation should be made.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, just a word. As I have taken a very great interest in this matter, it is extremely gratifying to me that the committee has made so liberal an appropriation. There are two hundred and sixty millions and more of white pine in this country that are threatened with destruction. We know what has happened to the chestnut trees, and had we taken that matter in hand as vigorously as it is proposed to take this disease of the white pine, I am satisfied that we might have saved the chestnut trees of the country, but they are practically destroyed.

I am glad, Mr. President, that the amendment is in the bill and hope it will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 1, after the words "United States," to strike out "\$75,010" and insert "\$90,010: *Provided*, That not less than \$15,000 of this sum shall be used for experiments in cotton-seed interbreeding," so as to make the clause read:

For acclimatization and adaptation investigations of cotton, corn, and other crops introduced from tropical regions, and for the improvement of cotton and other fiber plants by cultural methods, breeding, and selection, and for determining the feasibility of increasing the production of hard fibers outside of the continental United States, \$90,010: *Provided*, That not less than \$15,000 of this sum shall be used for experiments in cotton-seed interbreeding.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read to line 9, on page 23, the last paragraph read being as follows:

For the investigation and improvement of cereals and methods of cereal production, and the study of cereal diseases, and for the investigation of the cultivation and breeding of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax diseases, and for the investigation and improvement of broom corn and methods of broom-corn production, \$178,505: *Provided*, That \$40,000 shall be set aside for the study of corn improvement and methods of corn production: *Provided also*, That \$20,000 shall be set aside for the investigation of the diseases of wheat, oats, and barley known as black rust and stripe rust.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I simply wish to ask the Senator having charge of the bill how long we have been making special appropriations for the study of corn improvement and methods of corn production?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I can not answer that question. I know the investigation is still in process of development.

Mr. JONES. What I desire to ascertain is whether or not this is the first time that a special amount has been set aside for that purpose. I do not remember having seen a provision of that sort before in the Agricultural bill. It may have been there; but in this item we take \$40,000 out of the lump sum and direct that it be applied specially for that purpose. I should like to

know whether this is the first time the provision has been that way, or whether we have been doing that heretofore.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. In the report of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1917, on page 156, I observe that this work began in 1901. We have been setting aside appropriations for the purpose and the work has been carried on.

Mr. JONES. Does that mean that the work began then, or that we then began setting aside a specific amount for this purpose?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It seems from the text here that we have been setting aside a specific amount for the purpose, for it says that this work has been under specific experimental tests in different environments. It has been carried on in Nevada, Montana, Colorado, Nebraska, South Dakota North Dakota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, Missouri, Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, and New York. It seems, I will say to the Senator, that the department by this experimentation has discovered the very peculiar fact that in the case of corn bred, say, in the Senator's State and corn bred in a place some distance away, if the seed is interchanged it will not breed back to type; so that they have bred these varieties in the different environments in order to get the variety best adapted to each.

Mr. JONES. Is that the reason why we can not get any good corn bread any more?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; I think the reason we do not get any good corn bread any more is because they really are not housing the corn before it is put on the market. It is husked in the open, allowed to stand out in the rain, and readily absorbs the moisture, so that a kind of deterioration sets in and you get a kind of a bitter, musty stuff.

Mr. JONES. I think if we had good corn we could get good corn bread when you find some one who knows how to make it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the Senator will visit me some time, I will give him good pone corn bread.

Mr. JONES. I wish the Senator would suggest something to the restaurant down here as to how to make corn bread.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I suggest that the Senator from South Carolina invite the entire Senate.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I will be delighted to do so. The reading of the bill was resumed, at line 10, on page 23.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 15, after the word "distribution," to insert "except within the district now covered thereby, in accordance with Bulletin No. 2, issued by the superintendent of the Northern Great Forest Section, Mandan, N. Dak., October 12, 1914," and, in line 22, after the word "purposes," to strike out "in the States of North and South Dakota west of the one hundredth meridian, and in Montana and Wyoming east of the 5,000-foot contour line," so as to make the clause read:

For the investigation and improvement of methods of crop production under subhumid, semiarid, or dry-land conditions, \$160,000: *Provided*, That the limitation in this act as to the cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in the free distribution, or propagation for free distribution, except within the district now covered thereby, in accordance with Bulletin No. 2, issued by the superintendent of the Northern Great Forest Section, Mandan, N. Dak., October 12, 1914, of cuttings, seedlings, or trees of willow, box elder, ash, caragana, or other common varieties of fruit, ornamental, or shelter-belt trees in the Northern Great Plains area, except for experimental or demonstration purposes.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, at my request the Committee on Agriculture was kind enough to insert the same language that was inserted in the bill last year. I find, however, upon a close examination of the language which came from the House, that it is clearer than the provision which I asked to have substituted. I also find that there was a typographical error in the bulletin referred to. I therefore ask that the amendment of the committee, which is the amendment that I proposed, be disagreed to.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 8, after the word "countries," to strike out "\$102,200" and insert "\$112,200: *Provided*, That \$14,000 of said amount shall be available for the investigation and improvement of the pecan, and methods of growing, harvesting, packing, and shipping of same," so as to make the clause read:

For the investigation and improvement of fruits, and the methods of fruit growing, harvesting, packing, storing, handling, and shipping, and for experimental shipments of fruits within the United States and to foreign countries, \$112,200: *Provided*, That \$14,000 of said amount shall be available for the investigation and improvement of the pecan, and methods of growing, harvesting, packing, and shipping of same.

The amendment was agreed to.

THE REVENUE.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent to submit an amendment to the so-called revenue bill (H. R. 20573), and I ask that the same be read and printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the proposed amendment.

The Secretary read as follows:

Strike out line 4, page 11, and insert "Treasury notes." Strike out lines 15 to 24, inclusive, on page 11, and lines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 12, and insert the following:

"That for the purpose of defraying the expense to be incurred in placing the Nation in a state of military and naval preparedness, the Secretary of the Treasury shall be authorized to issue on the credit of the United States not to exceed \$500,000,000 of United States notes not bearing interest, payable to bearer at the United States Treasury, and of such denominations as he may deem expedient, not less than \$5 each, to be paid to all who shall supply material to and for the Army and Navy of the United States of whatever character and description and in compensation therefor. That such notes shall be redeemable in coin at the pleasure of the Secretary on and after the year anno Domini 1935, and shall be receivable in payment of all taxes, internal duties, excises, debts, and demands of every kind due to the United States of every kind whatsoever; and shall be also lawful money and a legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, within the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

LIQUOR-TRAFFIC PROPAGANDA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish to direct the attention of the Senate to the fact that a concern calling itself the United Press Association has been sending over the country free newspaper copy favoring the liquor interests. This copy is sent out under an envelope bearing the return address, "The United Press Association, Cleveland." The impression has thus been created that the famous association so familiarly known as the "United Press" is sending out this copy. The United Press has taken notice of the fact and has issued a statement which I ask to have the Secretary read. The proper name of the United Press is "United Press Associations," and the head office of this great organization is located in the city of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

EDITORS: The following is sent on advice of our counsel for your information and for publication if desired. In view of the fact that the liquor propaganda referred to above has been sent to many newspapers not receiving the United Press service we will greatly appreciate the publication of this disavowal.

W. H. HAWKINS.

New York, January 30.

A concern operating out of Cleveland, Ohio, is sending newspapers in the country a great deal of free copy favorable to the liquor interests. This copy comes in envelopes bearing the return address "The United Press Association, Cleveland."

The United Press Associations, with general offices in New York and bureaus in many cities throughout the country, is in no way connected with or responsible for the concern that is sending out this antiprohibition propaganda, and it has instructed its attorneys to institute proceedings to enjoin the methods which make it appear that the United Press Associations has abandoned its course of distributing only regular news matter.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is merely another illustration of the methods pursued by the liquor traffic in the endeavor to perpetuate its existence in this country.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) providing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Saturday, the 3d day of February, 1917, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that Mr. NORRIS had been appointed as one of the managers on the part of the House in the place of Mr. CAMPBELL in the conference between the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 18453) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 8090. An act granting the consent of Congress to Washington-Newport News Short Line, a corporation, to construct a bridge across the Potomac River; and

S. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies in 1917.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, which was read:

House concurrent resolution 71.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Saturday, the 3d day of February, 1917, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

Mr. KERN. I move the adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19359) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

The reading of the bill was continued to page 26, line 7.

Mr. JONES. I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill what results have come from the farm across the river here.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I will state that it is just one of the regular experimental farms on which the Government is making experiments.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will answer the Senator from Washington that there has been one very important result achieved, and that is the Government has built a good road between the Potomac River and Alexandria, Va. That is a very valuable result.

Mr. JONES. As to Virginia, it is all right.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. In the program of work for the fiscal year 1917 the department says in its note that the object is to maintain a field laboratory for the various bureaus and offices of the Department of Agriculture. This is owned by the Department of Agriculture. It began in 1900.

In general the land is being gradually improved and drainage systems extended. Additional areas have been rendered suitable and assigned to experimental work.

This is Government property.

Mr. JONES. I know, but what I wanted to get at is what results have come from the experiments over there.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I suppose they have distributed different seeds grown there adapted to different localities throughout the country. It is just like an experiment station in any State, they experiment as to the production of different seeds and distribute them. It comes under the general class of experimental work.

Mr. JONES. I know, but what I wanted to get at is, has anything concrete been brought to the attention of the committee that has resulted from experiments there that will be of benefit and has been of benefit?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No more than you would find from other experimental farms.

Mr. JONES. That does not give me the information. I am trying to find out what the results are on this farm.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I think it can be discriminated somewhat from the other farms. As I understand it, the immediate men in the department here use this land, and they want the money for their own special experiments. Just how they find the results, I do not know; but the scientists in the department here use it not in connection with the State of Virginia but for their personal experimentations from time to time on every kind of subject that they are investigating and that they want to experiment with. That is my understanding of it. How they subsequently use the results of their experiments, I do not know; but they have asked for this appropriation for their personal work.

Mr. JONES. When the committee considers the Agricultural appropriation bill another time, I think it would be a good idea if they would go a little into detail and find out what particular good the people are getting out of this farm and from the twenty-odd thousand dollars that we are expending yearly in connection with it. I have passed by the farm on the road that has been constructed to Alexandria, which, of course, is very nice for people wanting to go there. It shows that Virginia has some good roads, anyhow, even if we can not get connections to Richmond. I should like to know what good they have done for the corn grower, for instance. I notice that they have an

orchard there. I should like to know what good they have brought out for the orchardists for this section of the country; whether they have been able to give them any advice that has been of benefit or whether they have developed anything there of benefit. I notice that they seem to grow wheat, and I think oats and grasses of different kinds. I wish to know whether they have done anything more there than the ordinary farmers around here are doing in the growing of fruit or in the growing of corn or wheat or oats.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I should like to state to the Senator from Washington that all these matters are very easily ascertainable. We have set apart certain experimental stations throughout the country and we do not ask what is done specifically at one of them. The general result is for the benefit of the country at large. As I said a moment ago, the department is having different seeds propagated in different localities in order that they may be used advantageously.

Mr. JONES. Let me suggest to the Senator that he made that statement, I think, a little too broad. They do not determine anything about beneficial irrigation in the Yakima Valley or anything about production out in my part of the country.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I will say to the Senator from Washington that there was brought out in the hearings before the House committee information on this very point. If he will turn to pages 192 and 193, I think he will be thoroughly satisfied. If he wants a specific report as to what has been the beneficial result, I will be very glad to interrogate the department upon that matter.

Mr. JONES. I want the Senator to understand that I am not suggesting that there have not been beneficial results, but I am trying to find out what they are, if there are beneficial results. If there are beneficial results, and I think there are, I should like to know what they are. That is what I am trying to get at. I was not intimating at all that there are not good results coming from this farm.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, all that information can readily be obtained from the bulletins issued by the department. I take it that the farm is being used and developed and cultivated to experiment with plants grown in this latitude. There are plants that would probably be experimented with here that would not suit the western country. It seems to me that for everything which can be grown in this latitude it is a very fine thing to have a farm here under the direct observation and supervision of the Agricultural Department. The work that has been done by it can be known by simply reading the bulletins that are issued, which cover the work on that farm.

Mr. JONES. The Senator from Mississippi knows that we do not have time to read all the bulletins and all the various documents that are gotten out by the various departments with reference to their activities. I thought that possibly the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, having special charge of this matter and special consideration of this bill, might have gone into it with some of the representatives of the department. They could furnish this information in much less time than I could get it by reading all the various bulletins. I should like to read them, and I know they are interesting, but I have not time to do it.

Mr. BRADY. Will the Senator allow me?

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

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the Senator from Idaho will allow me a minute, here are some of the facts:

Dr. TAYLOR. Item 99 covers the work at Arlington farm which, as the result of the enlargement of the area that has now become available for experimental use through the reclamation of the marsh land formerly unavailable for commercial use, requires improvement; and we need \$7,500 for that enlarged area. There is about 60 acres.

The CHAIRMAN. How would you use that \$7,500—for putting in tile drains?

Dr. TAYLOR. That will be used in draining and for some small buildings required for tools and that sort of thing.

He goes on to give the special reasons:

The CHAIRMAN. How many buildings, just one or two?

Dr. TAYLOR. I think only some tool sheds and such things. I do not know that a detailed estimate of those has been submitted.

The CHAIRMAN. It says here that your buildings are to consist of a cement reservoir to cost \$3,000. That will leave \$4,500 to put in tile drainage and buy your equipment.

Dr. TAYLOR. That reservoir is needed for the water supply of the present improved portion of the farm. This building estimate covers the whole operation at Arlington farm.

Mr. STEELE. Why is it that you can not raise fruit over there?

Dr. TAYLOR. Fruit?

Mr. STEELE. Yes.

Dr. TAYLOR. Certain fruits succeed very well there. Mr. Steele. There is this, however, to be said with reference to the peach and other stone fruits that under tidewater and river bottom conditions in this middle Atlantic section fungus diseases are much more troublesome.

He goes on to show how by spraying and by different experiments they found how to improve the orchards. Then he covers the different items that you will find in the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture of the House.

Mr. JONES. Is that information that fruit growers did not have before they commenced experimenting there? We have had information with reference to spraying fruit, and all that sort of thing, for a good many years in our section of the country.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Senator from Washington does not pretend to say that they are not improving the methods by which they are eradicating peach rot or the fungus that causes the peach to rot, when at maturity the peach suddenly develops a black rot which almost destroys the entire crop. The old Bordeaux mixture attempted to correct that. They have improved the methods of spraying now so that you can eradicate it without picking over the tree carefully and destroying it. Each year they are improving the methods. Here is a fine place to investigate the matter locally and disseminate the information through like territory.

Mr. BRADY. If the Senator from Washington will permit me, I will say that it is the wish of the department to improve this experimental farm here near Washington for demonstrations under the direct charge of the Department of Agriculture.

Where we have an experimental station in Idaho or in Washington or in South Carolina the department finds they are too far away to test out certain plants or to make certain experiments, which they can do, however, if they have such stations in close proximity to the department where the work can be done. I have studied the matter very carefully, and I believe if the Senator from Washington will read the report of the Secretary of Agriculture he will be satisfied that this appropriation should be made.

Mr. JONES. Does the Senator think that general experiments here on the Arlington farm would be of any substantial benefit out in his country?

Mr. BRADY. I think they would in the broad sense. I will ask the Senator from Washington if he thinks that an experimental farm in Washington or in Idaho would have any specific beneficial effect on the District of Columbia?

Mr. JONES. I doubt it very much.

Mr. BRADY. Well, that is precisely the condition which exists relative to this farm.

Mr. JONES. If the Senator from Idaho agrees with me on that point, he agrees with me on the suggestion that the experiments here are of no special benefit out there. I do not say they are not beneficial here, but what I am trying to get at is what are the benefits that have come from this farm and in return for the twenty-odd thousand dollars that we are spending year after year?

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] suggested that the officials here wanted to have their personal investigations and experiments. He did not mean that they were to be for their personal benefit, but for the particular work they had in charge they wanted them here.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In order that they might personally see the work in progress.

Mr. JONES. But what I want to get at now is, what do they tell us they have been able to accomplish there, if anything?

Mr. BRADY. It would take up too much of the time of the Senate to state to the Senator from Washington in full the report that has been made by the Secretary of Agriculture relative to the Arlington farm.

Mr. JONES. Could the Senator tell me one or two things—

Mr. BRADY. As the Senator from South Carolina says, they have demonstrated—

Mr. JONES. Will the Senator from Idaho tell me something different from what the Senator from South Carolina told me?

Mr. BRADY. I can only in a general way state that the purpose of the department is to make specific demonstrations on the Arlington farm, under their personal supervision, as to plants, trees, and shrubs, the utility of which to some other parts of the country has not been fully demonstrated.

Mr. JONES. Has the Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry made any experiments that he has pointed out which have been of any benefit?

Mr. BRADY. I merely rose for the purpose of suggesting to the Senator in charge of the bill that, in order to get this information properly before the Senate and the country, he insert in the Record what the Secretary of Agriculture has to say relative to this particular item. As members of the committee, we do not have time to go into every detail of these matters, but we must depend largely on the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture relative to particular projects. I do not myself believe that the Secretary of Agriculture would recommend that we continue this experimental farm at Arlington

did he not believe that it was of some specific benefit to the people of the country as a whole.

Mr. JONES. Of course if we go on that theory in making appropriations, and so on, we shall spread out almost everywhere and take almost all the money that we have in sight and all the money that is in prospect, for the department certainly make their recommendations; and if we simply assume that because they have made a recommendation great benefit will result, we might just as well say, "Well, whatever you send down we shall appropriate for."

I do not mean to suggest that they do not estimate for what they think they ought to have, and for beneficial purposes; but we have to pass on that to some extent also. That is the reason why I am merely asking for some information as to what is being accomplished by all this money that we are proposing to appropriate.

Mr. BRADY. I will say to the Senator from Washington that it is the earnest aim of the committee to secure all the information that we can before acting on particular items.

Mr. JONES. I know that.

Mr. BRADY. Some of the members of the committee brought records to show us that the Government had given Washington, Idaho, and many other States of the West a hundred million dollars for the purpose of developing our irrigation resources.

Mr. JONES. Did the Senator say \$100,000,000?

Mr. BRADY. Yes; \$100,000,000.

Mr. JONES. When did they give us that?

Mr. BRADY. That was the record that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] brought in. I did not think it had been so much.

Mr. JONES. No; they have not given us that amount, and what they have given us we are paying back.

Mr. BRADY. We are paying every cent of it back.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The amount given by the National Government has been \$116,000,000, and it has gotten \$6,000,000 back.

Mr. JONES. I know that; but we are obligated for it all; we are going to pay it, and it will come back.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Oh!

Mr. JONES. I want to say to the Senator from Georgia that on a project near my home town we have paid back to the Government over a million dollars already for money that was spent there, and every dollar of it will come back to the Government.

Mr. BRADY. Idaho is paying back the money she received in just the same way, and we intend to pay it all back; but the point I wanted to make was that the Senators from the South do not have time to investigate every detail of the appropriations asked for by us. They have to depend largely upon our honesty and integrity that the money will be expended for useful purposes and will be returned to the Government, and I have no hesitation in saying that the people of the West will return the money.

Mr. JONES. Very frequently on this floor it is charged that we are not going to pay it back—I do not mean the charge is made by any particular Senator, but every once in a while somebody says the money will never be paid back; but the Senator from Idaho knows it will be paid back.

Mr. BRADY. There may have been intimations of that kind, but I do not believe that any western man has any such thought, and I do not believe that the people of the East, when they are properly informed, will doubt for a moment that every dollar of this money will be paid back.

I might say, in passing, that the lands that have been reclaimed are producing crops now that are worth over \$20,000,000 a year, which, in a direct way, must necessarily be of benefit to the entire country. But the point I wanted to make—

Mr. JONES. If the Senator will permit me, I think his estimate is very low.

Mr. BRADY. I myself think it would be found to be over \$30,000,000 if we could get the exact figures, but I think the last report of the Reclamation Service shows that it is a very large amount, and it will increase every year.

Returning to the Arlington farm—for we seem to have drifted away from the original subject—I was in favor of that provision, for the reason that I believed the recommendations that have been made by the Agricultural Department were justified. That farm may not be of any direct benefit to the people of Washington or to the State of Idaho, but I do believe it will be a direct benefit to the Nation, as a whole; and I am satisfied that the experiments which have been and are being conducted there have been made and are being made in good faith.

Mr. JONES. I hope the Senator from Idaho will not understand that I am opposing this item or suggesting that it has not been made in good faith, or because it may not be of

benefit to our section that the work ought to be discontinued. Nothing of that kind entered my thoughts.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator desires to strike out the item, I suggest that he move that it be stricken out. I do not care whether it is stricken out or not.

Mr. JONES. I have just told the Senator and the Senate that I have not even suggested that I am opposed to it. I am simply trying to get information; and if Senators are opposed to giving that information, or if because a Senator inquires for information they think he has some ulterior motive, of course we had better just not try to get it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think the Senator is right. In justification of the appropriation for this farm, and in answer to his question, I desire to read the conclusion from the testimony of Dr. Taylor before the House committee, so that the Senator may understand what is being done.

Mr. BRADY. That is what I should like to have done, and that was the purpose for which I rose.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I read from Dr. Taylor's testimony, as follows:

Dr. TAYLOR. No; there are certain lines of experimentation with reference to plant diseases and certain of them with reference to insects affecting plants in which certain plots are left deliberately unprotected and untreated in order to determine as quickly as possible the resistance of those several varieties to these troubles. For instance there is one block of seedling pear trees there under test. They have been grown by systematic crossing of relatively blight-resistant pears with our best pears, such as the Seckel, Bartlett, and pears of that type which are planted there and left exposed to pear-blight infection without attempting to protect them in order to determine through natural selection whether there is any one of those hybrids which is resistant enough and good enough to constitute a commercial pear that would be relatively free from blight. And in the case of the insect work, although that should be discussed by the Bureau of Entomology, certain blocks have been planted specifically with reference to the determination of their relative immunity or relative resistance to this attack, and certain of them also for the test of spray mixtures, to ascertain the strength and character of mixture that the tree would endure. It is felt better to risk trees that are owned by the department in these tests than it is to go into a commercial privately owned orchard and risk damaging the trees. The strength of those has to be determined somewhere by actual test, and a good deal of that is being done at Arlington farm. It does not represent demonstration work, and should not be so regarded. In fact, there is little of the field planting at Arlington farm that should be regarded as a demonstration of just how to do a thing. It is rather a testing place, an out-of-door laboratory.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, that is something like what I was trying to get at. I hope the members of the committee will not think, because I have been asking these questions, that I have intimated or that I have an idea that the committee is not doing its duty. Such a thing as that never occurred to me. I know that the committee can not inquire into all these different items. I know very well with reference to bills brought before committees of which I am a member that there are many things about them concerning which I do not know; but if any Senator not a member of the committee—and Senators must rely upon the committee for information—should ask as to any particular item about which I did not have information, or that the committee had not inquired about, it would be simply an incentive to look into that, of course, in the future. I want the members of the committee to disabuse their minds of any idea that I am intimating that the committee has not done its duty or that the committee is not disposed to do its duty, or anything of that sort. I have no thought of that kind at all.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 27, line 5, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$2,111,530" and insert "\$2,441,530," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$2,441,530.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the next amendment of the committee, striking out the provision on pages 27, 28, and 29, for the "purchase and distribution of valuable seeds," including the amendment of the total on page 29, line 21, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, under the subhead "Forest Service," on page 35, line 8, after the word "Arizona," to strike out "\$9,044" and insert "\$8,044," so as to make the clause read:

Coronado National Forest, Ariz., \$8,044.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 21, after the words "New Mexico," to strike out "\$8,067" and insert "\$6,067," so as to make the clause read:

Lincoln National Forest, N. Mex., \$6,067.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 8, after "\$6,165," to insert "Provided further, That the cost of any building erected at the nurseries on the Nebraska National Forest may amount to but shall not exceed \$1,000," so as to make the clause read:

Nebraska National Forest, Nebr., \$1,165; and to extend the work to the Niobrara division thereof, \$5,000: *Provided*, That from the nurseries on said forest the Secretary of Agriculture, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, may furnish young trees free, so far as they may be spared, to residents of the territory covered by "An act increasing the area of homesteads in a portion of Nebraska," approved April 28, 1904: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use so much of any of the funds herein appropriated for the Nebraska National Forest as may be necessary to acquire by purchase or condemnation lands in Nebraska which he may deem necessary and suitable for nursery sites to be used for the purpose of growing trees for planting on the Nebraska National Forest. So much, not exceeding \$1,200, of any funds hereafter appropriated for the Nebraska National Forest for any fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, as may be necessary, shall be available for the purchase of land now under lease and used as a nursery site for the Niobrara division of the Nebraska National Forest, \$6,165: *Provided further*, That the cost of any building erected at the nurseries on the Nebraska National Forest may amount to but shall not exceed \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 6, after the word "act," to insert: "*Provided*, That hereafter, all moneys received on account of permits for hunting, fishing, or camping, on lands acquired under authority of said act, or any amendment or extension thereof, shall be disposed of as is provided by existing law for the disposition of receipts from national forests, \$66,100," so as to make the clause read:

Additional national forests created or to be created under section 11 of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L., p. 963), and lands under contract for purchase or for the acquisition of which condemnation proceedings have been instituted for the purposes of said act: *Provided*, That hereafter, all moneys received on account of permits for hunting, fishing, or camping, on lands acquired under authority of said act, or any amendment or extension thereof, shall be disposed of as is provided by existing law for the disposition of receipts from national forests, \$66,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 25, after the word "forests," to strike out "\$1,816,367" and insert "\$1,813,367," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and general administration of the specified national forests, \$1,813,367.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read to line 11 on page 45, the last paragraph read being as follows:

For the construction and maintenance of roads, trails, bridges, fire lanes, telephone lines, cabins, fences, and other improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, protection, and development of the national forests, \$450,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the construction and maintenance of boundary and range division fences, counting corrals, stock driveways and bridges, and the development of stock watering places on the national forests: *And provided further*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the transportation or traveling expenses of any forest officer or agent except he be traveling on business directly connected with the Forest Service and in furtherance of the works, aims, and objects specified and authorized in and by this appropriation: *And provided also*, That no part of this appropriation shall be paid or used for the purpose of paying for, in whole or in part, the preparation or publication of any newspaper or magazine article, but this shall not prevent the giving out to all persons without discrimination, including newspaper and magazine writers and publishers, of any facts or official information of value to the public.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator having the bill in charge if he will not accept an amendment striking out the word "and," on page 44, line 23, and then, in line 24, inserting, after the word "places," the words "and the eradication of poisonous plants"?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Then how would the sentence read?

Mr. SMOOT. It would then read:

Counting corrals, stock driveways and bridges, the development of stock-watering places, and the eradication of poisonous plants on the national forests.

I just want to make a statement to the Senator as to why I ask this. At least 5,500 head of cattle have been lost annually during the last three years from poisonous plants on ranges within the national forests. The value of the stock lost annually is approximately \$300,000. The loss in my own State in 1916 was reported as 1,300 head. In some places on the forests they can be fenced. In other places it is absolutely impossible.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I will say to the Senator that the department have indicated a desire for such an amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I know they have, and I hope the Senator will accept it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is all right; I accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 44, line 23, it is proposed to strike out the second word "and"; and after the word "places," in line 24, it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "and the eradication of poisonous plants."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 12, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$3,263,275" and insert "\$3,260,275," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$3,260,275.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 1, after the words "Forest Service," to strike out "\$5,711,075" and insert "\$5,708,075," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Forest Service, \$5,708,075.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Chemistry," on page 49, line 6, after the words "Animal Industry," to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$40,000," so as to make the clause read:

For investigating the preparation for market, handling, grading, packing, freezing, drying, storing, transportation, and preservation of poultry and eggs, and for experimental shipments of poultry and eggs within the United States, in cooperation with the Bureau of Markets and the Bureau of Animal Industry, \$40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 10, after the word "food," to strike out "\$18,600" and insert "\$14,000," so as to make the clause read:

For investigating the handling, grading, packing, canning, freezing, storing, and transportation of fish, and for experimental shipments of fish, for the utilization of waste products, and the development of new sources of food, \$14,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 18, after the word "organism," to strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$10,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the biological investigation of food and drug products and substances used in the manufacture thereof, including investigations of the physiological effects of such products on the human organism, \$10,000.

Mr. NORRIS. As to this item regarding the biological investigation of food and drug products and substances, it is one estimated by the department at \$15,000, passed by the House at \$15,000, and the Senate committee reduced it. There was no investigation made by the Senate committee. I have had the matter called to my attention since the action of the committee, I have made somewhat an investigation of it, and it seems to me that the committee made a mistake. I believe that this particular investigation, while it is purely and entirely scientific, is of very great benefit in giving information, and will result in giving information of great value in regard to the various foods that should be given to animals.

It is a comparatively new proposition. The investigations are somewhat new. Some of the investigations that are being carried on by this particular bureau are carried on nowhere else. They have already given some very valuable information in regard to a balanced ration for food for various animals. For instance, they have given a great deal of consideration to the food value of the peanut. They have found that in one respect it has a food value superior to corn, and by using some of it in connection with corn it would make a balanced ration that would greatly increase the weight of any animal to which it was fed. They have made an investigation in regard to Kafir, sometimes called Kafir corn, that has added greatly to its use and to the information in regard to it. It is really in its infancy, and it seems to me that it gives to the feeders a scientific knowledge that they ought to have. This bureau proposes now to apply the information that they have gained in regard to the investigation of these various food products in actual experiments and in feeding cattle and hogs. It enables them to give information at various times to the farmers who are feeding various kinds of stock as to the fat-producing qualities, the weight-producing qualities of the various foods that they may utilize.

It seems to me, therefore, that we ought to disagree to this amendment. I hope therefore the amendment will be disagreed to.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I agree with the position taken by the Senator from Nebraska, who is also a member of the committee. There has grown up quite a lot of useful knowledge in this matter. They have investigated and found that the extraction of oil from certain seeds and certain fruit does not affect the food value at all after the oil has been extracted. They are making these experiments, as the Senator pointed out, on peanuts. They experimented with cotton seed and found you might take the oil from it and it would not affect its food value at all. The experiments along this line are of wonderful

benefit in that they will enable the farmers or the owner of the seed to first get the commercial value from a partial manufacturing process; that he can get the oil and then he can get the food value and the fertilizer value.

I am rather inclined to take the House appropriation, and so far as the acting chairman of the committee is concerned I agree that the amendment of the committee shall be rejected.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 4, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$849,201" and insert "\$829,601," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$829,601.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 5, after the words "Bureau of Chemistry," to strike out "\$1,212,191" and insert "\$1,192,591," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Chemistry, \$1,192,591.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Entomology," on page 55, line 4, after the word "nuts," to strike out "\$78,380" and insert "\$83,380: *Provided*, That \$9,600 of said sum shall be available for the investigation of insects affecting the pecan and method of control of same," so as to make the clause read:

For investigations of insects affecting deciduous fruits, orchards, vineyards, and nuts, \$83,380: *Provided*, That \$9,600 of said sum shall be available for the investigation of insects affecting the pecan and method of control of same.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 14, after "\$89,400," to insert "of which sum \$10,000 shall be immediately available," so as to make the clause read:

For investigations of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, tobacco, rice, sugar cane, etc., and the cigarette beetle and Argentine ant, \$89,400, of which sum \$10,000 shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 12, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$519,250" and insert "\$524,250," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$524,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 13, after the words "Bureau of Entomology," to strike out "\$926,480" and insert "\$931,480," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Entomology, \$931,480.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 26, page 57, at the end of the items for the Bureau of Biological Survey.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to offer an amendment after line 26.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The committee amendments are first to be acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What does the Senator from Alabama propose?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wanted to offer an amendment at this point, but I understand we are considering only committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is true.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will withhold it for the present.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Biological Survey," on page 59, line 15, after the word "demonstrations," to insert "upon the lands of the United States," so as to read:

For investigating the food habits of North American birds and mammals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry, including experiments and demonstrations upon the lands of the United States in destroying wolves, coyotes, prairie dogs, and other animals injurious to agriculture and animal husbandry, and for investigations and experiments in connection with rearing of fur-bearing animals, including mink and marten, \$395,540.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 23, after the word "them," to strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$12,560," so as to make the clause read:

For general administrative expenses connected with the above-mentioned lines of work, including cooperation with other Federal bureaus, departments, boards, and commissions, on request from them, \$12,560.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 24, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$548,140" and insert "\$545,700," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$545,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 25, after the words "Bureau of Biological Survey," to strike out "\$594,510" and insert "\$592,070," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Biological Survey, \$592,070.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Division of Publications," on page 61, line 14, after the words "chief of division," to strike out "\$3,500" and insert "\$3,750," so as to read:

Salaries, Division of Publications: One editor, who shall be chief of division, \$3,750; one editor, who shall be assistant chief of division, \$2,500; one chief clerk, \$2,000.

Mr. BRYAN. I call attention to this amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. That ought to be disagreed to.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for salaries, Division of Publications, on page 62, line 18, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$181,920" and insert "\$182,170," so as to read:

Two messengers or messenger boys, at \$360 each; one laborer, \$840; two laborers, at \$600 each; three charwomen, at \$480 each; three charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$182,170.

Mr. GALLINGER. That ought to be disagreed to.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, one page 63, line 6, after the word "films," to strike out "to educational institutions or associations for agricultural education not organized for profit," so as to make the clause read:

For photographic equipment and for photographic materials and artists' tools and supplies, \$17,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, under such rules and regulations and subject to such conditions as he may prescribe, to loan, rent, or sell copies of films, all moneys received from such rentals or sales to be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. BRADY. I ask that that amendment be passed over for the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator in charge of the bill if this amendment is intended to give discretion to the department to loan these films to all parties who may apply. This seems to be a restriction in the bill.

Mr. BRADY. The bill as it stands without the amendment would permit the department to loan or sell the films to all parties.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is what I understood.

Mr. BRADY. The amendment which I propose to offer reads:

Provided, That when films are loaned or sold, educational institutions or associations for agricultural education not organized for profit shall be given preference.

I do not believe that we should restrict the sale of these films to educational institutions; but I believe it would be well to give them the preference over persons dealing in films for profit, who might rush in and purchase all the films that would be most desirable, and thus deprive the educational institutions of the privilege of securing any at all. At the proper time I propose to offer that amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think by all means the educational institutions ought to have a preference. I am not quite sure that it ought not to be largely guarded so that irresponsible persons could not be considered at all. I am afraid the paragraph itself is not very well guarded.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Let me state to the Senator from New Hampshire that we investigated this matter thoroughly along the line of the amendment suggested by the Senator from Idaho; but it was our idea that certain films representing conditions would be educational, even where they were not sold to educational institutions or agricultural associations; that the general public would see them, and that to place this restriction upon them might seriously restrict the opportunities for education by a popular demonstration. The Senator from Idaho gives notice that at the proper time, when we are through with the committee amendments, he will offer the amendment he suggested, and then the Senate can use its discretion in the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 63, line 19, after the words "Division of Publications," to strike out "\$213,990" and insert "\$214,240," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Division of Publications, \$214,240.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Crop Estimates," on page 63, line 23, before the word "clerks,"

where it occurs the second time, to strike out "eleven" and insert "nine"; in line 25, after the words "at \$1,000 each," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty-four"; on page 64, line 2, before the word "messengers," to strike out "five" and insert "two"; and in line 6, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$129,140" and insert "\$122,880," so as to make the clause read:

Salaries, Bureau of Crop Estimates: One statistician, who shall be chief of bureau, \$4,000; 1 chief clerk, \$1,800; 6 clerks, class 4; 9 clerks, class 3; 15 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, \$1,300; 19 clerks, class 1; 19 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 24 clerks, at \$900 each; 2 messengers, at \$840 each; 2 messengers or laborers, at \$720 each; 2 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$660 each; 1 messenger, messenger boy, or laborer, \$480; 1 charwoman, messenger, or laborer, \$540; 2 charwomen, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$360 each; in all, \$122,880.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 12, after the words "as follows," to insert:

Provided, That hereafter the Monthly Crop Report shall be printed and distributed on or before the 12th day of each month.

So as to make the clause read:

General expenses, Bureau of Crop Estimates: For all necessary expenses for collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, and interpreting data relating to agriculture; for making and publishing periodically crop and live-stock estimates, including acreage, yield, and value of farm products, as follows: *Provided*, That hereafter the Monthly Crop Report shall be printed and distributed on or before the 12th day of each month.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee why that limitation is put into the bill?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Heretofore the printing of these reports was so retarded that they were issued sometimes as much as three months after the report was ready.

Mr. JONES. Did the committee take into consideration the matter of getting data from the far Western States that must necessarily go into the making up of these reports?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; and the department have that data at the time of the issuance of the report. What we desire to accomplish here is to insure the printing in case the matter is all in hand. According to our investigation, the delay heretofore has been unjustifiable, and we thought that as the printing was largely done by the department itself, they had in hand all the data needed for the purpose.

Mr. JONES. Does the Senator think that all of the data that they usually include in one of these reports would be available so as to be put into the report and printed on the 12th of the month?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. JONES. Then, I think this is a very good provision.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if that is the case, then the proposed amendment will not change the present situation. Every month there is a bulletin issued. I do not know that it contains all the information which the department may have, but there has never been a month in which there has not been a bulletin issued. This proviso reads:

Provided, That hereafter the Monthly Crop Report shall be printed and distributed on or before the 12th day of each month.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is what we had reference to—the crop report that we want for the month in order to know what was the condition for the month preceding. We wanted it so as to have the benefit of that information. If the report should come at the last of the month, what good would it be to us?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina that I have always understood that in the monthly bulletin all of the information which the department has is printed, and I suppose it would be so even under this proposed amendment; but does the Senator from South Carolina say that the department has had crop reports and withheld them from publication for three months?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; it was on account of a confusion as to the printing. Some of the printing, as I understand, was done at one place and some at another place. That caused the delay. The facts were brought out before the committee. I do not charge the department with intentionally withholding or delaying the printing of the report, but they had absolute discretion as to when it should be printed.

The result was that complaints came in to such an extent that we thought it wise to restrict it, and we had recommendations to the effect that the printing of the report should be restricted to not later than the 12th of the month. After all the facts were brought before us—with some of the causes of the delay I do not charge my mind—the committee felt justified in recommending the monthly bulletin which should be issued, giving the information as to the previous month, should not be later than the 12th of the next succeeding month. That recommendation was unanimously adopted, and the department thinks it will have the desired effect.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina must understand that I am not objecting to the amendment; I am simply saying that the bulletin is printed in one place, but the preparation of the material for the bulletin may come from different bureaus of the department.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. We ascertained that fact, but the department has all of the material.

Mr. SMOOT. The delay may have been caused as I have suggested, and not because the bulletin has been printed in different places.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The committee was very careful to investigate the very point which the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] raised; that is, whether the publication of this report at that date would exclude certain data so far as it related to distant States, and we concluded that it would not.

Mr. JONES. Does this printing refer to what is designated as the Crop Report?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It refers to that along with the bulletin.

Mr. SMOOT. This refers to the bulletin.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It refers to the bulletin as to crop conditions. Now, I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the data are gathered as of date of the 25th, so that the crop month runs from the 25th of one month to the 25th of another month, so we propose to give from the 25th of one month until the 12th of the next month for the printing. Most of the data, I will say, are gathered by telegraph.

Mr. JONES. I can see how there might occur under this provision what, as I understand, the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] suggested. This amendment does not specify that the monthly report of one month shall be printed by the 12th of the succeeding month.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. But that is what is understood.

Mr. JONES. I think that is the purpose aimed at, but I was going to suggest that if the department are behind in the printing of these reports three months when this law goes into effect, then they could bring that data out the next month and still the next month, and yet be three months behind all the time.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. But the understanding as to this provision is that the report shall be printed as stated; that is the purpose of it.

Mr. JONES. But that will not be brought about by the language used in the amendment. Does the Senator think that under the amendment the department will do that?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think so.

Mr. JONES. If we made the language a little bit more specific, so that it would require the department to do just what they probably will do when the statement of the Senator is known, I think it would be preferable.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think this will cover it.

Mr. JONES. But when we put language in the bill to accomplish a certain thing, I think it would be better if we so framed the language as to require them to do what we expect to have done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 64, line 20, after the word "investigations," to strike out "\$179,950" and insert "\$175,872," so as to make the clause read:

Salaries, travel, and other necessary expenses of employees out of the city of Washington engaged in field investigations, \$175,872.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 22, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$204,650" and insert "\$200,572," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$200,572.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 23, after the words "Bureau of Crop Estimates," to strike out "\$333,790" and insert "\$323,452," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Crop Estimates, \$323,452.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Library, Department of Agriculture," on page 65, line 3, before the word "clerks," where it occurs the first time, to strike out "seven" and insert "six," and in line 8, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$33,060" and insert "\$32,160," so as to make the clause read:

Salaries, library, Department of Agriculture: One librarian, \$2,000; 1 clerk, class 3; 1 clerk, class 2; 5 clerks, class 1; 3 clerks, at \$1,080

each; 3 clerks, at \$1,020 each; 4 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 6 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 clerk, \$840; 1 junior library assistant, messenger, or messenger boy, \$720; 1 junior library assistant or messenger boy, \$660; 3 junior library assistants or messenger boys, at \$600 each; 1 messenger, messenger boy, or laborer, \$480; 2 charwomen, at \$480 each; in all, \$32,160.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 15, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$22,000" and insert "\$18,000," so as to make the clause read:

General expenses, library: For books of reference, technical and scientific books, papers, and periodicals, and for expenses incurred in completing imperfect series; for the employment of additional assistants in the city of Washington and elsewhere; for official traveling expenses, and for library fixtures, library cards, supplies, and for all other necessary expenses, \$18,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I want to inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill what knowledge he has concerning the employment of messenger boys in the Agricultural Department? I observe running through the bill the term is used, "messenger or messenger boy," and the salary is fixed such as is paid messengers. In some of the other appropriation bills messenger boys are differentiated, and they are paid, I think, about \$480. I will ask the Senator from Utah about that.

Mr. SMOOT. They are paid \$480.

Mr. GALLINGER. Running through this bill, I repeat, the term is used "messenger, or messenger boy."

Mr. SMOOT. Some of them are paid \$720.

Mr. GALLINGER. With salaries at \$720, \$660, and so forth. Does the Senator from South Carolina know how that is?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I really am unable to give the Senator any information as to that. In running over this bill we depended largely upon the other House and upon the hearings held there. We took some things in the bill for granted.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course, there ought to be uniformity, so far as we can reach uniformity in these different classes of employees. In the other bills of which I have had knowledge the messenger boy is separated from the messenger and is paid less compensation, as would be natural and proper; but in this bill the term is used "messenger or messenger boy," giving the salaries at about the figure that messengers are appropriated for.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It attracted my attention. I notice in the paragraph we have just had before us it says "messenger boy, or laborers, \$480." I am not positive as to just what constitutes the messenger at a higher salary.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina that the Agricultural bill is framed on a different basis as to salaries than other appropriation bills, and it always has been so. The salaries are fixed entirely independent of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. The explanation, to my mind, as to these messengers and messenger boys has been that a certain class of them are boys who not only have their present occupation but who are pursuing a line of education looking to higher places in the department.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I suspected something of that sort.

Mr. WARREN. But the Agricultural Department is founded upon a special law, and has grown up by itself. Senators will notice all through the bill that instead of all the salaries being fixed by classes 1, 2, 3, 4, and so forth, many of them are provided at so much each, and that there are different classes of salaries breaking the hundred dollars; for instance, salaries of \$1,140, \$1,160, and so on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture was, on page 65, line 16, after the word "library," to strike out "\$55,060" and insert "\$50,160," so as to make the clause read:

Total for library, \$50,160.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read down to the item on page 66, line 9, beginning with the subhead "Rent in the District of Columbia."

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator in charge of the bill if he knows what rent is being paid now for the buildings for the Agricultural Department, and does he know what percentage the rent the Government is paying bears to the value of the buildings?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Well, the Government is now paying \$143,000 a year rent for buildings for the Agricultural Department. Just what per cent that is of the value of the buildings I am unable to tell the Senator; but that matter came before us, and we thought that it was not good business to be renting buildings when we own sufficient ground and have ample space for the use and convenience of the Agricultural

Department. Hence, we put in the amendment which the Senator will see, beginning in line 13, on page 66.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Are the buildings now rented near the Agricultural Department?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; they are scattered all about.

Mr. VARDAMAN. All over the city?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; just like all other buildings rented by the Government are.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator states that he does not know the percentage of the value of the buildings that the Government is paying in rent?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do not know.

Mr. VARDAMAN. A year or two ago this question came up with reference to the Post Office Department, and in one instance it developed that the Government was paying 16 per cent on the value of the building it rented. It strikes me as very poor business, when the Government of the United States can borrow money for 2½ per cent, to pay the enormous rental that is being paid for buildings. It does not look good on the face.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. VARDAMAN. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator that there has been a joint committee already appointed for the purpose of investigating that subject.

Mr. VARDAMAN. When was that committee appointed—a couple of years ago, was it not?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I will say to the Senator it was appointed in the closing days of the last session of Congress. That committee at present is making the investigation, not only as to the rent of buildings for the Agricultural Department, the floor space occupied, and so forth, but as to every other department of the Government. The committee hopes before long to have a report ready to present to Congress, with certain recommendations; and I am quite sure that the recommendations will be such, if adopted, as to do away with just such conditions as the Senator has cited.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Well, 'tis a consummation devoutly to be wish'd." I have never understood why the policy of renting buildings for Government use should have been inaugurated in the first instance. I can account for it upon one theory, and one alone, and that is to give somebody a profit upon an investment. The custom is discreditable to the good judgment of Congress, and if persisted in after the matter has been called to the attention of Congress, it reflects upon the integrity and good faith of the Congress.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it was not many years ago that the Agricultural Department was housed in one building, but an appropriation was made for additional buildings, and two other buildings were constructed in close proximity to the original building. Now, it seems that that department has outgrown these three buildings, and is spending in rent \$183,000 a year. If my mental arithmetic is not at fault, we could erect a \$5,000,000 building and not pay any greater interest than that; and it does seem to me that we ought to have relief in this regard.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I want to state in this connection, that we do not need a \$5,000,000 building; but Congress can provide for the erection of a building that will serve all purposes and meet all the requirements for a very much less sum. We can pretty nearly erect a building for the rental we pay per annum.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. VARDAMAN. I desire to say, further, Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, that, so far as the growth of this department is concerned, that is gratifying to me. In the beginning this department amounted to very little. I have observed its growth with a great deal of interest, because I really think, as I have said so often heretofore upon the floor of the Senate, that the money invested in the development of agriculture brings a larger return to the American people than the money invested in any other department. I have noticed the increased production of land due largely to the progressive and intelligent aid rendered by the agents of this department. The farmer is learning to analyze the soil; he is learning to breed plants so as to more than double the production of the soil; in every way the condition of the farm is being improved, and farm life is being made more attractive to the people. I think it is a great work; and Congress can not do too much to forward that character of enterprise. As a matter of fact, we all understand that upon the products of the farm all the superstructure of commerce rests. It will be noted that when propitious seasons come and the farmer is able to properly till

his soil, intelligently manage the affairs of his farm, there is plenty in his home, and from his fertile fields is gathered the wheat and the corn and the cotton and all the grain that feed and clothe the world, the railroads are running on schedule time with heavily loaded trains, the merchant collects his bills, the doctor is not forgotten, the humble preacher dons a new suit of clothes, and the lawyer gets his share. The banks are filled to overflowing with "somebody else's money," and the life-giving current of commerce rushes through the arteries of trade like the freshets from the mountain side. But paralyze the strong arm of the farmer, send a blight upon his crops, unfavorable seasons to hinder his efforts, the current of trade dries up and the whole superstructure languishes and dies. It is well for the Congress to be prudent and economical, but to be niggardly in its appropriation for this department is a crime against all the people.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I quite agree with the Senator from Mississippi, but I want the Senator from Mississippi not to misunderstand me in regard to my suggestion about a \$5,000,000 building. I meant to say that, if necessary, we could construct a building costing \$5,000,000, and that it would not cost the Government any more than to pay the amount of rent it is now paying.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I understood the Senator thoroughly. It was just an illustration to show the mistake we are making by pursuing this policy.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; and what I think an extravagance.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Yes; I so understood the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the amendment put in this bill by the Agricultural Committee. Already certain plans and specifications have been prepared for what is to be known as the "middle building." The two new buildings of the Agricultural Department were erected when Mr. Wilson was Secretary of Agriculture. The idea at that time was to erect two buildings as wings and to construct the middle or the main structure between the two. The Committee on Agriculture thought that they would appoint members of the committee to investigate and see what could be done, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, and report to Congress not later than December, 1917, in order to get rid of this intolerable condition of paying \$150,000 a year rent—

Mr. GALLINGER. The amount, I think, is \$183,000.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. For buildings, when we have ample ground, and the plans have already been prepared for an additional building. It would be infinitely better for the Government to issue bonds and to erect adequate buildings than to go on renting scattered buildings all over the city, causing inconvenience to those who desire to visit the departments, necessitating their running all over the city and to go into all sorts of nooks and corners in order to get information which they desire. I hope this amendment will stand, because it provides for a specific committee, charged with a specific work, which has already in a sense been undertaken. The committee will be enabled to do the work and to report to Congress.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will venture to suggest to my friend the Senator from South Carolina, who doubtless will be on the committee, if one shall be constituted, that I trust the committee will make a very careful investigation of the floor space now occupied by the three buildings which we do own, with a view to determining whether the space might not be economized. There is a disposition on the part of every department to have possession of as much space as they can possibly get, and I have some knowledge, I think, of certain instances where more space is being occupied than is absolutely necessary.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I am glad the Senator has called my attention to that. I shall certainly investigate it, if I am a member of the committee.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES.

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 1 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.). The hour having arrived at which, in accordance with the concurrent resolution of the Congress of the United States the two Houses are to assemble in joint session, the Senate will now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives to listen to an address by the President of the United States. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the order of the Senate.

Thereupon the Senate, preceded by its Sergeant at Arms and headed by the Vice President and its Secretary, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The address of the President of the United States this day delivered to the two Houses of Congress in joint session is as follows:

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONGRESS: The Imperial German Government on the thirty-first of January announced to this Government and to the governments of the other neutral nations that on and after the first day of February, the present month, it would adopt a policy with regard to the use of submarines against all shipping seeking to pass through certain designated areas of the high seas to which it is clearly my duty to call your attention.

Let me remind the Congress that on the eighteenth of April last, in view of the sinking on the twenty-fourth of March of the cross-channel passenger steamer *SUSSEX* by a German submarine, without summons or warning, and the consequent loss of the lives of several citizens of the United States who were passengers aboard her, this Government addressed a note to the Imperial German Government in which it made the following declaration:

"If it is still the purpose of the Imperial Government to prosecute relentless and indiscriminate warfare against vessels of commerce by the use of submarines without regard to what the Government of the United States must consider the sacred and indisputable rules of international law and the universally recognized dictates of humanity, the Government of the United States is at last forced to the conclusion that there is but one course it can pursue. Unless the Imperial Government should now immediately declare and effect an abandonment of its present methods of submarine warfare against passenger and freight-carrying vessels, the Government of the United States can have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the German Empire altogether."

In reply to this declaration the Imperial German Government gave this Government the following assurance:

"The German Government is prepared to do its utmost to confine the operations of war for the rest of its duration to the fighting forces of the belligerents, thereby also insuring the freedom of the seas, a principle upon which the German Government believes, now as before, to be in agreement with the Government of the United States.

"The German Government, guided by this idea, notifies the Government of the United States that the German naval forces have received the following orders: In accordance with the general principles of visit and search and destruction of merchant vessels recognized by international law, such vessels, both within and without the area declared as naval war zone, shall not be sunk without warning and without saving human lives, unless these ships attempt to escape or offer resistance.

"But," it added, "neutrals can not expect that Germany, forced to fight for her existence, shall, for the sake of neutral interest, restrict the use of an effective weapon if her enemy is permitted to continue to apply at will methods of warfare violating the rules of international law. Such a demand would be incompatible with the character of neutrality, and the German Government is convinced that the Government of the United States does not think of making such a demand, knowing that the Government of the United States has repeatedly declared that it is determined to restore the principle of the freedom of the seas, from whatever quarter it has been violated."

To this the Government of the United States replied on the eighth of May, accepting, of course, the assurances given, but adding,

"The Government of the United States feels it necessary to state that it takes it for granted that the Imperial German Government does not intend to imply that the maintenance of its newly announced policy is in any way contingent upon the course or result of diplomatic negotiations between the Government of the United States and any other belligerent Government, notwithstanding the fact that certain passages in the Imperial Government's note of the 4th instant might appear to be susceptible of that construction. In order, however, to avoid any possible misunderstanding, the Government of the United States notifies the Imperial Government that it can not for a moment entertain, much less discuss, a suggestion that respect by German naval authorities for the rights of citizens of the United States upon the high seas should in any way or in the slightest degree be made contingent upon the conduct of any other Government affecting the rights of neutrals and noncombatants. Responsibility in such matters is single, not joint; absolute, not relative."

To this note of the eighth of May the Imperial German Government made no reply.

On the thirty-first of January, the Wednesday of the present week, the German Ambassador handed to the Secretary of State, along with a formal note, a memorandum which contains the following statement:

"The Imperial Government, therefore, does not doubt that the Government of the United States will understand the situation thus forced upon Germany by the Entente-Allies' brutal methods of war and by their determination to destroy the Central Powers, and that the Government of the United States will further realize that the now openly disclosed intentions of the Entente-Allies give back to Germany the freedom of action which she reserved in her note addressed to the Government of the United States on May 4, 1916.

"Under these circumstances Germany will meet the illegal measures of her enemies by forcibly preventing after February 1, 1917, in a zone around Great Britain, France, Italy, and in the Eastern Mediterranean all navigation, that of neutrals included, from and to England and from and to France, etc., etc. All ships met within the zone will be sunk."

I think that you will agree with me that, in view of this declaration, which suddenly and without prior intimation of any kind deliberately withdraws the solemn assurance given in the Imperial Government's note of the fourth of May, 1916, this Government has no alternative consistent with the dignity and honour of the United States but to take the course which, in its note of the eighteenth of April, 1916, it announced that it would take in the event that the German Government did not declare and effect an abandonment of the methods of submarine warfare which it was then employing and to which it now purposes again to resort.

I have, therefore, directed the Secretary of State to announce to His Excellency the German Ambassador that all diplomatic relations between the United States and the German Empire are severed, and that the American Ambassador at Berlin will immediately be withdrawn; and, in accordance with this decision, to hand to His Excellency his passports.

Notwithstanding this unexpected action of the German Government, this sudden and deeply deplorable renunciation of its assurances, given this Government at one of the most critical moments of tension in the relations of the two governments, I refuse to believe that it is the intention of the German authorities to do in fact what they have warned us they will feel at liberty to do. I can not bring myself to believe that they will indeed pay no regard to the ancient friendship between their people and our own or to the solemn obligations which have been exchanged between them and destroy American ships and take the lives of American citizens in the wilful prosecution of the ruthless naval programme they have announced their intention to adopt. Only actual overt acts on their part can make me believe it even now.

If this inveterate confidence on my part in the sobriety and prudent foresight of their purpose should unhappily prove unfounded; if American ships and American lives should in fact be sacrificed by their naval commanders in heedless contravention of the just and reasonable understandings of international law and the obvious dictates of humanity, I shall take the liberty of coming again before the Congress, to ask that authority be given me to use any means that may be necessary for the protection of our seamen and our people in the prosecution of their peaceful and legitimate errands on the high seas. I can do nothing less. I take it for granted that all neutral governments will take the same course.

We do not desire any hostile conflict with the Imperial German Government. We are the sincere friends of the German people and earnestly desire to remain at peace with the Government which speaks for them. We shall not believe that they are hostile to us unless and until we are obliged to believe it; and we purpose nothing more than the reasonable defense of the undoubted rights of our people. We wish to serve no selfish ends. We seek merely to stand true alike in thought and in action to the immemorial principles of our people which I sought to express in my address to the Senate only two weeks ago,—seek merely to vindicate our right to liberty and justice and an unmolested life. These are the bases of peace, not war. God grant we may not be challenged to defend them by acts of wilful injustice on the part of the Government of Germany!

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19359) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Rent in the District of Columbia," on page 66, line 13, after "\$143,689" to insert: "Provided, That a joint committee to be composed of three Members of the Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Members of the House, appointed by the Speaker of the House, is hereby constituted, who shall investigate the amount of floor space required by the Department of Agriculture for its various activities in the city of Washington, the annual rental now paid by the department, the land available for the erection of Government-owned buildings to meet the needs of the department, together with the cost of erecting the same, and report to Congress not later than the first Monday in December, 1917," so as to make the clause read:

Rent of buildings, Department of Agriculture: For rent of buildings and parts of buildings in the District of Columbia, for use of the various bureaus, divisions, and offices of the Department of Agriculture, \$143,689: *Provided*, That a joint committee to be composed of three Members of the Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Members of the House, appointed by the Speaker of the House, is hereby constituted, who shall investigate the amount of floor space required by the Department of Agriculture for its various activities in the city of Washington, the annual rental now paid by the department, the land available for the erection of Government-owned buildings to meet the needs of the department, together with the cost of erecting the same, and report to Congress not later than the first Monday in December, 1917.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator in charge of the bill if he thinks this proviso is necessary, in view of the fact that another committee has already been appointed for the investigation of the very matter covered by this amendment?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Let me make this suggestion to the Senator: This committee would not in any way interfere with the other, and might be helpful if its attention were devoted to just the one specific work. There is no appropriation for anything. It costs us nothing; and we might be able to aid you in expediting the very work for which your committee is appointed generally. I think it would be helpful rather than otherwise.

Mr. SMOOT. I should not like to have the two committees make separate investigations and two reports. It seems to me that one committee ought to make a report covering the whole subject matter.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. What progress has the other committee made?

Mr. SMOOT. We have made a great deal of progress. We now have floor space mapped out, and the work is going on every day. The amount of rents paid has been tabulated, of course. The question that is being considered now is as to the space in the buildings occupied by different departments, and who are occupying more space than is absolutely necessary for the employees they have, and who have not enough.

I will say to the Senator that there is some feeling between the heads of the departments as to floor space in many of the buildings. Take the State, War and Navy Building: There is not complete accord there. It is going to take some time to make the investigation, and some time to decide upon where is the best location, and what it is going to cost the Government, and about what the buildings will cost; also, to show whether it would be profitable to us, on the basis of 3 per cent interest per annum, to erect all the buildings necessary.

I wish to say that I have no doubt in my own mind, as far as the investigations have gone, that when the report is made we are going to get rid of the renting of a great many of these segregated buildings all through the District and have Government buildings erected. They will be fireproof; they will be better arranged; the employees will be better taken care of, and I believe at less expense to the Government of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Does not the Senator think it would expedite matters if the Senate sees fit to adopt this amendment and this committee is appointed, when our work will be restricted entirely to an investigation by the Agricultural Committees of the two Houses as to the needs of the Agricultural Department, and, as I suggested before the recess was taken, some progress has already been made looking to the matter of floor space and the proper housing of the Agricultural Department on our own ground?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that if the Agricultural Committee of the Senate feel that it is necessary, now that the attention of the committee has been called to the fact that another committee has already been appointed, I shall not object.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think it would expedite matters, and I do not see where there would be any conflict; and it would help meet a condition that has come specifically to our attention.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the Agricultural Committee has been appropriating now for several years large sums of money for rents. We appropriate this year \$126,000 for rents.

Mr. SMOOT. One hundred and forty-three thousand dollars. Mr. SMITH of Georgia. One hundred and forty-three thousand dollars for rents—\$20,000 more. We simply thought we were not justified in voting that appropriation when we had the ground all around the building, when half that amount would pay the interest on vastly better buildings; and we thought we would like to look into that branch of the question, anyhow. This department is separate from the other departments and it has its land there. We have plenty of land.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that if an appropriation were made to-day to build the central building between the two wings that have already been built for the Agricultural Department, there would be sufficient room there to house properly, and in a first-class way, all of the employees of the Agricultural Department.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Our committee felt that we would be glad to look into this matter, too; and of course any committee that is appointed will cooperate with the other committee.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry have no desire whatever to interfere in any way with the committee that is now at work securing information along the same lines that we expect to secure under this amendment. I was under the impression that this committee of three Members from the Senate and three from the House was to be appointed from the membership of the Agricultural Committees, with the thought of working out some plan that would be proper and beneficial for the Agricultural Department. When that is done I believe it will be well for this committee to report to the larger committee, of which the Senator from Utah speaks, and let you have the information we secure. But the members of our committee feel that something should be done relative to this particular department for the purpose of lowering, as much as possible, the expenses of that department, and that is the reason why this amendment was placed in the bill by the committee. It was adopted unanimously.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 24 on page 68.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator in charge of the bill inform the Senate what percentage of these appropriations is paid to employees in the city of Washington? I ask the question because I notice that this is the only appropriation bill which carries lump sums and provides that out of those lump sums there shall be paid not a stated amount but an authorization given to the Secretary of the department or head of the bureau to pay employees in the city of Washington. I notice on the next page:

For farmers' cooperative demonstration work outside of the cotton belt, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, \$578,240.

In almost all other appropriation bills, I will say to the Senator, all the employees in the District of Columbia are specifically provided for and named in the bill and the rate paid to them, and the lump-sum appropriation is for general expenses attached to the department or work outside the limits of the United States. But I notice all the way through this appropriation bill there is allowed a lump-sum appropriation to employ persons in the District of Columbia. Has the Senator made any investigation into that matter?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do not know what the relative per cent of the employees in the city is to those outside. I only know in a general way that very often there is a transfer from the District to field work, that when one becomes thoroughly competent to do the work according to the regulations of the department he is transferred to field work outside the city. I would imagine it would be a very hard matter to arrive at any way of fixing the status of clerks and the salary of employees of the department in this city in relation to those in the field, because it works both ways. I know that in certain cases after they have had field experience they are transferred here, and it is impossible for me to give information even as to the relative number.

Mr. SMOOT. I can plainly see that the number employed in the field can not be provided for specifically; but it does seem to me that we do know what the clerical work in the department here in Washington will be, and we ought to provide that that clerical work shall be done in the District of Columbia, and a specific appropriation made for so many clerks, so many messengers, so many laborers, and so forth.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I suggest to the Senator that the difficulty there would be that in the rapidly expanding work of the department you could not provide any such fixed appropriation for those who are employed here.

Mr. SMOOT. We do it in all the other departments.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think the nature of the Agricultural Department perhaps, as the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] pointed out this morning, is different from practically any other department we have. We are continually adding to the Agricultural Department functions that a few years ago we did not dream of, and in the administration of the different bureaus and departments that we have added to it, it is necessary for them to have, now at least, a lump sum, so that they may transfer employees here to the field or vice versa.

In this connection I wish to say to the Senator, for fear I may be misunderstood, that I am not an advocate of this lump-sum system. It invites an easy road to the expenditure of money that may not be warranted, and I will join the Senator and others in the Senate in trying to have specific appropriations rather than a lump sum, which leaves it to the discretion of some head of a department to use it as he may see fit.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is perfectly right in that, because anyone who has had any experience at all with lump-sum appropriations by our Government knows that the most extravagant use of public funds comes through lump-sum appropriations. The heads of the various departments and bureaus would never think of spending money as they do if it was specifically provided for, but as long as it is in a lump sum, no report being made, it comes easy and goes easy, and there is the most extravagant expenditure of the public money in that way.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Senator knows as well as I do that it would be a stupendous task now to begin to weed out and fix the salaries of these employees; but it is a matter which calls for our attention, and I think when we come to the preparation of the next appropriation bill we should serve notice on the House that if they do not take up the work the Senate proposes, as far as it is able, to reduce it to a clear understanding of what we are doing.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the Senator will.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Utah a question relative to the clauses of the bill he has just been discussing. He is, as we all know, certainly well advised on these matters of legislation. I was a little surprised to hear him make the statement that there are included more of these lump-sum appropriations in this appropriation bill than in any other appropriation bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say that in nearly all the other appropriation bills we cut out such items. The Committee on Appropriations has required that the clerks and employees shall be named specifically, and, whether they are clerks, messengers, stenographers, chief clerks, or under any other designation, the appropriation describes their status and their work. As I said the other day in asking that such a provision be stricken out of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, there is a tendency all the time to get this very wording into the appropriation bills. Then, if the department getting a lump appropriation want 10 clerks, they go and get 10; if they want 20, they go and get 20; and sometimes, if they think they need 30, they will go and get 30. I am speaking now of employees in the District of Columbia. When they are specifically provided for we can say to the head of a department or bureau, "Where are you going to place these employees, and what are they going to do?" but in the case of a lump-sum appropriation the committee can not do that.

Mr. BRADY. The Senator feels that that tendency has been greater in the Agricultural appropriation bill than any other appropriation bill?

Mr. SMOOT. There is not any doubt about it at all; and I was very glad to hear the acting chairman say that before the next Agricultural appropriation bill is finally drafted he is going to take up the question and see himself if these employees can not be specifically appropriated for.

Mr. BRADY. We have tried to accomplish the very purpose the Senator suggests. I hope that the Senator in charge of the bill will be able to accomplish something along that line.

Mr. BRYAN. It seems to me that the paragraph under discussion, giving a lump-sum appropriation, appropriates the amount required by law to be spent under the Hatch-Morrill Act in each State for agricultural experiment stations.

Mr. SMOOT. I spoke of the item on page 68 and referred to the item on page 69, "for farmers' cooperative demonstration work outside of the cotton belt."

Mr. BRYAN. That may be open to objection, but the items on pages 67 and 68 are not. I did not know that we had reached the item on page 69.

Mr. SMOOT. I referred to the item on page 69; and not only that, but, I will say to the Senator, all through the bill I have noticed provisions of the same character. I simply wanted to call attention to it, and I am satisfied with the statement made by the Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. BRYAN. But it does not apply to the items on pages 67 and 68.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to page 70, line 25.

Mr. JONES. I wish to ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether the appropriation of \$10,000 for the experiment station in Alaska is all that is estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. JONES. I ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether this appropriation of \$10,000 to be "immediately available for the location, equipment, and maintenance of an agricultural experiment station in the Matanuska Valley" is a sufficient amount.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Secretary so stated.

Mr. JONES. He thinks that is all that is necessary?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I will say that I am very glad, indeed, to see this provision in the bill.

The reading of the bill was continued. The next amendment was, under the subhead "States Relations Service," on page 71, line 9, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$39,000" and insert "\$35,000," so as to make the clause read:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of such products for these purposes, with the cooperation of other bureaus of the department, and to disseminate useful information on this subject, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, \$35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, one page 71, line 16, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$2,976,580" and insert "\$2,972,580," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$2,972,580.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 17, after the words "States Relations Service," to strike out "\$3,111,660" and insert "\$3,107,660," so as to make the clause read:

Total for States Relations Service, \$3,107,660.

The reading of the bill was continued to page 72, line 20.

Mr. JONES. I wish to ask the Senator in charge of the bill a question. Line 19 reads, "Seven laborers, messenger boys, or charwomen, at \$480 each." Does that mean that the Secretary can employ seven charwomen or seven messenger boys or seven laborers, or does it mean that he can employ seven of each class? Or does it mean if he employs seven charwomen he has no money then for laborers covered by that item?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I will say frankly my attention has not been called to that item, because, as I said before, this matter was carefully gone over by the House.

Mr. JONES. I recognize that it is the House text.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. But the Senator will see that under the language, "seven laborers, messengers boys, or charwomen," it may be that at certain times he will want to employ some laborers and then he may want to employ some messenger boys or charwomen. He is restricted to the total number of seven for the year. He can employ but seven, but he is given a discretion during the year as to whom he may employ. He can not go above seven with this amount appropriated.

Mr. JONES. Then he might—it is mere supposition—employ seven charwomen one month, seven laborers another month, and seven messenger boys another month.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; as the necessities of the case might require.

Mr. JONES. But is it not true that where they need charwomen they need them all the year? I suppose that there is about the same amount of work all the year around that charwomen are supposed to do.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I am not advised as to that. I presume the department fixes it as the necessities require. I think they would have a certain latitude.

Mr. JONES. I think probably this was gone into a little while ago. If it was, I would not ask the Senator a question again, but it strikes me that this bill in connection with em-

ployees of this kind is framed a little differently from the other appropriation bills. Now, why is that?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do not know whether the Senator was present when the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] called attention to it. It is framed not so much after the manner of the ordinary statutory roll but has reference to day laborers. You will see a fractional part of a hundred dollars, for instance, four hundred and twenty and eight hundred and forty, as the Senator from Wyoming pointed out. That is because they figured it upon the cost of the day labor that they would employ from time to time, and not as a salary upon the ordinary basis.

Mr. JONES. That is the reason why you put this indefinite provision in here as to the class and character of the employees?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is the case.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to page 78, line 14.

Mr. JONES. I wish to ask the Senator from South Carolina if he can tell me whether the Bureau of Roads has reached any definite conclusion as to what are the best methods of constructing roads in the different sections of the country?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. As I understand it, they are now engaged in that very work. The good roads act was only passed last year, but previous to that the department had taken up the work. They are issuing bulletins giving expert advice as to the best method of constructing roads in different parts of the country. For instance, in the case of the sand and clay roads they have developed a plan by which the sand and clay road is perhaps made the most durable in the world by mixing a certain degree of moisture with sand and clay and seeing that the bed is thoroughly drained, and then by coating it with sand and clay. I have had a little experience with that myself. Under the auspices of the department they have issued bulletins of standard sand and clay roads and a standard macadam road, giving advice after experimentation over here at Arlington.

Mr. JONES. Have they reached a point in their experimental road building where they can say to the people in the State of Illinois, for instance, a certain character of road building is the best for your section?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I am not advised as to that. I think they have experimented to a point where they do not absolutely say this is the best, but that it is the best at this stage of our investigations. I know they have changed something of the constituent elements in the manner of preparing the sand and clay road, but it looks to me very much like there will not be any further improvement, because it stands the wear and tear of very heavy vehicles and also the extraordinary wear and tear of automobiles.

Mr. JONES. So the Senator would think that they have about reached the end of expenditures along that particular line?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think so. I think in a very few years perhaps it will be standardized and scarcely anything more will be required.

Mr. JONES. I understand that this bureau has been experimenting in building roads for a good many years. What I wanted to get at was whether they had gone so far as to be able to determine in this or that section of the country as to what class of road building was best adapted to that section.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Within my own knowledge, to speak affirmatively and speaking in reference to my section, they have, I think, about standardized the sand and clay road.

I agree with the point the Senator is getting at. He wishes to know when the experimentations along lines capable of standardization will stop so that we can for all time rest upon their findings. I think we are approaching that.

SUBMARINE WARFARE.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the Senator from South Carolina allow me to tender a resolution? I ask unanimous consent to adopt a resolution. It will not take one minute. There will be no debate and no objection. It is merely to get information.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I have no objection if it does not call for debate.

Mr. LEWIS. I will not allow any debate if there is objection. It is merely to obtain a document for the information of the Senate. May I have the resolution read at this time and ask unanimous consent that it be adopted?

Mr. SMOOT. Let it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 349), as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State, if not incompatible with public service, transmit to the United States Senate a correct copy of the message and accompanying memoranda from the Imperial Government of Germany advising of the resumption of submarine warfare against the neutral and other countries of date February, 1917.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not want to be technical, but does not the Senator from Illinois think "public interest" would be better than "public service"?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes, Mr. President, if the Clerk will be so kind as to substitute the word suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire, "public interest." I thank the Senator. I ask that the resolution be changed and I ask for unanimous consent to adopt the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. LEWIS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

CONSTRUCTION OF BATTLESHIPS.

Mr. TILLMAN. I send to the desk the following resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I think when the resolution is read it will be seen that it is very important.

The resolution (S. Res. 348) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be directed to furnish the Senate a statement showing the present status of the appropriation of \$6,000,000 made in the act of August 29, 1916, known as the naval appropriation bill, which authorized him to improve and equip the navy yards at Puget Sound, Philadelphia, Norfolk, New York, Boston, Portsmouth, Charleston, and New Orleans for the construction of ships at such yards, giving amount expended and to be expended at each yard, and the conditions at each of those yards for building the ships heretofore ordered to be constructed.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19359) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from South Carolina if he does not think, in lines 8, 9, and 10, on page 78, the inquiries on the part of the department are too limited? The word "management" is used and the inquiry is to be made in regard to systems of road management. From the Senator's discussion a moment ago I infer that road construction is the thing the department has been doing, that it has been investigating methods of road construction.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Senator will find that the next paragraph reads:

For investigations of the best methods of road making, especially ordinary sand-clay and dirt roads, and the best kinds of road-making materials, and for furnishing expert advice on road building and maintenance.

Mr. STERLING. Very well. Then I should like to inquire of the Senator—and I am obliged to him for calling my attention to that paragraph—what is the inquiry made in regard to road management as provided in lines 8, 9, and 10? To what does that particularly refer?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That refers to upkeep after the road has been constructed. For instance, with the sand-clay road they have found that the use of what they call a split-log drag, which is formed of two pieces of material, either steel or wood, about 8 or 10 inches, set at an angle so that it will scrape the entire road, or at least one side at one time, with the angle so set that as it goes over it scrapes the dirt into the center. They have discovered that if it is done at a certain time, just after a rain, the vehicles coming over it after three or four days, it is all the work that is necessary. It will smooth the surface and make it almost as hard as an asphalt pavement.

Mr. STERLING. I call the attention of the Senator now to the paragraph in lines 15 and 16 on the same page, in which there is appropriated \$51,220. I ask him if that does not relate to and cover the very point he has been discussing?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. For conducting field experiments?

Mr. STERLING. "For investigations of the chemical and physical character of road materials." It seems to me that we are rather duplicating appropriations here and that there is no need of both these appropriations.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Here is the idea: This plan has been prepared by the department. It will be necessary, perhaps, in order to save time, to read from a statement furnished the committee. I may state that there is different material found in different places with which they are experimenting. They have had great success with some, and this is to continue such experiments. The provision is:

For investigations of the chemical and physical character of road materials.

Now, I will read to the Senator from the memorandum furnished us:

Road-material investigations (p. 71, line 3): The work under this item consists primarily of laboratory investigations, and may be divided into two parts: (1) Routine testing and analyses of road materials, and (2) research work regarding road materials.

Hunting it, finding it, and then testing it out after it is found.

The routine testing and analyses embrace physical tests to determine by impact, abrasion, etc., the hardness, toughness, cementing value, and other qualities of road materials, and also chemical and microscopic analyses to determine their mineral constituents.

The research work covers investigations of the properties, suitability, and applicability of concrete for road and bridge construction; investigations of the properties and uses of the various asphalts, oils, tars, and other binders and dust preventives for road construction, and maintenance; the standardization of methods of testing road materials; and the development and maintenance of the various instruments and appliances for the testing and research work of the Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering.

So the Senator will see that, though the terminology used here seems to indicate duplication, upon investigation he will find that they divide themselves very clearly into different classes, which need expert and differentiated attention.

Mr. STERLING. The term "management" on page 73, line 8, is a pretty broad term, I admit; and under the Senator's interpretation of it, if I understood him correctly a while ago, it includes an examination into the materials of road construction. If it includes that, Mr. President, it also includes an examination of the material used in road repair, as I think the Senator has just admitted.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The best way I can illustrate that is in road construction. I take a piece of paper, if I am an architect, and draw you a plan of a house; but that is not building the house; that is merely showing you how to build the house. When I have already given you the plan it is for you to determine what material you will use in filling out the contour or the general physical aspect of the house which I propose that you shall build. If the Senator will take these three items seriatim he will find first:

For inquiries in regard to systems of road management—

That is, how best to keep them up; how are you going to keep up your asphalt roads? How are you going to keep up your sand and clay roads; how are you going to keep up your dirt roads, if you have no sand or clay; where by drainage you have constructed a road and are trying to keep it in proper shape?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, does not the Senator from South Carolina think that those who built the roads know how to repair them?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. We did not. I know that the split-log drag is a marvel, and I wish the Senator from New Hampshire could see it in operation. Until it was demonstrated, no one knew when there was dampness in the road, if you scraped the road just where the wheels of the vehicles or the hoofs of the animals or the erosion of the water in the incline had cut little canals, that by dragging with the split-log drag at a certain time when the rain had passed you would need no other work on the road.

Mr. GALLINGER. I presume the Senator from South Carolina is talking about dirt roads.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I am talking about the sand and clay roads that are mentioned here. Suppose they developed the experimentation, let me ask the Senator if he supposes that a resident on a road is going to go out there and experiment as to what is going to keep it up and how to manage it?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will tell the Senator what I think. I think the system which they have in Europe—I am not now speaking of dirt roads—and the system we are adopting in New England is the proper system for our roads. There we have the material along the roadside and are constructing roads costing from \$5,000 to \$10,000 a mile, and we have men looking after the sections of road and repairing them as soon as they are torn out to any extent.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. With us in the South it may not be necessary to make this investigation, as has been indicated by the Senator from Washington. The present system may prove an absolute success, and perhaps we do not need any further demonstrations or any further lessons as to road management, but I should imagine that out in the West, where they have difficulties with the soil, it might be very important that the Government should appoint men who have the ability, the time, the energy, and the engineering knowledge to experiment and to work with different materials, so as to ascertain if they can discover something with which they can make a permanent road.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course, I am not familiar with the character of roads of which the Senator from South Carolina speaks. The Government, however, has built a very good macadam road between the Potomac River and Arlington, much to my gratification. I always thought Virginia ought to have done it; but the Government has done it. The Government has built that road, but it is no better than the roads which for 10

years we have been building in the North. They can not teach us anything about building macadam roads. I hope they will discontinue that experiment, at least. The trouble is that these men never stop.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I see the Senator has the same object in view that the Senator from Washington had in view; but I want to state to the Senator, from my knowledge of the West, of the Southwest, and of the South, that there is vast room for a splendid work to be done, not at such great expense on the part of the Government as it would be to instruct us how best to accomplish that end.

The Senator must not forget that only last year we passed a good-roads law—a cooperative law—a law which calls on the States to do a certain part and the Government of the United States to do a certain part. It is very essential that none of the money shall be dissipated in useless experiments, and it would not be if we could concentrate it at some one place, where, under the auspices of the Government, a type of road is fixed and then construct that type of road throughout the entire region where it is intended to apply the fund.

Mr. GALLINGER. That doubtless is so. A small fraction of that money has gone to New Hampshire, I am gratified to say. We have a man there employed by the State who will take care of that appropriation and use it just as economically and as successfully as can the experts over in Arlington or in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I am happy to tell the Senator from New Hampshire that with the advent of the automobile and its constant improvement, and that improvement in turn calling for good roads, the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from South Carolina stand a better chance to become neighbors. It is a common interest, and I hope it will be as much to the Senator's benefit to have ready transportation down into our section as it will be to us to have ready transportation into his section.

It does not mean how much is appropriated for New Hampshire, but how perfect the roads shall be in New Hampshire, coupling it with the next State, and the next State, so that the facilities for transportation will benefit us all.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, New Hampshire stands pretty well in that regard, and I am glad to know that there is a revival of interest in South Carolina and in other Southern States with reference to the construction of good roads, for certainly they have not had them in the past.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to line 5, page 74, the last clause read being as follows:

For investigating and reporting upon the utilization of water in farm irrigation, including the best methods to apply in practice; the different kinds of power and appliances, and the development of equipment for farm irrigation; the flow of water in ditches, pipes, and other conduits.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I do not like to criticize any part of this bill, particularly the text as it came from the other body; but there are so many things in the bill that strike me as being semiabsurd, to say the least, that I can not help noticing them. For instance, in the item which has just been read at the top of page 74, we are proposing to appropriate money to determine "the flow of water in ditches, pipes, and other conduits." Does that mean we desire to find out whether or not water runs down hill or up hill, or what does it mean?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. To what water has the Senator from New Hampshire reference, I inquire, so that I may get the continuity?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think I know how water runs in ditches without having a bureau of the Government tell me. The same law that causes it to run in ditches causes it to run in pipe and in conduits.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. But this provision has reference to water on arid lands in the West, I presume. I will read what the department has to say with reference to it:

Farm irrigation investigations (page 71, line 14): The work done under this item consists of experiments to ascertain the best methods of controlling water in irrigation; to determine the adaptation of pumping machinery to supplying water for irrigation, including the cost of installation, maintenance, and operation of wells and pumping machinery; to develop the best types of appliances and equipment for irrigation purposes; to test the accuracy of formulas for the flow of water in conduits of various kinds, and to work out new formulas in order that conduits may be properly designed to carry the water which they are intended to convey; to improve and standardize devices for measuring water for irrigation; and to determine the effect of customs, regulations, and laws upon the economic use of water in irrigation and upon the success of irrigational development.

Mr. GALLINGER. The explanation does not explain; but I have performed my duty in calling attention to the matter. If they can get water for irrigation purposes I imagine they will find a way to run it through the ditches to the lands. I think

they will do that without our appropriating money for the purpose.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I want to say in justification of the acting chairman of the committee that this whole matter is absolutely foreign to my section of the country. To get water on the land is not our problem, but our problem is to get it off. So the very antipodes of this would be true in my section.

Mr. GALLINGER. Even that, getting water off irrigated lands, Mr. President, is a proposition that confronts us now, and we have been asked for appropriations for that purpose. First, it is proposed to irrigate the lands, and, then, to get rid of the water. That is an anomalous fact, but it exists.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I understand that where they irrigate hillsides the seepage in the valleys produces disastrous effects, and they are trying to find some method to prevent that.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I assume that the acting chairman of the committee is familiar with the fact that the best authorities on irrigation in this country and those who have had the most experience with it—an experience that dates back over 300 years—are the Pueblo Indians. The Spaniards, when they came to our country, found the Pueblo Indians with systems of irrigation perfectly adapted to all conditions of agriculture which they had in that climate. They had irrigation systems perhaps a thousand years old, and they had been used so long that the stone conduits had moss on them. They had been constructed hundreds and hundreds of years before the white man came here. I assume, then, that the information regarding this matter will be sought from them and that a Pueblo Indian will be put in charge of the investigation. We can get a Pueblo Indian to do the work for about \$25 a month, and we can save large appropriations if we will employ one to take charge of that work. I merely suggest that to the Senator as a matter of economy.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I desire to say, in vindication of the acting chairman of the committee, that if the Senator wants to take that attitude, or if he states that to be the fact, in reference to his section of the country, as a matter of course it will have to go as authoritative. I take it for granted, however, that those interested in irrigation out in his section would like to have some other advice, because, if I remember correctly, the Senator from Utah wanted \$100,000 or more to bore wells in the ground and to prospect for wells, to see whether or not water could be obtained. I suppose a Pueblo Indian could furnish that information, too.

Mr. LANE. I think he could furnish it about as well as anyone else, although the Pueblos do not dig wells; but after they secure a supply of water they know perfectly well—no one knows better, as is conceded by everybody, although they live in Arizona, not in Oregon—how to manage it for the irrigation and reclamation of lands. They have been practicing irrigation apparently for hundreds and hundreds of years, and perhaps for thousands of years, with entire success, until the white man came along and got the supply of water in his hands, leaving the Indian without it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, just a word in reply in regard to the great irrigating work being done by the Department of Agriculture. I take it for granted that they are doing in that department the work intrusted to them as honestly as the work of the other departments is being done.

Mr. LANE. I think, however, that, like the Senator, they have overlooked the experience and success of the Pueblo Indians, and have not gone and consulted the real, true, available source of information; but are experimenting now to find out what the Indians, after thousands of years of experiment, already have ascertained.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That may be true; but, be that as it may, the point I am making for the committee is that if it is the opinion of the United States Senate that the Agricultural Department is a fraud, that it is absolutely squandering millions of dollars a year, then the thing to do is not to come here and make the point that we are ridiculous—for that makes us ridiculous, as we are the ones who furnish the money—but let us abolish the whole business.

I do say, however, in reference to road building and to the different activities of the department in my section, that they have been worth every cent that they have cost us.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, in regard to irrigation, I think that is exactly the condition. They are making us ridiculous, and if the Senator will offer a motion to strike this item out, I will gladly support it; indeed, I think we would not lose much if we cut the whole bill out, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, in connection with the discussion of the subject of drainage and good roads, I want to

make an observation or two. I think if the provisions of the bill were somewhat modified so as to drain out one of the bureaucrats in the department it would be doing a good service to the country. It came to my knowledge probably a year ago that the head of the Good Roads Bureau provided specifications for bids for culverts. There are manufacturers of culverts in my State and also in Alabama. Those manufacturers make what is called a nestable culvert. They had a patent upon it, but the specifications were so framed that no bids would be received on a patented culvert. As a result, the department was deprived of getting the better class of culverts, and we have this anomalous condition: The Congress of the United States voting large sums of money for the maintenance of a Patent Office for the encouragement of invention and a bureaucrat in the Agricultural Department discouraging invention by saying, "I will receive no bids on any patented culvert." The manufacturers who brought this information to me were not asking favors. They simply wanted to have the specifications so changed that bids could be presented either on patented or unpatented culverts, and they ought to have had that privilege, but this bureaucrat said "no."

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio whether he thinks it would be better to abolish the Agricultural Department or discharge the man who acts in that manner?

Mr. POMERENE. No; I have the very highest regard for the Agricultural Department generally, but I would not like to express in public what I think about the head of that bureau.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the suggestion of the Senator from South Carolina that the Agricultural Department ought to be abolished if it is not doing good work certainly was not inspired by any expression of mine. I think the Agricultural Department is doing very great work, but the difficulty in that department, as in every other department, is that a bureau starts on a small scale and grows more rapidly than anything else in nature. After a while it becomes unwieldy and reaches out for more and more appropriations, and, in my judgment, becomes, in some instances, harmful rather than helpful. The very instance that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] has suggested is in point, and I feel sure that the time will come when there will be a careful inquiry into all these things.

In connection with the matter of road building I wish to say that there are five or six different items, each covering pretty nearly the same ground, the only difference being in the amount of the appropriation in each case. We are appropriating money for purposes for which every intelligent man in the country knows it is entirely useless to appropriate. The Agriculture Department may tell a farmer something about the soil, but it can not tell an intelligent farmer how to do the ordinary things that farmers have been doing since the days of Abraham, and yet we are making appropriations for such purposes all along the line.

I should like to see the time come, although I probably never will see it, when there will be a careful investigation into these matters by somebody to ascertain how much of the work is duplicated, and whether or not we are making profligate expenditures, so that, without any reference to any personal feeling or the charge that we are assailing the department itself, we may try to reach more sane and sensible conclusions than we seem in very many instances able to reach now.

There are a great many things in this bill that might have been criticized. The Senator from South Carolina is not responsible for them at all. The bill comes to us from another body, I think, very crudely framed. Now, let me call attention to just one little item, on page 74, in line 5, reading:

The duty, apportionment, and measurement of irrigation water.

For heaven's sake, what is the "duty of irrigation water"?

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That refers to the charges that are made when the dams are being constructed and leaks occur.

Mr. GALLINGER. That means a charge, does it?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I so understand.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, "duty" is a very unfortunate word.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield.

Mr. BRADY. Before leaving that subject I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire what he understands the words "duty of irrigation water" to mean.

Mr. GALLINGER. I give it up.

Mr. BRADY. The duty of water is one of the most important things that the farmer has to decide in an irrigation country.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, will the Senator explain what it means?

Mr. BRADY. I will be glad to do so. The "duty of water" refers to the amount of water required to irrigate a particular piece of land in a manner that will produce the best crops, and the very best work that has been done by the irrigationists in the Government employ has been to assist us in demonstrating what the duty of water really is. In my State in the early days, before it was determined accurately, we used to figure that 1 cubic inch of water flowing continually was sufficient to irrigate 1 acre of land, and we so provided in the law. Years of experience, however, have demonstrated to us that we were entirely wrong, and that we could not determine by law what the duty of water is, but that we must determine it by experimentation. The result has been that to-day we are measuring water under the laws of our State by the cubic foot, instead of by the continuous flow of cubic inches, and are now determining how many cubic feet of water are required per acre properly to irrigate an acre of land. It is something that means a great deal to the western people. One acre of land may be irrigated with 1 cubic foot of water; another acre may require 2 cubic feet of water, and another acre may require 3 cubic feet of water.

Under the great Carey projects our land board, consisting of the chief executive of the State, State engineer, our secretary of state, our attorney general, and the superintendent of public instruction, five of the elective officers of the State, determine what the duty of water is for a particular piece of land. In one instance they have placed it at 1 foot per acre covering several thousand acres of land, where millions of dollars have been invested in reclamation projects; in another instance they have placed it at 2 feet per acre, and in other instances it has been discovered that it required almost 3 feet per acre. The question now that the people of that western country are trying to decide is whether or not, when there is required a duty of water greater than 3 feet per acre, it pays at all to irrigate that land.

These are questions that must be solved; they must not be treated lightly. I know full well the Senator from New Hampshire does not mean to do so, and certainly will not when he understands the real situation. While to an eastern man, who has had no experience in irrigation, the expression may seem strange and absurd, to a western man, to a farmer on irrigated land, living there, striving to build a home by the assistance of the Government, it means everything in the world; and I hope that Senators in discussing this matter may realize that the duty of water means very much to the man who irrigates land in the West.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BRADY. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I merely wish to add that the "duty of water," as it is understood in the West, means the amount of water essential to the irrigation of an acre of land. It has a technical meaning that is very familiar to the people of the West. However, I quite agree with the criticism which the Senator from New Hampshire makes regarding the appropriation itself. The "duty of water" is ascertained and understood by the men who use it—

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. By the farmers out in Idaho and Colorado and other States who by actual experience know what it is; but this entire section, like others to which I may refer before this bill is finally voted upon, is designed to appropriate a lot of money to ascertain things that we know a great deal about already, and that the inhabitants of the West can ascertain much better than a paid corps of employees, however intelligent and earnest they may be, sent out there from other sections of the country.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senators from Idaho and Colorado have given me the information I wanted. It might have been answered in a single phrase that the word "duty" is a technical word understood by certain men who are engaged in this work; and while I think it is an unfortunate word, and that they might have found a better word than that, still I yield to the superior knowledge of Senators who have had experience in these matters.

I still think, however, to repeat what perhaps I ought not to, that this Bureau of Road Making, or whatever it is called, is growing very rapidly, and that it is going to reach a point before a great while when it will have to be halted in some way. The duplication of work, on page 73, is to me rather startling. Of course, Senators can differentiate and can use technical phrases

to make it appear that the work is not duplicated, but, as a matter of fact, it is. They inquire in regard to systems of road management; then they investigate the best methods of road making; then they conduct field experiments in various methods of road construction. Perhaps there are technical meanings of the words "making" and "construction" that I do not understand. So it runs along through the bill, and when we get through this one bureau accumulates \$300,000 or thereabouts for the work in which they are engaged. While they may be doing great work for some sections of the country, the work they are doing has very little interest or advantage to other sections of the country.

However, if they can by any process or any ingenuity devise methods that will improve the roads in some sections of this country, I shall be delighted. I tried once or twice a little while ago to get to Mount Vernon in a vehicle, and did not succeed very well. I can get to Alexandria now, at the expense of the Government; and I know that in other sections of the country a man takes his life in his hands if he tries to go anywhere, especially in the rainy season.

I am in favor of giving reasonable appropriations from the Government to encourage this enterprise, but I really do not believe that we need in the city of Washington a great corps of clerks and assistants and experts to teach the people of this country how to build roads. That is my judgment.

I notice in one of these items an appropriation for "assistants and labor." I suppose the assistants do not work. I could not interpret it in any other way.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VARDAMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield the floor.

Mr. BRADY. I wish to ask the Senator from New Hampshire, while he is discussing the items on page 73, which items he feels are duplications?

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, I think they are all duplications.

Mr. BRADY. Well, let me read the paragraph commencing on line 8, page 73, where it says:

For inquiries in regard to systems of road management throughout the United States, and for giving expert advice on this subject, \$41,040.

Mr. GALLINGER. What does the Senator understand by the words "road management" in that sense?

Mr. BRADY. My understanding is that they mean to investigate under what method the roads have been placed in the best condition; whether it is under the management of the precincts, or under the management of the road districts, or under the management of the State administration.

I am in hearty accord with the Senator from New Hampshire along any line that will reduce the expenses of this Government, and especially the extravagance in employing a large number of unnecessary clerks; but in a large undertaking like this I believe we should give these things very careful and fair consideration. Not referring in any sense to the Senator from New Hampshire—who, I feel, always desires to be fair with us western men—I must say that every time the Agricultural bill comes before the Senate and every time it is discussed it seems to me that some Senators take the view of it that we are trying to take away something from this Government. I do not believe that such is the case. I believe that the Agricultural Department and the Agricultural Committees of both the House and Senate have used every effort to hold down these expenses just as much as possible under existing conditions.

Referring to the specific items to which the Senator from New Hampshire refers, we have recently appropriated something like \$75,000,000 for the construction of roads in these United States, to be duplicated by the States, making in all an expenditure of \$150,000,000 for that purpose. It is a great undertaking. Does any Senator here presume that if an association of business men were going to invest \$150,000,000 along some line in which they had never invested that amount before, they would not make inquiries in regard to systems of management throughout the United States, and secure expert advice on the subject? Do the Senators believe that those men investing \$150,000,000 would not try to make investigations of the best methods of construction along the lines in which they were investing their money; would not attempt to make investigations along the line of conducting field experiments in methods of construction of properties similar to those in which they were going to invest their money?

It is a sane business proposition. We are investing \$150,000,000, and we are spending by these appropriations \$41,000, \$141,000, \$51,000, and \$60,000 in making experiments and investigations so as to enable us to know how that money will be spent economically.

As has been said on the floor here to-day, there may be some small inconsistencies; but the purpose of the men who framed this bill, the purpose of the Agricultural Department, has been to secure the greatest good for the greatest number. The farmers of this country are entitled to just exactly as much consideration as the investors of this country, the bankers, or the corporations of this country. I am not one of those who try to belittle other undertakings of business men of this Nation. I believe that they should all have an equal chance, and the farmer of America, if I understand his purposes—and I think I do—wants only an even chance. He does not want any advantage over any other citizen, organization, or corporation. The committee has approved these small appropriations for experimental and demonstration purposes. I do not want to feel as though our efforts are not appreciated when in my simple way I tried to impress upon the Senate the facts that I believe that the farmers of this country are entitled to more consideration than they are receiving at our hands. I believe this appropriation is fair and just, and that these sections of the bill should be enacted into law.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, just a word. I do not know to whom the Senator refers. I certainly never have sneered at the Senator from Idaho. I think he is one of the most valuable Members of the Senate, and when he speaks on a subject such as he has just addressed himself to he speaks with a certain degree of authority that we all respect. I want the Senator to know that I had no purpose of belittling him in any way or of criticizing him in any way.

Mr. BRADY. I certainly made the statement in my remarks that I did not refer to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I asked a question of the Senator from South Carolina as to what the word "management" meant, and he gave me a definition, and then I asked the Senator from Idaho and he gave me an entirely different definition. I am content, however, with the information I received. It has not enlightened me at all; but they did the best they could, and I am satisfied with it.

Mr. BRADY. I am sorry, indeed, if I have not enlightened the Senator in any way. I wish to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that my immediate remarks were not at all in reference to him, and I think if he will read my remarks he will see that I plainly stated so in making them.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very well.

Mr. BRADY. I have found him voting on many occasions for things to upbuild and help the West that have been beneficial in many ways.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BRADY. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely wish to assure the Senator from Idaho that while I differ with him as regards the importance and need of this appropriation, I certainly had no intention of reflecting either upon his judgment or upon his standing here as a Senator. The Senator is one of the most useful members of this body, and has been so long connected with great enterprises having for their object the reclamation of western lands and benefit to western people that his judgment is entitled to the highest respect. So if I said anything that even sounded like a reflection upon the Senator's view of the matter, I am very sorry.

Mr. BRADY. I did not think the Senator from Colorado reflected upon me in any manner whatever.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BRADY. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. I was very much interested in the Senator's discussion and in his definition of the word "management" as used here on line 8. Just as has been said by the Senator from New Hampshire, the definition given by the Senator from Idaho is altogether different from the definition given by the Senator from South Carolina. I myself asked the Senator from South Carolina in regard to the word "management," and his construction of that word would embrace the very things set forth in the next two paragraphs of the bill. Therefore, I thought I was justified in insisting that there was some duplication here, and that there was not any need of all these three appropriations.

I appreciate the force of the Senator's definition of the word "management." It seems to me he gives a reasonable construction to and interpretation of that word as here used, and that it refers to the management of the roads by precinct, county, or State authority, and not to material that enters into the repair or construction.

Mr. BRADY. And to determine which has been most successful.

Mr. STERLING. The idea is to give the Federal authority some supervision over that matter, so as to ascertain which is the best management, probably.

Mr. BRADY. The Senator is quite correct in his statement as to what my thought was in expressing my views; but take the four paragraphs here. If you will read them carefully, you will see that the first refers to management, the second to investigations, the third to physical character, and the fourth to experiments and methods. It seems to me that those are the four things that any association of business men would investigate before investing their money; and that is the reason why I feel that we should consider all four of them as a whole.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho further yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. BRADY. I do.

Mr. STERLING. I just want to say to the Senator from Idaho that the only question I have in regard to the item embraced in lines 11 to 15, or either of the other two items, is as to whether each one does not provide for work and for supervision that should be done by the local or State authorities themselves, and whether it is not a needless expense upon the part of the Government.

Now, I have not fully made up my mind in that regard. It is a question whether or not the communities themselves, the counties or the States in which these improvements are to be made, are not in the end better off when they themselves and the men within the States or the counties take the initiative and think out some of these problems for themselves rather than to always rely upon the General Government to do it all—not only to furnish the information, but, as in many cases, actually do the work.

Mr. BRADY. I think the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota are very pertinent, indeed; and that is just exactly the reason why I think these investigations should be made. We will investigate, with this small appropriation, road management; we will make other investigations of the methods; we will make other investigations of the physical character; and we will make other investigations in the line of field experiments in regard to the different methods that the States have undertaken and tried. And then we will decide just how far we shall go in assisting those States in carrying on this work.

I agree with the Senator that it is the duty of these States to take the initiative. We have passed the law, however; we have appropriated \$75,000,000; we have asked the States to contribute their part; and now I feel that it is only fair and right and just to the States and to ourselves and to the taxpayers and to the public that we should make a thorough and complete investigation before expending any more money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed, beginning on line 5, page 75.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering," on page 75, line 14, after the word "experiments," to strike out "\$16,000" and insert "\$12,600," so as to make the clause read:

For general administrative expenses connected with the above-mentioned lines of investigations and experiments, \$12,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 23, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$606,240" and insert "\$602,840," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$602,840.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 24, after the words "Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering," to strike out "\$701,600" and insert "\$698,200," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering, \$698,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead of "Bureau of Markets," on page 77, line 18, after "\$184,740," to insert "of which sum \$40,000 shall be immediately available," so as to make the clause read:

For collecting and distributing, by telegraph, mail, and otherwise, timely information on the supply, commercial movement, disposition, and market prices of fruits and vegetables, \$184,740, of which sum \$40,000 shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read to line 12, on page 78, the last paragraph read being as follows: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to gather from stockmen, live-stock associations, State live-stock and agricultural boards, com-

mon carriers, stockyards, commission firms, live-stock exchanges, slaughtering and meat-packing companies, and others information relative to the number of different classes and grades of marketable live stock, especially cattle, hogs, and sheep in the principal live-stock feeding districts and growing sections; prices, receipts, and shipments of the different classes and grades of cattle, hogs, and sheep at live-stock market centers; prices of meats and meat food products and the amounts of such products in storage; to compile and publish such information at such frequent intervals as most effectively to guide producers, consumers, and distributors in the sale and purchase of live stock, meats, and other animal products; and to gather and publish any related information pertaining to marketing and distribution of live stock, meats, and animal by-products, the sum of \$66,800.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the committee to a class of work that it seems to me could be done by this department better than any other department of the Government, and to a class of work that ought to be done, in my judgment, by some of the departments.

In looking through the items of appropriation I observe, on page 77, an appropriation of \$289,000 for the purpose of acquiring, and acquainting people with, useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distributing of farm products. The next item is an appropriation of \$184,000 to acquaint them with market prices of fruits and vegetables. The next item is an appropriation of \$66,000 to enable the Secretary to gather information as to the different classes and grades of live stock, etc. Then we reach an item that has been stricken out of the House bill. Perhaps it is stricken out because it is thought that the work to be done is very largely that of investigating the manipulation of markets. Then, following that, is a provision for the expenditure of \$48,000 to investigate the condition of cotton. The next item is for the purpose of enabling the Secretary to make studies of cooperation among the farmers, and it appropriates \$30,000. Then we come to an item at the bottom of page 79 appropriating \$106,000 for the purpose of investigating the handling, grading, and transportation of grain. Still further on we come to several items to enforce certain acts of Congress, one being the cotton-futures act, for which \$98,000 is appropriated; then, to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the grain-standards act, the considerable sum of \$519,000 is appropriated.

Mr. President, in every part of the country farmers are engaged in marketing fruits and vegetables which are shipped to the great commercial centers. A great proportion of these shipments are made to commission merchants. When a shipment is made to a commission merchant by a farmer living thousands of miles away, very frequently the report comes back to him that the fruits or vegetables were received in bad condition. The farmer has no means of knowing whether that statement is correct or not. Many of them believe, whether they are justified in that belief or not, that advantage is taken of their inability to question the accuracy of the statement. Even if the statement is correct, Mr. President, the particular shipment involved may be small in amount, and may not justify the bringing of a suit to collect against the transportation company whose delay in delivery caused the fruits or vegetables to be in a decayed condition.

If this department which has undertaken to fix the standards and marketing of grain could in some way place agents at the great cities to which the fruits and vegetables are shipped and from which they are distributed to the smaller markets, I do not hesitate to say that I believe the benefit would equal any benefit conferred by the provisions of this bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BRYAN. I do.

Mr. GRONNA. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Florida that the \$50,000 which has been stricken out would be used for that purpose?

Mr. BRYAN. No; I will say to the Senator that I have not that impression; neither do I see any provision in the bill that would enable the department to do the thing I have in mind.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. BRYAN. If the Senator will permit me just a little further—

Mr. GRONNA. I was simply going to say to the Senator that I am heartily in favor of putting something into the bill to protect the shippers, because I have had some experience in that line and know something about it; and as one of the members of the committee, I shall be very glad to cooperate with the Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. It has occurred to me, Mr. President, that perhaps in carrying out the various activities here provided for there would be located in these large cities agents of the Department of Agriculture who could be of assistance in remedying the situation I have attempted to bring to the attention of the Senate. For example, if it could be made the

duty of the consignee of fruits or vegetables, in case he intended to claim that they had arrived in bad order, to report to an agent of the Bureau of Markets and get his certificate upon the fact, and then if we could provide that that certificate should be prima facie evidence of the truth, it would enable the farmer back in the State from which the goods came to bring suit. But as things are now, if he could bring a suit and prove his case it would cost him a prohibitive amount to gather up the evidence; and, moreover, there would be great difficulty in the first place in ever ascertaining whether or not the statement made to him was correct.

From what I have learned on this subject I believe it is true that the farmers throughout the country are imposed upon by many commission merchants. The temptation is very great for a man of irresponsible character to set up a commission house. I do not mean to say that that obtains as a rule, because there are commission merchants who have been long established and who have held the confidence of shippers from my State, I know, for half a century, but new concerns spring up and they get business. They will promise before the shipping season comes on that they will take the truck. The farmer agrees to ship it to him and he is unable to collect. The fruit or vegetables leave the point of shipment in good condition and when they arrive at the market it is claimed that they are in bad condition.

I mention this not with any idea that it can be taken care of upon this bill, because it would have to be in the nature of general legislation, but I wish to call the attention of the committee to it and I hope they will call the attention of the department to it, so that something along this line may be done. I am not familiar enough with the bureau of markets to know whether they have such men in great cities like New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and St. Louis—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him for just a moment?

Mr. BRYAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will not take the Senator off the floor. I will say to him that the director of the bureau of markets has been studying this question and has during the past year undertaken to experiment in an effort to work along the line the Senator suggests at two cities. Of course, he has not funds enough under this appropriation to carry it into practical operation. He has said to me that it ought to be done, and if it was done at about 25 cities in the United States that would cover the present demand of the producers of food-stuffs that are of a perishable character. I feel sure that by the time another bill comes around the test will have been made sufficiently for the Department of Agriculture to give us a definite suggestion on the subject.

Mr. BRYAN. I am very glad to have that statement from the Senator from Georgia. I do not see anything very difficult in the department having in those cities agents, when the goods are claimed to be in a bad condition, to inspect them and give a certificate, and let that certificate be prima facie evidence of the truth of the statement made.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I wish to state that this matter was brought to the attention of the department who have under investigation the question brought out by the Senator from Florida. They are heartily in accord on the identical point he has been emphasizing. I will read into the RECORD just what the department says in reference to the amendment which was offered on the floor of the House.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Which amendment is the Senator speaking about?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. On page 78, beginning with line 13, the Secretary of Agriculture says:

This item was inserted on the floor of the House. It seems to me that it is defective in two particulars. The appropriation is too small to make possible a satisfactory inquiry over so important and wide a field. It does not give the department the power it would need to make a conclusive inquiry—that is, to compel the production of the necessary facts.

I am on record to the effect that such an investigation had better be made by the Federal Trade Commission. It appears that the Federal Trade Commission's power to investigate may be limited to corporations doing an interstate business with a view to discover whether the anti-trust laws are violated.

Mr. BRYAN. I did not have special reference to the language stricken out, I will say to the Senator; but on the general situation under the heading of Bureau of Markets, in considering these various items, I thought it worth while to call the attention of the committee to it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Without reading further, I wish to make a statement. The committee went over this very field. The Secretary seemed to be of opinion that the Trade Commission could take care of it from their point of view, but that it would require a larger appropriation and a more compre-

hensive and a more thoroughly worked-out system would be justified, but not one in this crude and imperfect way. I hope that in conference we may be able to find some way to meet the very urgent necessity indicated by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wish to ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat.

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

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do.

Mr. TOWNSEND. What argument does the Senator offer for striking out lines 13 to 19, relative to food products, which does not apply to the next item?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I was just about to read further what the Secretary of Agriculture had to say. Without reading it into the Record I will state that the Secretary of Agriculture informed the committee that he thought this could be taken care of by the Trade Commission, who were to look into any fraud practiced by shippers.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Why could not that duty be also conferred upon the Trade Commission relative to cotton. I see that the next item is an appropriation of \$48,000, among other things, for developing the market of cotton.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do not think that has anything to do with this item; it is not in the same class of business, for the reason that it has no reference to any fraudulent act or a perishable crop. The point the Senator from Florida makes is that certain truck is shipped and the reply is that it was received in bad order. The paragraph to which the Senator now refers is as to what is the best method of marketing cotton, whether collectively or individually, or at what points. Cotton is totally indestructible if kept away from fire and weather. It is not in the same class as the shipments complained of by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I realize that, but it is an appropriation of \$48,000 for that purpose, whereas this other provision which has in view a most desirable object and which, as the Senator from Georgia suggests, the \$50,000 could be used in certain places to make a demonstration as to possible fraud or injustice practiced upon the farmer, and it might be useful in enlightening the rest of the country.

I understand that this appropriation of \$50,000 did not comprehend the investigation of the subject for the whole United States, but it did comprehend the idea of making an investigation to determine whether in any place these frauds were being practiced, and if that demonstration were once made it would be very easy for Congress then to proceed to act upon the matter in an intelligent manner.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator misunderstood me.

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

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have the floor through the courtesy of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I did not make myself clear if the Senator gained the impression that these tests were being made in matters that are covered by the provision we struck out. I understand its real object was to conduct investigations to determine the extent, manner, and methods of any manipulation of the markets or control of the visible supply of foodstuffs by individuals, groups, associations, combinations, or corporations. I think this provision placed in the bill upon the floor had in view placing upon the Department of Agriculture the duty of going out and investigating the combinations that are supposed to have been made to control the price of foodstuffs, especially of wheat and meats. The Department of Agriculture advised us that this investigation of illegal combinations to interfere with the handling of food products seemed to be already covered by the act creating the Federal Trade Commission, and that the Department of Agriculture had no authority to compel the production of books, to subpoena witnesses, and to conduct the investigation in a way that would bring results.

The Secretary suggested that if we undertook to put this class of investigation upon the department we ought also to give him power and authority by which he could conduct it, and he sent us a bill to that effect. Upon examination it was perfectly plain to us that the bill was general legislation and that one objection would stop it. There was, as I recall it, one objection in the committee, and we concluded that we need not undertake it.

The class of work to which I was referring is entirely different work. It is the stationing of an expert in a city to watch and advise as to the real condition of perishable products that come into the city and make some investigations, not with the power of action but just for information, as to the extent to which the

rights of the farmers were disregarded in the treatment of their perishable products in the city.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I certainly would not wish to advocate the incorporation of any provision in the bill which would be a vain thing or which would cover ground that was prepared by another commission. I had thought, however, that this had in mind some very important matters which should be investigated. We have been talking about the high cost of living. We have had various speculations indulged as to what that cause is. It has seemed to me for some months that the Department of Agriculture having agents throughout the United States coming into contact with the farmer and his market might be able to make some suggestions that would be of real service; but if the Trade Commission has taken this up, I would not, of course, vote for an additional appropriation, because it would be simply a waste of money if the subject was covered already.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not claim that it is being properly covered. I do not think it is; but the Secretary of Agriculture said, "You must give me some power to subpoena witnesses and to produce books and to force the production of testimony or else you put a responsibility upon me with my hands tied." He said, "If you do that; if you give me the authority and the power, please, also authorize me to act in cooperation with the Federal Trade Commission that we may not duplicate our work." Some of us were disposed to support an amendment which would have amounted to general legislation in its power as we thought it ought to be done, but we became satisfied that it would go off on a single objection, and that objection would be made to it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does the Senator believe that a point of order would be made against an amendment to the provision inserted by the House for the purpose of making that provision effective? It would not be a new provision. It appropriates money to make an investigation. The Senate provision would simply be an amendment to make it effective so that the department could make the investigation and make it of value.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The reason stated in the House, I think, why they did not give fuller power was that the trend of the House was to avoid anything in the shape of general legislation, and we concluded that the amendment sent us by the Secretary of Agriculture could not be used. If the Senator has such an amendment and it is not objected to, I will vote for it. I will not object to it.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I took some part in the debate when this provision was considered in committee. I understood from what explanation was made to me that the provision suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture was simply for the purpose of giving the Department of Agriculture or the Secretary of Agriculture the same power that the Trade Commission now has. If an amendment is offered on this floor giving the Secretary of Agriculture the power asked for by the Senator from Florida to investigate the marketing of food products and perishable goods, I certainly shall not object to it. I think it would be very wholesome legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator yield to me a moment?

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

Mr. GRONNA. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not think what the Senator from Florida asked for really has any relation to the provision on page 78 that we struck out. The Senator from Florida was considering simply agents in the cities to watch the treatment of perishable goods sent in by farmers. The provision we struck out proposed to place upon the Secretary of Agriculture the duty of making investigations into trade combinations and trade monopolies, not with reference to perishable goods but with reference especially, as we viewed it, to meat and to grain, and so forth, in the great distributing centers. He said, "I can not do that unless you give me additional power," and he sent us a bill quite elaborately prepared to that end. We recognized the fact that the Trade Commission has that authority now, although we did not claim that it was performing it.

Mr. GRONNA. That is exactly the way I understood it; but I simply wanted to express my sentiment that the suggestion of the Senator from Florida appeals to me, and if there is any way in which we can insert a provision in the Agricultural appropriation bill, either now or in the next bill, I am heartily in favor of it.

Mr. BRYAN. I am glad that so many members of the committee feel that way about it. It occurs to me perhaps if the amendment striking out the language in the House is agreed to that would throw the matter into conference, and it may be

that after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture a provision of that kind could be reported back from the conference committee. It is not a very difficult thing, it seems to me, to provide for. I would not have one of these agents in any of the cities go to the trouble to investigate all the shipments, because that would be an insurmountable task, but we could provide that upon the claim by the consignee of the perishable goods that they were in bad order he must notify the agent if we had one there and get a certificate from him; otherwise the goods would be considered as arriving in good order.

I have no doubt that with this amendment agreed to, the conference committee can, after consultation with the Secretary, report something of value. He knows what agents he has already in the cities and how much burden it would be to undertake this work, whether we should have to employ new people or people already in the employ of the Government could give it their attention.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator having charge of the bill explained the reason for the insertion of this clause in the bill by the House. It seemed to me, when my attention was first attracted to it, to constitute perhaps the most important feature of the bill, since its apparent purpose was to investigate and make some provision against what is generally known as the high cost of living. I welcomed the appearance of this clause when the bill was sent over from the other House as the beginning of a proper method of dealing with the subject, but I think we have gone at it wrong end to. We are proposing to elevate the salaries of the employees of the Government for the purpose of meeting the advances in the cost of living, and by so doing we are proposing to place a premium on that practice which has made the request for an increase of salaries necessary. I am satisfied that if we proceed along that line of legislation, those receiving the increased wage will derive no great benefit from it, because those who control food products can elevate their prices much more rapidly than can the Government increase the salaries of its employees. In such a race the inequality is apparent. Therefore, by the process which is now being experimented with in these supply bills, instead of doing away with the evil, we are only feeding it.

So I was anxious to ascertain why the Senate committee had determined to make this excision. I think the explanation that has been made is quite satisfactory. At the same time, I regret that the proposed amendment of the Department of Agriculture was not incorporated in the bill, notwithstanding the danger that it would encounter if a point of order should be made against it, because, Mr. President, of all the important things before this Congress, certainly none is more important than that some effort should be made to restrict, if not to do away entirely with, the enormous and unreasonable and extortionate rise in the prices of the necessities of life.

Of course, the rise consequent upon the vast influx of gold in the United States is perfectly understandable and perfectly natural and perhaps unavoidable, but where groups of men, associating themselves together, not only are enabled to take advantage of this normal influence upon prices, but can also advance them beyond all reason and to the point of extortion, certainly this Government owes it as a duty to the public to ascertain whether or not it has the power; and if it has, then to exert that power in the shape of legislation for the purpose of doing away with this intolerable evil.

I noticed only a day or two ago in one of the local newspapers an announcement of the advance of 5 cents per pound in the price of meats. There is no occasion for it except the opportunity and the power to extort that additional sum from the masses of the people, and unless the Government can ascertain some remedy for this evil we must not be surprised if the people shall take the law into their own hands, because when monopoly goes to the point of cornering food supplies, in times of peace particularly, and placing its own price upon products to the consuming public, either the Government must interfere to prevent it or the people must not be blamed if they take the law into their own hands.

Some time ago we read the accounts of a great egg monopoly in Chicago, which was being investigated. Soon afterwards we were informed that the investigation disclosed that those engaged in the business of cornering eggs and demanding an exorbitant price for them were violating no law. Certainly that must have referred to statute law, because there was a violation of moral law and a violation of the old common law against regrating and engrossing, which every lawyer will at once recognize. Then came the announcement that the principal head of the Egg Trust was decidedly boastful in his assertion, not only of the vast amount of money that he had made through this manipulation, but of the fact that he had done it with impunity. If the next morning I had seen in the Chicago newspapers that the long-

suffering public of that great city had gone at night to that man's house, taken him out of his bed, and hanged him to a lamp-post, I should have read it, I confess, with a great deal of quiet satisfaction, because it is enough for a man to commit an act of that kind without boasting of it and announcing to the world the impotence of the Government under which he lives to prevent that sort of exaction.

It will come to that, Mr. President, and, if it does and when it does, I think I voice a common sentiment when I say that no man will express surprise, and very few will express much regret, unless, of course, we can in the meantime set abroad some agencies which will at least tend to produce the desired result.

Of course, I can very readily understand that a widespread condition of this sort can not be very well overcome by a modest appropriation of \$50,000 to be expended in the mere making of an investigation.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. It has been impressed upon my mind that prices are, without any reason, being arbitrarily increased all along the line. The Senator from Colorado calls attention to the fact that the announcement was made that the increase in the price of meats, I believe, would be 5 cents a pound.

Mr. THOMAS. A few days ago there was some such statement in the newspapers, as I was told.

Mr. GALLINGER. I presume the Senator from Colorado received the same letter that I did not long ago from the Swift Co. I am not acquainted with the gentlemen who are running that great company; but I was quite surprised in reading that letter—assuming that they told the truth—to learn that they were getting a profit of but one-fourth of a cent a pound on live cattle and one-quarter of a cent a pound on the meat when it was prepared for market. That shows conclusively, assuming that it is correct, that these prices are largely imposed upon the consuming public by the middle man and by the retailer. For that reason, I think it will be a very difficult matter to regulate; and yet it ought to be regulated, if it can possibly be done.

I simply wanted to put that into the RECORD as it has come to me from that great firm. Of course, I have no way of determining whether or not it is absolutely accurate; but I state simply the plain fact as it was communicated to me.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am obliged to the Senator from New Hampshire for reminding me of that circumstance. I received a similar letter from the same firm, and I read it with some degree of surprise. Of course, I am not prepared to say that the statement is not correct; yet it is true that the packers are flourishing as they never before flourished, and their vast operations are constantly increasing. So we must take the statement in connection with the very evident fact that their prosperity is unbounded and perhaps unusual even for such great concerns. There is no doubt, however, Mr. President, that very much of this exorbitance in the prices of the necessities of life is due to the middle man, because the middle man is also combining with, and not only combining with but entering into relations with the wholesaler, which are so drastic that no outsider can purchase by wholesale unless he belongs to the middlemen's association.

We all know that some time ago a practice existed—and I presume the practice still exists—among some commission merchants of reporting goods sent to them to be sold upon commission as badly damaged and in poor condition, in consequence of which the consignor receives a very small amount for his consignment, while at the same time the goods were sold and disposed of, I might say, almost as a custom in some sections of the country a few years ago, at most excellent prices, and because of the fact that they were in good condition and not subject to the report which the consignor received; in other words, the middleman, on the one hand, representing to the owner of the commodities that his goods were not in good condition and settling with him for a small price, while, on the other hand, selling to the consumer at the ordinary price and putting the difference in his pocket. That is one illustration of the manner in which the combination of the middlemen works.

I was about to say when the Senator from New Hampshire interrupted that I hope the Trade Commission is carrying on investigations that are going to lead to something. I have the best of feeling toward the Trade Commission. I was not impressed when the act creating that commission was passed that it would be productive of much benefit, and I have not had occasion since then to change my mind very materially, but it certainly has the authority, if it will exercise it, to carry on investigations along some lines in regard to the necessities of life that would be sufficient at least to attract the attention of Con-

gress to the difficulty in such way as to enable them to legislate swiftly and intelligently concerning it, for it is perhaps the greatest of all our duties now, if we can do so, to bring down the price of the necessities of life, so that the man of ordinary wage and of ordinary salary can live decently and support his family. Therefore, I was surprised when I saw the excision of this part of the bill, and I am glad that a very satisfactory explanation has been made of the reasons for it.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, is the amendment on page 78 now pending?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It is.

Mr. BRYAN. In lieu of that amendment I move the amendment which I send to the desk.

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

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the portion proposed to be stricken out insert the following—

Mr. BRYAN. Strike out the words in the House text and in lieu insert—the committee amendment simply strikes out the House text.

The SECRETARY. Strike out lines 13 to 19, on page 79, in the following words:

To make investigation relating to the production, transportation, storage, preparation, marketing, manufacture, and distribution of agricultural food products, including the extent, manner, and methods of any manipulation of the markets or control of the visible supply of such food products or any of them by any individuals, groups, associations, combinations, or corporations, \$50,000.

And insert:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and certify to shippers the condition as to soundness of fruits and vegetables when received at markets under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, \$25,000: *Provided*, That the certificates issued by the authorized agents of the department shall be received in all courts as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think that amendment is proper, and the committee has no objection to it. I think it will cover the ground.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] will be agreed to. I was rather surprised when I read the lines here to see that they were stricken out by the committee. It seemed to me they covered a very important phase of our commercial life, and I felt that the committee must have had some very overpowering reason for striking them out. I am glad that the amendment has been proposed by the Senator from Florida, and I hope that it will be adopted, because it seems to me that it will assure putting the whole matter in conference, and I have no doubt that then the conferees will be able to work out something, if this amendment does not, that will take care of a situation that needs looking after.

I merely want to add that in my section of the country, which is a fruit-growing and vegetable-producing section, I have heard many times of instances where farmers have consigned their fruits or their vegetables to market and the report has come back that the commodities were in bad condition, and in some circumstances a bill for freight was sent to them. They have no means of ascertaining the truth or falsity of such representations; and it seems to me we can not do anything better for the interests of the farmers and producers of the country than to get some plan worked out along the line of the suggestion of the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida to the amendment offered by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am very desirous of getting over the committee amendments, and, as I presume Senators are now familiar with the House text, I will ask the Secretary to read from now on the committee amendments, so that we may consider and get through with them.

Mr. JONES. I understand that when the Secretary gets through reading the bill and the committee amendments the Senator is going to close the work for to-day.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; I have to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 78, line 23, after the word "cotton," to strike out "\$53,000" and insert "\$48,000," so as to make the clause read:

For investigating, demonstrating, and promoting the use of standards for the different grades, qualities, and conditions of cotton, and for investigating the ginning, grading, stapling, baling, marketing, compressing, and tare of cotton, \$48,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 20, after "\$106,590," to insert: "*Provided*, That \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to install a small experimental flour mill and other apparatus, and chemical and baking laboratories, for the purpose of aiding him in establishing standards of quality and condition of wheat and other grains, as required by the act of Congress approved August 11, 1916, known as the United States grain standards act," so as to make the clause read:

For investigating the handling, grading, and transportation of grain, including the grain sorghums, for the purpose of fixing definite grades thereof, \$106,590: *Provided*, That \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to install a small experimental flour mill and other apparatus, and chemical and baking laboratories, for the purpose of aiding him in establishing standards of quality and condition of wheat and other grains, as required by the act of Congress approved August 11, 1916, known as the United States grain standards act.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator in charge of the bill if this amendment came from the department?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I will state that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] is the author of this amendment and can explain it fully.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is rather a startling proposition that the Government is going to establish a little flour mill and chemical and baking laboratories; but we are drifting along that line pretty rapidly, taking out of the hands of private enterprise and private initiative the affairs of the public, and passing them over to the paternal care of the Government of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I will state to the Senator that no such proposition was made to the committee, but this amendment, as the Senator from North Dakota will explain, was simply to provide a means for testing the quality of certain grain that might be deceptive in looks, and thus aid in grading wheat and testing its bread-making qualities.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the department could find somewhere an old flour mill already built, and if they will come to my section of the country I will accommodate them; but perhaps we have got to go into the building of a flour mill and enter into competition with Corby Bros. Possibly that is so.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that my physical condition to-day is such that I may not be able to explain this item satisfactorily to the Senate. I desire to say, however, that I believe, after I have made the explanation, there will be no opposition to it.

There has been provided in the Agricultural College of North Dakota a small flour mill. I say a "flour mill," but it is a very simple affair. We only have to go back a century or two to find that a flour mill was a rounded stone and the implements used were simple and inexpensive. How much it would cost the Department of Agriculture to install this mill in quarters which they already own I do not know; but I do know that it cost very little to the agricultural college at Fargo.

I have here before me a paper published in my State giving results of experiments which have been made in testing wheat of different weights. Everybody knows that this year in the United States, in the spring-wheat belt, we had what we call a poor crop. We had excessive heat and the kernels were shriveled up so that the wheat was exceedingly light, weighing all the way from 40 to 50 pounds a bushel instead of 60 pounds a bushel.

Now, the question is, How is the Department of Agriculture to grade this wheat and do justice to the producer and to the consumer?

I have here this report—and it is an official report—issued by the food commissioner of our State; and while I will not take the time of the Senate to go into it as fully as I should like to, I want to say that this little mill located in the agricultural college took 600 samples of wheat and ground them into flour. The report gives the laboratory numbers of some of them. Some of this wheat weighed 39 pounds to the bushel, some 46 pounds to the bushel, other specimens 47, 41½, 49½, 49½, 52½, and 38, showing all the different weights. The price of that wheat was based upon its weight, and this report shows that there was a very slight difference in the real value of a bushel of wheat by weight. The difference in the market price, however, on all these samples, on an average, was 85 cents per bushel.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The difference in price?

Mr. GRONNA. The difference in price in the selling market and the milling price was 85 cents a bushel. That was the average, and it ran as high as \$1.03 per bushel.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Senator does not mean the difference?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I mean the difference in the price per bushel. The Senator knows that wheat this year is abnormally high. In Minneapolis and in Duluth there has been paid for wheat above \$2 per bushel. The farmers received for that wheat all the way from 75 cents to 90 cents per bushel. You understand that the farmers had to give 60 pounds to the bushel, although the wheat required to make a bushel weighed all the way between 39 and 52 pounds.

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

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I shall be glad to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that when wheat is quoted at \$2 per bushel in the markets of the United States the farmer gets only about 75 cents a bushel for it?

Mr. GRONNA. I say that for some of this light, shrunken wheat the farmers received as low a price as 75 cents per bushel, and I sold some for that price myself.

Mr. GALLINGER. I want to ask the Senator further—and I dislike exceedingly to disturb him or to delay the consideration of the bill—

Mr. GRONNA. No; I am very glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. That wheat, of course, would not be quoted for \$2 per bushel in any market, would it?

Mr. GRONNA. No. The quotations are based upon No. 1 hard, No. 1 northern, No. 2 northern, and so on.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is what I supposed.

Mr. GRONNA. But I want to show the Senator the real value of this wheat. The wheat that weighed 39 pounds to the bushel had a milling value of \$1.88. The wheat weighing 46 pounds had a milling value of \$1.96, and the wheat that weighed 47 pounds had a milling value of \$2.01. That was at the mill, of course. So, Mr. President, it simply goes to show the enormous profit that is made by somebody and the sacrifice that is being made by the producer; and it certainly does not help the consumer. The consumer pays the price based upon the high quality of wheat, and not upon the low quality of wheat.

This has been made an issue in my State. More than 45,000 farmers resolved themselves into a league called the Nonpartisan League. They are publishing a paper, which is their own, called the Nonpartisan Leader. They are publishing to-day a daily paper called the Courier News. They have established the first paper with their own funds. They have bought this daily paper with their own money. They have built, with their own money, a terminal elevator located at St. Paul, holding 1,000,000 bushels of grain and costing \$500,000.

Mr. President, it is a serious proposition with us. We raised, in 1915, in North Dakota, 155,000,000 bushels of wheat. Make a reduction of 10 cents per bushel and see what that amounts to. In the United States we produced that very same year more than a billion bushels. At 1 cent a bushel that amounts to \$10,000,000; at 10 cents it is ten times that much, or \$100,000,000, which is sacrificed by the producer and which does not help the consumer.

Mr. President, I know of no other way to remedy this condition than to appropriate money to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make milling tests—and this is the proper place for it, in order to carry out the standard grain-grades act—to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to install a little flouring mill somewhere in the Department of Agriculture, which will not cost very much; to establish a baking laboratory; to establish a chemical laboratory; and to fix the standards which we authorized in the grain-standards act a year ago. This, I say, is the only way in which the Secretary of Agriculture can do justice to the producers and to the consumers; and I sincerely hope there will be no objection to it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am very much interested in this matter, because the explanation puts some little reason in it, whereas it seemed to me to be without reason upon reading it. I should like to ask, however, if such a test is made at Fargo of the wheat which happens to come there, whether that would be a sufficient guide to establish the bread value of wheat raised in Michigan or Indiana or any other State outside of that particular wheat belt in the Northwest?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I will say to the Senator that it will apply in the same way to all. Of course, in years when we have a crop of heavy wheat it may not be of so much value; but every year we have some shrunken wheat, we have some late-sown grain in every State, I take it—I know we have in our State—and of course that makes a lower quality. Now, it is not only the mill at Fargo that has ground this particular wheat.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I know the Senator is an expert authority on that subject, and that is the reason why I asked the question.

Mr. GRONNA. It will be applied to the winter wheat, of course, the same as it is to the spring wheat.

Mr. TOWNSEND. What I can not quite understand, and what the Senator probably can make clear to me, is how this test would be of any value except in regard to the particular wheat that is tested.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator, of course, knows that under the grain-grading act the Secretary of Agriculture now issues licenses to all inspectors.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

Mr. GRONNA. It is really under the supervision of the Federal Government. Now, if in any market—we will say in Detroit, Mich.—some farmer complains of the grade, all that he has to do is to ask the inspector to send to Washington a sample large enough so that it can be ground into flour sufficient to make a loaf of bread.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Where is this mill to be located?

Mr. GRONNA. Right here in the city of Washington, in the Agricultural Department. I take it that they have room enough for it. It only requires a small, inexpensive mill.

Mr. TOWNSEND. So as I understand it, then, the Senator's idea is that these various samples of wheat, where the owner or shipper desires a test, are to be sent to this mill?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes, sir.

Mr. TOWNSEND. And thus they will get a judgment on that particular class of wheat?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; this appropriation is merely for the purpose of conducting research work, of testing the grain, so that the Secretary of Agriculture will be enabled to fix a standard that will do justice, as I said a moment ago, both to the producer and to the consumer. That is the idea.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. The very thing that troubled the Senator from Michigan troubles me. I could not quite see how the establishment of a mill in one State could be utilized to determine the quality of the grain or of the bread in a distant State.

Mr. GRONNA. It is not to be established in my State at all.

Mr. GALLINGER. No.

Mr. GRONNA. It is to be established here in the city of Washington, or wherever the Secretary deems best—perhaps up in New Hampshire; I do not know.

Mr. GALLINGER. No.

Mr. GRONNA. Wherever the Secretary thinks best.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it ought to be here, and I think we ought to specify that in the amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. I was satisfied to leave that to the judgment of the Secretary. Undoubtedly it would be established here. I am quite sure that it would be.

Mr. GALLINGER. It ought to be here if we have a mill, I think.

Mr. GRONNA. I have some tables here, Mr. President. It would take too much time to go into them in detail, and I do not wish to delay the Senate unduly. I ask unanimous consent that this full report may be printed in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

ANOTHER BROADSIDE FROM LADD—FOOD COMMISSIONER ISSUES NEW OFFICIAL BULLETIN ON LIGHT-WEIGHT WHEAT GROUND AT MINNESOTA COMMERCIAL MILL.

Dr. E. F. Ladd, North Dakota pure-food commissioner and president of the agricultural college, has issued another broadside in regard to the 1916 crop of light-weight wheat. The new bulletin, out last week, tells of the milling of rust-hit, light-weight wheat at the now famous Maine Roller Mill at Phelps, Minn. It is an official report, with official tests and figures, confirming the unofficial investigations of the non-partisan newspaper which had a series of articles on this and other custom Minnesota mills which have proved that the so-called poorer grades of wheat, especially that bought by elevators and mills since last year, make in most instances as good, and sometimes better, bread than heavier wheat, though the farmers are forced to part with it for a song.

Dr. Ladd's latest bulletin follows:

THE MAINE MILL.

[By Dr. E. F. Ladd, State food commissioner.]

There has been a feeling that the tests made upon the experimental mill at the agricultural college might not represent the results which are obtained in the commercial milling of wheat. For the purpose of gathering information on this point, and to determine to what extent there might be a variation in results in the commercial mill from those secured in the experimental mill at the college, it has seemed best to gather some data. We were informed that at Phelps, Minn. (Under-wood post office), was located the Maine Roller Mills, with W. E. Thomas as proprietor, from whom much valuable information might be

gathered. On writing for information, the following letter was received:

MILLER OF MAINE WRITES TO LADD.
 PHELPS (UNDERWOOD POST OFFICE), MINN.,
 November 27, 1916.

Prof. E. F. LADD,
 President North Dakota Agricultural College.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your inquiry of the 21st instant, regarding value of light-weight wheat and amount and quality of flour it will produce, will say that I am grinding for the farmers, running night and day, on wheat which tests from 35 pounds to 53 or 54 pounds to the bushel, and it is surprising what an amount of flour some of the light-weight wheat is turning out. Wheat that tests 37 pounds per bushel, perfectly clean and ready for milling, is turning out 25 pounds flour per bushel. Some wheat testing 38 pounds in the dirt is making 28 to 30 pounds, and it is good flour, too; it is strong and rises quick and makes light, nice bread, but it is a trifle more yellow than flour made from the best grades of wheat.

I am grinding for cash and asking the farmers to bring me 30-bushel grists and am making them flour out of their own wheat as nearly as possible. I charge them 15 cents a bushel for grinding and I give them back their screenings and all the flour the wheat will make, and bran and shorts enough to make up 58 pounds for every 60 they bring here.

The wheat is cleaned through six different cleaning machines before it is ground, and from three of these machines the dust is blown out of the mill, so I am sure there is from 1½ pounds to 2 pounds waste in cleaning and grinding.

The farmers are all well pleased with this way of grinding and are getting more flour from their wheat than they expected to get. Some of them wonder where it all comes from. They are coming 30 to 35 miles from all directions, and some of them waiting for their grists three or four days. We are swamped with wheat, and lots of it is piled up on the ground outside of the mill. The farmers are finding out that this low-grade wheat will make flour, and lots of it.

Yours, respectfully,

W. E. THOMAS.

INVESTIGATORS SENT TO OBTAIN FACTS.

Having received the foregoing it was deemed desirable to have a personal inspection made and more complete data gathered. Therefore Thomas Sanderson and W. C. Palmer were requested to make the investigation. They report that they found farmers coming with grists from 30 to 35 miles from all directions; some coming through towns and villages in which are located up-to-date commercial mills. The wheat came faster than could be ground and there were accumulated outside of the mill at least 1,000 sacks of wheat.

In reply to requests for information, Mr. Thomas stated: "My customers all know now that I want, if possible, a grist of at least 30 bushels. Of course, I get some that are smaller, but I like them to run not less than 30 bushels, if possible. Each farmer's grist is taken in and weighed, and then run over six different cleaning machines, the screenings taken out of the wheat, weighed, and returned to the farmer. The clean wheat is run through the mill and we re-

turn to the farmer all the flour from his grist and feed enough to make 58 pounds for every bushel of wheat he has after deducting the weight of screenings from the gross weight for grinding, and I find the farmers are all well satisfied."

The mill is run by water power and has a capacity of 85 barrels of flour in 24 hours when working on good wheat. The building is three stories above the basement, heated with hot water.

GRIST-BOOK DATA SHOW THE RESULTS.

The following data were taken from the grist book at the mill office and is a copy of about 2½ pages of the same. The first 19 entries were taken from work done the first part of October when the bran and shorts were weighed separately. The balance of the data was taken just prior to and during the time Messrs. Sanderson and Palmer were at the mill. Mr. Carl Shole, who had a grist at the mill and got the results of the last grist as shown in Table I, informed us that the best offer he could get on the market for his wheat was \$1.50 per bushel when No. 1 northern was selling at \$1.81 per bushel. This would give him a market value of \$1.37 for his wheat based on values shown in the table below, or a gross profit of 68 cents per bushel. On this grist of 31 bushels and 10 pounds this would be \$21.19 less 15 cents per bushel for grinding, leaving \$16.51 and a profit over value of wheat of 38.66 per cent. The average of these 49 grists, as shown by the table and based on local values quoted in Fergus Falls December 2, 1916, would be a gross profit of 87 cents per bushel; and on the average grist of 29 bushels and 23 pounds would be \$25.56 less 15 cents per bushel for grinding, leaving \$21.15, a profit over value of wheat of 65.44 per cent.

MARKET VALUES AT FERGUS FALLS DECEMBER 2, 1916.

As quoted to Messrs. Sanderson and Palmer at one of the commercial mills, were as follows:

Patent flour, \$5.15 per sack of 98 pounds; straight flour, \$5.05 per sack of 98 pounds—very little going out; low grade, \$2.50 to \$3 per sack of 98 pounds; bran, \$30 per ton; shorts, \$32 per ton—mixed feed \$31 per ton; No. 1 wheat, \$1.08 per bushel; no grade, test weight, 40 pounds, 96 cents per bushel.

EXPLAINS METHODS OF FIGURING USED.

The values used in the deductions in the following tables are the same as above, except the straight flour, which we assume to be worth \$5 per 100 pounds, low grade \$2.50, screenings 75 cents per 100 pounds, and as the average test weight of the samples on which this data was obtainable was 45 pounds we have assumed the wheat to be worth \$1.10 per bushel.

Of the data in the following table, No. I, the first 10 columns were taken from Mr. W. E. Thomas's grist book, the next 6 columns are the percentages of the different mill products of each lot of wheat, and the last column the value of the mill products from a bushel based on the percentage of products as shown and at the market values above quoted.

In Table II will be found the milling and baking results of five different grists that were milled while Messrs. Sanderson and Palmer were at the mill. These represent a fair average of the wheat coming to the mill.

TABLE I.—Milling results taken from Phelps Mill grist book, Dec. 1, 1916.

| Date. | Name of producer. | Weight per bushel. | Before cleaning. | | Screenings, clean. | Clean wheat. | | Straight flour. | Low-grade flour. | Bran. | Shorts. | Per cent lost in milling. | Value, mill products. |
|--------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|---------|--------------------|--------------|---------|-----------------|------------------|-------|---------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | Bushels. | Pounds. | | Bushels. | Pounds. | | | | | | |
| Oct. 7 | P. Torvis | 39 | 34 | 36 | 213 | 31 | 3 | 846 | 40 | 610 | 305 | 3.38 | \$1.88 |
| 10 | Mrs. A. Holm | 46 | 39 | 51 | 140 | 37 | 31 | 1,127 | 50 | 666 | 333 | 3.45 | 1.96 |
| 10 | T. Bailey | | 30 | 33 | 400 | 23 | 53 | 770 | 62 | 369 | 184 | 2.48 | 2.12 |
| 10 | T. Tweeten | 47 | 28 | 18 | 68 | 27 | 10 | 850 | 36 | 460 | 230 | 3.38 | 2.01 |
| 10 | T. Mokler | | 30 | 7 | 307 | 25 | | 705 | 34 | 474 | 237 | 3.35 | 1.95 |
| 11 | P. R. Sande | 41.5 | 38 | 39 | 272 | 34 | 7 | 885 | 57 | 692 | 345 | 3.32 | 1.85 |
| 11 | A. Swanson | 49.5 | 30 | 3 | 36 | 29 | 27 | 950 | 38 | 481 | 340 | 3.28 | 2.03 |
| 11 | Olaf Isakson | 49.5 | 29 | 32 | 39 | 28 | 53 | 911 | 40 | 483 | 241 | 3.31 | 2.00 |
| 13 | William Lutch | 52.5 | 32 | 24 | 88 | 30 | 56 | 1,025 | 90 | 453 | 226 | 3.45 | 2.08 |
| 14 | Carl Johnson | 38 | 39 | 20 | 225 | 35 | 35 | 1,090 | 29 | 630 | 315 | 3.25 | 2.00 |
| 14 | Halverson | | 27 | 18 | 72 | 26 | 6 | 866 | 26 | 416 | 207 | 5.50 | 2.06 |

TABLE II.—Milling and baking results from wheat secured at Phelps, milled at North Dakota Experiment Station, and milling results of the same wheat milled at Phelps, flour from same baked at North Dakota Experiment Station.

SAMPLES MILLED AT NORTH DAKOTA EXPERIMENT STATION.

| Laboratory number. | Weight per bushel. | | Loss in cleaning. | Flour. | Feed. | Loss in mill. | Water absorbed. | Loaf volume (c.c.) | Score. | | Receipts. |
|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------|-------|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------|----------|-----------|
| | Before cleaning. | After cleaning. | | | | | | | Color. | Texture. | |
| | Pounds. | Pounds. | | | | | | | | | |
| 3381 | 44 | 47.5 | 13.61 | 57.45 | 38.39 | 4.16 | 54.7 | 2,370 | 89 | 90 | \$2.1418 |
| 3382 | 50 | 54.5 | 6.85 | 62.97 | 33.19 | 3.84 | 54.1 | 2,335 | 93 | 92 | 2.2086 |
| 3383 | 33.5 | 39 | 21.66 | 47.91 | 45.09 | 7.00 | 57.1 | 2,380 | 79 | 85 | 1.9541 |
| 3384 | 40.5 | 46 | 15.67 | 57.63 | 36.85 | 5.52 | 56.5 | 2,290 | 55 | 68 | 2.1421 |
| 3385 | 56.5 | 57 | .77 | 62.93 | 32.33 | 4.74 | 52.9 | 2,340 | 93 | 95 | 2.1920 |

SAMPLES MILLED AT PHELPS, MINN.

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|-------|----|----|----------|
| 3381 | 44 | 47.5 | 12.43 | 46.27 | 49.67 | 4.06 | 51.5 | 2,370 | 91 | 89 | \$1.9060 |
| 3382 | 50 | 54.5 | 4.88 | 51.04 | 42.13 | 6.83 | 50.0 | 2,400 | 94 | 88 | 1.9450 |
| 3383 | 33.5 | 39 | 14.31 | 38.52 | 58.20 | 3.28 | 51.8 | 2,410 | 91 | 88 | 1.7813 |
| 3384 | 40.5 | 46 | 13.66 | 51.33 | 45.50 | 3.17 | 51.5 | 2,735 | 89 | 88 | 2.0245 |
| 3385 | 56.5 | 57 | .96 | 59.18 | 37.57 | 3.25 | 51.5 | 2,215 | 92 | 90 | 2.1291 |

Having secured a sample of the flour and a sample of the wheat from each of these five grists they were given the following laboratory numbers:

SAMPLES GIVEN LABORATORY NUMBER.

3381. Wheat from Emil Schleske, Fergus Falls, Minn., R. R. No. 5.
 3381a. Milled at Phelps mill, same wheat as 3381.
 3382. Peter O. Jensen, Dalton, Minn., R. R. No. 3—wheat.
 3382a. Milled at Phelps mill, same wheat as 3382.
 3383. C. J. Damlo, Richville, Minn.—wheat.
 3383a. Milled at Phelps mill—same wheat as 3383.
 3384. Emil Stub, Elizabeth, Minn., R. R. No. 1—wheat.
 3384a. Milled at Phelps mill—same wheat as 3384.
 3385. L. Reinhart, Richville, Minn., Box 16—wheat.
 3385a. Milled at Phelps mill—same wheat as 3385.

In compiling the data for these samples the percentage of low-grade flour is added to the percentage of straight flour and the sum is used as total flour in the data from the Phelps mill, and it is assumed to be worth \$5 per 100 pounds. And in the data for the samples milled in the experimental mill the percentage of bran and shorts are added together, using the sum as total feed and assuming it to be worth \$1.55 per 100 pounds.

The baking results as shown are for the straight flour without the low grade added for the Phelps mill, and as will be observed by the percentage of flour obtained, the amount represented by the baking results as shown are for this total flour for the experimental mill.

COMMERCIAL MILLS GET BETTER SHOWING.

To compare actual results as shown by the figures from the Phelps mill with the work done in a commercial mill would hardly be a fair comparison, because the commercial miller has a much better chance to make a good clean-up than a mill running under the conditions existing in this one. In the commercial mill the wheat is all blended, and the stream of wheat coming on the rolls is kept as nearly alike as is possible to do for days or even weeks at a time, giving the miller a chance to make determinations and know exactly what he is doing in the matter of quantity as well as quality of products obtained, whereas a mill doing a gristing business may have fairly good wheat for a while and other grists may go to the other extreme. The matter of adjusting the mill to suit the two extremes in this crop is almost a physical impossibility and get the best results possible from each grist. If this mill was doing an exchange business and could keep the amount of wheat ahead which they had piled up in sacks with a chance to blend so as to make an even run of wheat on the mill it would be possible to make a better clean-up and a more satisfactory flour to all of their customers. This method, however, would not be as fair to the individual farmer.

All of the farmers who came to the mill while there were interviewed. Many of them were having wheat ground every year; two had the second grist in this year; others had tried their flour at home; and they were all satisfied with the results of their business transactions at the mill, also with the bread obtained from the flour at home. These statements seem to be conclusively proven by the figures in the table showing individual results of the samples milled at the Phelps mill. The samples milled in the experimental mill at the college do not show quite as good baking results in some of the factors, but a study of the milling results will show the reason. It will be noticed that a higher per cent of flour was secured in each case, together with no purification of middlings which would make some difference in color, the average color score being about three points below the minimum allowed for a Minneapolis standard patent. Individually two of the five wheats in the experimental mill at the college score below a standard straight flour and only one of those milled at Phelps scores below a standard patent.

The average market value of this wheat is \$1.10 per bushel; the average value of the mill products from a bushel milled here is \$2.13, or a gross gain of \$1.03 per bushel; and the average value of the mill products from a bushel as milled at Phelps is \$1.95, or a gross gain of 85 cents per bushel.

The amount of wheat milled during the 24 hours spent in the vicinity of the Phelps mill was 319 bushels 3 pounds, gross weight, from which the farmers received the following mill products:

| | |
|---|---------|
| Screenings—1,613 pounds, at 75 cents per 100 pounds..... | \$12.10 |
| Straight flour—8,309 pounds, at \$5 per 100 pounds..... | 415.45 |
| Low-grade flour—408 pounds, at \$2.50 per 100 pounds..... | 10.20 |
| Feed—8,138 pounds, at \$1.55 per 100 pounds..... | 126.14 |

Total..... 563.89

Total number of pounds, 18,468.

Value—319 bushels 3 pounds, at \$1.10 per bushel..... 350.96

Gross gain..... 212.93

Less grinding charge, 15 cents per bushel..... 47.86

Net gain to farmers..... 165.07

or 47.03 per cent over cost of wheat, or a net gain per bushel of clean wheat of 56.5 cents and a cost of 16.4 cents per bushel for milling the clean wheat.

As stated, the average value of this wheat, according to the local market, would be \$1.10 per bushel. With the 16.4 cents per bushel for grinding the clean wheat would make \$1.264 the actual cost value of the mill products per bushel. According to the table the average market value to the consumer is \$1.97 per bushel, or about 71 cents per bushel as middlemen's profit and cost of distribution. Or, in other words, the cost of distribution of mill products from the mill door to the consumer is 56.7 per cent over cost of raw material and manufacture.

GET GOOD BREAD FROM THIS FLOUR.

From the data already given it would seem that the results at the commercial grist mill do not differ materially from the data secured at the experimental mill. The higher percentage of total flour, being due to a better clean-up in the experimental mill at the end of each cut-off than in the case of the commercial grist mill.

From the cut illustrating the loaves of bread it is clearly evident that the flour produced at both the commercial and the experimental mills is capable of producing a good loaf of bread. The upper row in the cut shows the bread produced from flour made at the experimental mill, while the lower row is from that produced at the commercial mill at Phelps, Minn. At the extreme left in each case the loaf of bread is made from the standard flour of the crop of 1909, and does not show any advantages over the bread produced from some of the other flours of the commercial mill or of the experimental mill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota has elucidated this matter and put it in a form that really modifies the amendment, so far as my views are concerned.

Mr. GRONNA. I am glad of that.

Mr. GALLINGER. I shall feel constrained, however, to vote against the amendment, because I do not like putting these matters in the hands of the Government. But my vote will not count for much. I have no doubt the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I want the Senator from New Hampshire to be satisfied. I fear that I have not fully explained it. This is simply for the purpose of enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to make tests. It is for research work. The committee has no idea that any flour will be manufactured for any other purpose than to make these tests.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, has the Senator any objection to inserting, after the word "laboratory," the words "in the city of Washington"?

Mr. GRONNA. No; I have no objection whatever.

Mr. GALLINGER. I offer that amendment, then.

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

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 6, after the words "Bureau of Markets," to strike out "\$20,105" and insert "\$15,105," so as to make the clause read:

For general administrative expenses in connection with the lines of investigation, experiment, and demonstration conducted in the Bureau of Markets, \$15,105.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 7, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$844,395" and insert "\$784,395," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$784,395.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, line 6, after the words "Bureau of Markets," to strike out "\$1,719,575" and insert "\$1,659,575," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Markets, \$1,659,575.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, after line 6, to insert:

Hereafter, in the performance of the duties required of the Department of Agriculture by the sections of this act relating to the Bureau of Markets, the Secretary of Agriculture shall have power to administer oaths, subpoena witnesses, and compel the production of books and papers.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I simply wish to suggest to the Senator in charge of the bill that it seems to me that it would be better to use the word "provisions" instead of the word "sections" in that amendment. There are no sections, as we generally know them, in the bill. It is all one section.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I have no objection to that amendment.

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

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Horticultural Board," on page 83, after line 10, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the existence of the pink boll worm of cotton in Mexico and the movement of some 500 carloads of cotton seed from the infested districts in Mexico to milling points in Texas and elsewhere, and to prevent the establishment of such insect in Texas or in any other State by providing for adequate inspection and the employment of all means necessary under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him to prohibit the movement of cotton and cotton seed from Mexico into the United States, including the examination of baggage and railroad cars or other means of conveyance and the cleaning and disinfection thereof; to inspect mills in Texas or elsewhere in the United States to which Mexican cotton seed has been taken for milling; to supervise the destruction, by manufacture or otherwise, of such seed and the thorough clean-up of the mills and premises; to conduct local surveys and inspections of cotton fields in the vicinity of such mills and ports of entry in order to detect any instances of local infestation; and to determine and conduct such control measures in cooperation with the State of Texas or other States concerned as may be necessary to stamp out such infestation, including rent outside of the District of Columbia, employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, \$50,000, available immediately and until expended.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina will give me his attention, the most that I have been able to do in connection with this bill is to criticize a little language. The first part of this amendment reads:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the existence of the pink boll worm of cotton.

Does not the Senator think it would be better language to say "pink cotton-boll worm"?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. How does it read here? I have not noticed the language.

Mr. GALLINGER. "Pink boll worm of cotton."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is its color. The worm is pink.

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand; but would it not be better to say "pink cotton-boll worm"?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. We want to designate it. There are different kinds. This is the one that is likely to come here from Mexico, and it is pink.

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand. I do not propose to change the color. However, if the Senator is satisfied with it, all right.

Now, does not the Senator think that in line 16, where it says "and to prevent the establishment of such insect," it would be better to say "the introduction and spread"?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. This is an amendment suggested by the department, and they used the terms that I suppose were satisfactory to them.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very well. If it came from the department, I have nothing to say. I just thought that the Senator, in writing the amendment, perhaps did it in a hurry.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; this came from the department.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is no objection, although I think what I have suggested would be the better language. However, I shall not urge it.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from South Carolina a little further about this "pink boll worm of cotton." This is a new pest, is it, that has appeared?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; a new one that has appeared in Mexico, as the weevil did.

Mr. GALLINGER. The weevil destroys a portion of the cotton and this worm attacks the boll?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; it is a misnomer to call it a boll weevil. It really destroys the little shape in which the flower appears before it blooms. This worm attacks the boll.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think I have read somewhere that this worm attacks the boll itself.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Which the weevil does not.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. So that the cotton producers have now two enemies to combat, which is pretty serious.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; that is, in the form of insects. They have numerous ones otherwise.

Mr. THOMAS. The color of this worm, Mr. President, indicates that it is a child of the revolution. [Laughter.]

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 11, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$54,500" and insert "\$104,500," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$104,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 12, after the words "Federal Horticultural Board," to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$125,000," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Federal Horticultural Board, \$125,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, after line 12, to insert:

That section 8 of an act entitled "An act to regulate the importation of nursery stock and other plants and plant products; to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain quarantine districts for plant diseases and insect pests; to permit and regulate the movement of fruits, plants, and vegetables therefrom, and for other purposes," approved August 20, 1912, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to quarantine any State, Territory, or District of the United States, or any portion thereof, when he shall determine that such quarantine is necessary to prevent the spread of a dangerous plant disease or insect infestation, new to or not theretofore widely prevalent or distributed within and throughout the United States; and the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to give notice of the establishment of such quarantine to common carriers doing business in or through such quarantine area, and shall publish in such newspapers in the quarantined area as he shall select notice of the establishment of quarantine. That no person shall ship or offer for shipment to any common carrier, nor shall any common carrier receive for transportation or transport, nor shall any person carry or transport from any quarantined State or Territory or District of the United States, or from any quarantined portion thereof, into or through any other State or Territory or District, any class of nursery stock or any other class of plants, fruits, vegetables, roots, bulbs, seeds, or other plant products, or any class

of stone or quarry products, or any other article of any character whatsoever, capable of carrying any dangerous plant disease or insect infestation, specified in the notice of quarantine except as hereinafter provided. That it shall be unlawful to move, or allow to be moved, any class of nursery stock or any other class of plants, fruits, vegetables, roots, bulbs, seeds, or other plant products, or any class of stone or quarry products or any other article of any character whatsoever, capable of carrying any dangerous plant disease or insect infestation, specified in the notice of quarantine hereinafter provided, and regardless of the use for which the same is intended, from any quarantined State or Territory or District of the United States or quarantined portion thereof, into or through any other State or Territory or District, in manner or method or under conditions other than those prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture, when the public interests will permit, to make and promulgate rules and regulations which shall permit and govern the inspection, disinfection, certification, and method and manner of delivery and shipment of the class of nursery stock or of any other class of plants, fruits, vegetables, roots, bulbs, seeds, or other plant products, or any class of stone or quarry products, or any other article of any character whatsoever, capable of carrying any dangerous plant disease or insect infestation, specified in the notice of quarantine hereinafter provided, and regardless of the use for which the same is intended, from a quarantined State or Territory or District of the United States, or quarantined portion thereof, into or through any other State or Territory or District; and the Secretary of Agriculture shall give notice of such rules and regulations as hereinafter provided in this section for the notice of the establishment of quarantine: *Provided*, That before the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate his determination that it is necessary to quarantine any State, Territory, or District of the United States, or portion thereof, under the authority given in this section, he shall, after due notice to interested parties, give a public hearing under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, at which hearing any interested party may appear and be heard, either in person or by attorney."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 17, after the word "work," to strike out "\$24,241,091" and insert "\$24,204,623," so as to make the clause read:

Total, Department of Agriculture, for routine and ordinary work, \$24,204,623.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous," on page 87, line 25, after the word "elsewhere," to strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$50,000," so as to make the clause read:

Demonstrations on reclamation projects: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and aid in the agricultural development of the Government reclamation projects; to assist, through demonstrations, advice, and in other ways, settlers on the projects; and for the employment of persons and means necessary in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, line 7, after the word "elsewhere," to strike out "\$23,604" and insert "\$40,000," so as to make the clause read:

Experiments in dairying and live-stock production in semiarid and irrigated districts of the western United States: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct investigations and experiments in problems connected with the establishment of dairying and meat-production enterprises on the semiarid and irrigated lands of the western United States, including the purchase of live stock, the erection of barns and other necessary buildings, and the employment of necessary persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 19, after the words "the sum of," to strike out "\$1,250,000" and insert "\$1,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals: In case of an emergency arising out of the existence of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious disease of animals which, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, threatens the live-stock industry of the country, he may expend in the city of Washington or elsewhere, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000,000, which sum is hereby appropriated, or so much thereof as he determines to be necessary, in the arrest and eradication of any such disease, including the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction, in cooperation with the States, of animals affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful quarantine regulations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, line 1, after the words "Department of Agriculture," to strike out "\$25,714,695" and insert "\$25,454,623," so as to make the clause read:

Total carried by this bill for the Department of Agriculture, \$25,454,623.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, line 8, after the words "rate of" to strike out "10" and insert "15"; in line 10, after the words "per annum," to insert "of \$480 or"; in line 11, after the word "less," to strike out "than \$1,200"; in line 12, before the words "per centum," to strike out "5" and insert "10"; in line 14, after the words "rate of," to strike out "not"; in the same line, before the words "per annum," to strike out "\$1,800" and insert "\$480"; and in line 15, before

the words "per annum," to strike out "less than \$1,200" and insert "exceeding \$1,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

That to provide, during the fiscal year 1918, for all persons employed under the Department of Agriculture, including on the lump-sum rolls only those persons who are carried thereon at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, increased compensation at the rate of 15 per cent per annum to such employees who receive salaries or wages from such department at a rate per annum of \$480 or less, and increased compensation at a rate of 10 per cent per annum to such employees who receive salaries or wages from such department at a rate of more than \$480 per annum and not exceeding \$1,000 per annum, so much as may be necessary is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That the increased compensation provided by this section shall not apply to persons whose duties require only a portion of their time, except charwomen, or whose services are needed for brief periods at intervals, or to any persons who receive a part of their salaries or wages from any outside sources under cooperative arrangements with the Department of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That detailed reports shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next session showing the number of persons, the grades or character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation provided for herein.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, after line 3, to insert:

The President is hereby authorized to extend invitations to other nations to appoint delegates or representatives to the International Farm Congress, to be held at Peoria, Ill., in connection with the International Soil Products Exposition, during the fiscal year 1918: *Provided*, That no appropriation shall be granted or used for the expenses of delegates.

The amendment was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Laconia and Jaffrey, in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the enactment of legislation for the protection of migratory birds, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for national prohibition, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the California State Daughters of the American Revolution Club, praying that a statue of Joaquin Miller be placed in the vicinity of the present site of his cottage in Rock Creek Park, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Luis Obispo, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to improve and develop the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. STONE presented a petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Springfield, Mo., praying for Government ownership of all great public utilities, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 8114) authorizing the President to appoint to the grade of major general on the retired list of the Army any brigadier general now borne on said list with certain military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 8115) for a Federal building and site at Bowie, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 8116) granting a pension to John S. Dodge (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 8117) granting a pension to Kate E. LeVelley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 8118) granting an increase of pension to Michael Callahan (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 8119) to amend and reenact section 10 of an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914; and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 206) extending until January 8, 1918, the effective date of section 10 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS (H. R. 20079).

Mr. ROBINSON submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$5,000 for a survey of the oyster beds of Texas, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m., Saturday, February 3, 1917) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 5, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, February 3, 1917.

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

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

Our Father in Heaven, we appeal to Thee with all the fervor of soul for wisdom to guide us in the impending crisis, that we may be permitted to maintain as a neutral Nation peace with all the world. Guide our President, his advisers, and all others who have the Nation's welfare at heart to an amicable adjustment of all international questions, that we may pursue our way with justice and equity to all in the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

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

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] notifies the Chair that it is impossible for him to serve as a conferee on the Indian appropriation bill (H. R. 18453). The Chair therefore appoints the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] in his stead.

JOINT SESSION OF SENATE AND HOUSE.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 71.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Saturday, the 3d day of February, 1917, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from North Carolina inform the House whether, so far as he knows, there is an expectation of any action by the House to-day?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; none that I know of. There was simply a notice that the President desired to communicate with Congress.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 20453) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, had agreed to the conference asked for by the House, and had appointed Mr. BRYAN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. OLIVER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 18453) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, had agreed to the conference asked for by the House and had appointed Mr. ASHURST, Mr. MYERS, and Mr. CLAPP as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 1024. An act for the relief of Allen M. Hiller;

H. R. 10124. An act to add certain lands to the Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo.;

- H. R. 8452. An act for the relief of Charles L. Moore;
 H. R. 13820. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Buttner;
 H. R. 9547. An act authorizing the acceptance by the United States Government from the Kenesaw Memorial Association, of Illinois, of a proposed gift of land on the Kenesaw battle field in the State of Georgia;
 H. R. 5262. An act for the relief of John B. Hoover;
 H. R. 1358. An act for the relief of Everett H. Corson;
 H. R. 3238. An act for the relief of Sarah E. Elliott;
 H. R. 8057. An act for the relief of the legal representatives of Napoleon B. Giddings;
 H. R. 11745. An act for the relief of S. E. Bennett;
 H. R. 10173. An act for the relief of Anna C. Parrett;
 H. R. 14978. An act for the relief of Ida Turner;
 H. R. 12240. An act for the relief of John Brodrie;
 H. R. 14572. An act for the relief of Bertie Foss;
 H. R. 14784. An act for the relief of Alma Provost;
 H. R. 14645. An act for the relief of the legal representative of P. H. Aylett;
 H. R. 13106. An act for the relief of the trustee and parties who are now or who may hereafter become interested in the estate of James A. Chamberlain under the terms of his will;
 H. R. 12742. An act for the relief of Gottlob Schlect and Maurice D. Higgins, and for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Valentine Brasch;
 H. R. 8267. An act to place Bernard A. Schaaf on the retired list of the Army;
 H. R. 14822. An act to prevent and punish the desecration, mutilation, or improper use within the District of Columbia, of the flag of the United States of America; and
 H. R. 21. An act authorizing the city of Salida, Colo., to purchase certain public lands for public-park purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

- H. R. 12541. An act authorizing insurance companies and fraternal beneficiary societies to file bills of interpleader;
 H. R. 11150. An act for the relief of mail contractors;
 H. R. 11474. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to permit the construction of a public highway through the fish-cultural station in Unicoi County, Tenn.;
 H. R. 6145. An act for the relief of Edward F. McDermott, alias James Williams;
 H. R. 8492. An act to restore homestead rights in certain cases; and
 H. R. 18181. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following concurrent resolution:

House concurrent resolution 71.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring): That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Saturday, the 3d day of February, 1917, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

EDWARD F. McDERMOTT, ALIAS JAMES WILLIAMS.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs, I ask the Speaker to lay before the House the bill H. R. 6145, a bill for the relief of Edward F. McDermott, alias James Williams.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 6145) for the relief of Edward F. McDermott, alias James Williams, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read and agreed to.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 20632).

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. PAGE of North Carolina in the chair.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes additional to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, the principal objection, the only objection, in fact, that has thus far been urged in this debate against this bill making an appropriation of

\$351,000,000 for our Naval Establishment is found in the argument advanced by members of the committee and others opposed to the bill, that the construction authorized by the bill can not be completed in time for use in case of immediate hostilities, unless such hostilities should be protracted over a long period of time, and therefore authorizes a useless and unnecessary expenditure of public funds. The reasons assigned in support of this objection lie in the fact that we are already behind in naval construction, that contracts heretofore let have not been fulfilled according to specifications and time limit, and that contracts for the capital ships authorized in the last naval appropriation bill have not yet been let and their construction undertaken. It may be, it no doubt is, pertinent to inquire the reasons for the delay complained of. Some gentlemen place the blame in one place and some in another. The distinguished and important member of the committee, my esteemed colleague [Mr. BRITTON], who, if not numerically, is intellectually the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, blames the Secretary of the Navy, while the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] frankly confesses that both parties are equally at fault, and that Republican administrations and Democratic administrations have been alike derelict and in default in providing those agencies and means of defense seemingly so necessary at this moment. If the cause has not been avoidable, if the contingency ought to have been and with reasonable foresight and precaution could have been foreseen and provided for, then no doubt the gentleman from Massachusetts is right in locating the blame not only in the present but relating it back to former administrations, and I much prefer to accept his version of the case rather than the irresponsible, whimsical, and garrulous vapors of my distinguished colleague. The gentleman from Illinois, who imagines that there is a peculiar significance in the name, some kind of relation between his name and the Navy, fails to comprehend why no one takes him seriously, and has seen fit to severely criticize the present Secretary of the Navy and attach to him all blame for conditions, which the gentleman from Massachusetts says have existed for 20 years, and which everyone but the gentleman from Illinois knows are beyond the control of the Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the fact is that it has been impossible to let contracts for the construction of much of the work authorized in the last naval appropriation bill within the limits fixed by Congress, because of the fact that it has been impossible to secure skilled labor in sufficient numbers and because of excessive and exorbitant prices of materials entering into naval construction. To these reasons may be added the attempted extortion by sordid, selfish, unnatural, and unpatriotic manufacturers in our own country, who have taken advantage of market conditions, both of labor and materials growing out of the European war, and who would satiate their rapacious spirit of greed and avarice by giving preference to foreign orders for war munitions, and who by a system of commercial brigandage would imperil the existence of their own Government in the hour of emergency. This is clearly illustrated in the recent contract let by the Secretary of the Navy for armor-piercing shells to an English firm of manufacturers, who, notwithstanding the fact that the English manufacturers of war munitions are taxed to the utmost for home supply, underbid the American munition factories \$200 per shell, while at the same time our domestic plants were filling foreign orders in competition with the English manufacturer in his own market. The gentleman from Massachusetts points a remedy, and says we should commandeer the American steel plants and shipyards and compel them to accept Government contracts for the manufacture of munitions, naval supplies, and ships in preference to all other orders, foreign or domestic, at a reasonable profit. This may be done in time of war, but I question the constitutional power of the President to exercise confiscatory powers of this character in time of peace. The Secretary of the Navy has not had the power of fixing the prices, reserving a reasonable profit to the manufacturer, nor the power to compel the steel plants and private shipyards to enter into contracts and undertake the fulfillment of orders for munitions, shipbuilding, and the like, and in consequence without fault of his has been unable to let contracts within the authority conferred upon him by Congress.

Gentlemen may disclaim partisan motive for their charges, but the criticism indulged and the motive therefor are too illy disguised to deceive any one. I served during the Sixty-third Congress on the Committee on Naval Affairs, and it was my privilege to become well acquainted with Secretary Daniels, and I feel assured that I am within the limit of candor and truth when I say he has been actuated in every step by the highest ideals and the loftiest motives, and that he has discharged the arduous duties of his office with a zeal, fidelity, integrity, and ability equal to that of any former incumbent of that great office. [Applause.]

The fact that we are delayed in naval construction by reason of conditions beyond our control is not a sufficient argument, to my mind, that would justify us in calling a halt and throwing up our hands in the face of the gravest danger and most imminent peril that has confronted us as a Nation since the close of the Civil War. [Applause.] No man knows what a day will bring forth. Our President has taken the justified and humane position that the high seas shall be kept open to the commerce of the world, and that merchant ships shall not be sunk without notice and opportunity to the passengers and crews to escape and reach a place of safety, except under certain conditions within the limitations of international law, and that the innovation of submarine warfare can not create an exception to nor change and avoid existing law, without the consent of all nations affected. The greatest military power on earth conceded our contention nine months ago, and gave promise that our interpretation of international law would thereafter be observed. That same power has within a few days notified the President that it will not longer observe its promise, but that, now equipped with an immense flotilla of submarines, it intends to go forth with relentless fury and prey upon the commerce of the earth. Not only that, it has undertaken, with an arrogance and defiance unparalleled in the world's history, to prescribe for us and dictate the conditions under which American commerce may be borne to the markets of Europe, to the very width of the stripe and the tone of the colors that shall herald the coming of a merchant vessel flying the American flag. The President, in an ultimatum last April, said that unless the method theretofore employed in submarine warfare against passenger and freight carrying vessels should be immediately abandoned, "the Government of the United States can have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations" with the offending nation. As much as I deprecate war, so abhorrent and appalling, I can see no way, in view of the present attitude of Germany, that we could have avoided the severance of diplomatic relations, with all the fateful consequences that will inevitably follow, and I, in common with this House and the American people, indorse and approve the course the President has this day pursued in breaking with Germany.

What is our duty under conditions of this kind in the face of danger involving the honor and imperiling the existence of our country? Certainly my answer will find no response in a do-nothing policy. This is not the time to hesitate and pause. There is but one course open to us, and that is to provide for immediate and future contingencies, and trust to the ingenuity, skill, and patriotism of the American people to find a way to speed construction.

If war comes, the President will find a way under the Constitution without action on the part of Congress to advance and hasten the construction of all work heretofore authorized and that may be authorized in this bill and by any emergency legislation that may be called for, and, to my mind, it is no good argument against this bill to urge the delay which has heretofore unavoidably occurred; and I am sure no good purpose can be attained by criticism of the character which has been indulged by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITEN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY]. Such action does not commend to me the patriotism and the Americanism of those who would criticize the administration at a time when the statements and attitude of Members of the American Congress antagonizing the administration will afford so much comfort to the enemy abroad. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, my attention has been called to an editorial appearing in the Chicago Tribune of date February 1, which seemed to me to deserve some consideration or attention in connection with this bill. That paper has been one of the loudest and most rampant publications in America in favor of the most extensive—in fact, almost unlimited—war preparation, and with its large circulation and prestige has exercised no little influence on the mind of the public in favor of preparedness. The editorial to which I refer reads as follows:

EXCESS PROFITS AND EXCESS BRASS.

Congress has been compelled by public sentiment to appropriate large amounts of money to enlarge the Navy. It ardently desires also to scatter post offices and Federal courthouses throughout the villages of the South. Combined, the sums make it necessary to bring more money into the Federal Treasury from taxes. Chairman CLAUDE KITCHIN, of the Ways and Means Committee, is the man who must devise the means for getting the money.

The proposal which pleases him the most is the tax on excess profits of corporations. It pleases him because it will be borne entirely by the North.

"You can tell your people," he argued to the southern Democrats who have shown themselves eager for pork, "that practically all of this tax will go north of the Mason and Dixon line. The preparedness agitation has its hotbed in such cities as New York."

It is highly satisfactory in Mr. KITCHIN's enlightened philosophy to build post offices and dredge rivers in the South with money taken

principally from other sections of the country, but when such a local issue as national defense comes up the North should be made to pay the bills.

The South is willing to contribute somewhat to the erection of its own post offices, but national defense is so extravagant that the southern Democracy does not want to contribute to it. If the North is crazy enough to want a Navy, the North ought to pay for it.

Mr. KITCHIN not only admits that this proposed excess-profits tax discriminates in favor of the South, but he rejoices in the discrimination. It tickles him silly to think of penalizing patriotism. "Excess-profits taxes," he said in ecstatic manner, "will fall chiefly on those who have been clamoring for preparedness."

The proposed excess-profits tax is discriminatory in other ways than geographical. Large profits of partnerships are not to be taxed; large profits in individual enterprise, like farming, are not to be taxed. There is already one tax on incomes, and it is to be increased. Owners of stock in corporate enterprises are to be taxed a second time. Profits in other forms of industry are to be left untouched.

Mr. KITCHIN and his pacifist southern friends are good spenders, but they want to spend other people's money.

It appears to me, when a gentleman of known probity and integrity, such as the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, has stated that the language attributed to him in this editorial was never spoken by him, that a great newspaper, whose influence and success in a large measure necessarily depends upon its reliability as a purveyor of political information would hesitate before editorially sanctioning or giving credence to a statement which every Democratic Member present at the caucus on the revenue bill knows to be false. I was present and heard what was said, and say to the membership of this House that Mr. KITCHIN never said that "practically all of this tax will go north of the Mason and Dixon's line." In response to my request, Mr. KITCHIN has furnished me with a statement in which he says:

I said in caucus, as every man present knows, in answer to intimations that the larger portion of the tax would be collected north, that most of the appropriations, perhaps nine-tenths, for which the tax would be levied would be expended in the North, and properly so, because these States were better prepared to build ships, make munitions of war, etc. I never mentioned the Mason and Dixon's line, never uttered in the caucus or elsewhere any sentiment akin to that attributed to me.

The Tribune could find no legitimate argument, either against the revenue bill which was rendered necessary by the preparedness program advocated by it nor against the present Navy bill, which carries with it an appropriation of \$351,000,000; but is so blindly partisan and so bent on prejudicing the minds of its readers against the administration and a Democratic Congress that unjustifiably and with manifest purpose to deceive and mislead editorially puts words in the mouth of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee which it knows are at least controverted and, in fact, denied by the man whose integrity the Tribune would hardly dare question.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Whether or not it would be true if Mr. KITCHIN had said that a large part of the revenue would be collected in the North.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. I presume that if the tax was collected in proportion to the population and wealth of the country and the interests to be protected the bulk of it would be paid in the North. Everybody knows that our preparedness program and the expenditure or authorization of nearly a billion five hundred million dollars during this administration for the Army and Navy has rendered a new revenue bill necessary, and that the comparatively meager appropriations for rivers and harbors and public buildings, a mere drop in the bucket, contribute practically nothing to the condition of the Treasury, which requires either the issuance of bonds or taxation in addition to that heretofore authorized and provided for.

The public-buildings bill, which recently passed the House, and may not pass the Senate, carries with it an appropriation of but \$32,000,000, and the rivers and harbors bill \$38,000,000, and are the only public-buildings and rivers and harbors bills passed during this entire administration which carry appropriations for new projects, and represent but one twenty-sixth part of the total appropriations during this administration for the combined purposes of public buildings, river improvement, and the Army and Navy. In view of these figures, it is absurd to say that "combined the sums make it necessary to bring more money into the Federal Treasury from taxes." The viciousness of the editorial referred to, after all, does not consist so much in the misleading and deceptive assumption of fact, as in its patent effort to array section against section, solely for partisan purposes. In the first place, the same Democratic Congress, constituted with the same committees and chairmanships that voted appropriations for rivers and harbors and public buildings, is the same Congress that has furnished the country with the great preparedness program so essential to meet the alarming conditions with which we stand face to face, and it does seem strange indeed that a newspaper which has placed

so much stress and importance on the question of preparedness can not be big enough and broad enough to accord a meed of praise to the Congress which has carried out the preparedness program which it advocates, and can not for the moment abstain from partisan sectional flings and insinuations. As to the public-buildings bill, the fact is that there is equally as large a percentage of the authorization provided for in the North as in the South, and as large a proportion of questionable enterprises, where the population and receipts of the office would not seem to justify the appropriation. As to the rivers and harbors bill, necessarily a larger proportion is expended in the South than in the North, because there the rivers of the great Central West, comprising three-fourths of the United States, converge and discharge their waters, and improvement of navigation in that section is as necessary to the North as it is to that section farther south, through whose lines of river transportation the products of the farm and factory of the North must find cheap transportation and outlet to the markets of the world.

Mr. Chairman, these observations are only incidental and have consumed more of my time than I intended. I favor this bill in its entirety. I would favor it if war were not imminent; and when I realize that we have severed diplomatic relations with the great German nation, I can not understand the theory on which any patriotic citizen can oppose it. The wires at this moment are burdened with the intelligence being carried to the remotest corners of the world that the United States has this day broken with Germany and awaits only an overt act, which God forbid, when a declaration of war may become necessary. Under these conditions and at this time, as one of the Representatives of the third greatest State in this Union, I feel it my duty to promote this bill and to sustain the President in every effort he may make to maintain the honor and the integrity of our Nation and the glory of its flag. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] desires to yield some of his time to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY].

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I reckon that I might be called a belligerent pacifist. I am ready to fight those of this country who want to drive us into war.

Without any thought of what the future is going to say about me, without any political ambition and with but one concern, and that the future welfare of a hundred million people and the future of this Republic, with independence and liberty to her citizenship, I say to you I would not go to war and plunge a hundred million people into the consuming horrors of this unprecedented war because Germany threatens to violate our lawful right to navigate a 20-mile zone around the British Isles.

As certain as we live the submarine is going to revolutionize the present system of warfare and make it necessary to rewrite international law which was formulated prior to its advent as a potent and controlling factor in sea warfare, and therefore not recognized in present law. Under present law a nation to maintain a blockade must be able to enforce it by control of the surface of the sea. Submarines can not, out of their very nature, effectively operate against commerce under such restrictions. Are nations going to abandon this most effective sea weapon, or will the regulations be modified to meet this new development? In my judgment the law will be modified so as to grant the fullest use to this most powerful factor in sea warfare.

Not with my vote nor my action in this House will we jump into war because these old standards of international law are not adhered to, and the whole thing of stopping neutral ships is not followed out in accordance with international law as adhered to under other conditions. The submarine is the only sea weapon Germany has that she can use in her present condition, and if she complies with recognized law she can not effectively use that. She claims she is fighting for her very existence. I am not willing to involve this country in an unprecedented world war because she in a death grapple incidentally injures us in violation of that law. We are told by proponents of this bill that an emergency confronts us. I pointed out a year ago that there could not be a single battleship nor battle cruiser built that would meet any emergency if we were confronted by an emergency. We are told now that there is a new emergency confronting us. I ask you to answer if what I stated a year ago was not then true and is not to-day the truth? Not a single ship provided for under that program is now ready for action. I ask you again if it is not a fact that the nearest approach that we have to any of the things provided for under that program is a contract for submarines, made in December last, that will deliver us the first one in 22 months, and a submarine per month

after that? Does that meet any emergency? Is not your program that you passed at the last session of Congress, which belligerent statesmen demanded as a preparation to meet an emergency, an unqualified fraud?

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

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes.

Mr. BROWNING. The gentleman from Texas is speaking of a five-year program. It was a three-year program that we adopted at the last session of Congress.

Mr. CALLAWAY. A five-year program was the one you first wanted to adopt.

Mr. BROWNING. I did not want to adopt any five-year program.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Make it a three-year program. It does not change the thing one particle. It is the same proposition. These warriors, acting under that three-year program, submit a bill that will cost, according to the estimates of the department, \$392,000,000. The committee trimmed it down, by deferring some of the appropriations, to \$354,000,000, and in that included appropriations for additional battleships of \$55,000,000 that the minority report wants to cut out. We have not even a contract for any of the battle cruisers provided for in the last year's bill, and no prospect of a contract for battle cruisers in the future should we adopt this bill. We have a contract, executed in December last, for the battleships, and they are to be constructed within 48 to 52 months.

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

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman state now or during his speech what war craft have been finished during the last 12 months?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I could not name the different things that have been finished within the year; but nothing has been finished provided for in the three-year program that was demanded by the warriors. We ought to be reasonable men. Not an item in the program nor within this bill can possibly be constructed in time to meet the emergency they tell us now exists. Then why make this appropriation further than to carry out the items already begun and contracted for?

There is not a man in this House who knows anything about the evidence before our committee nor the conditions in this country who will deny that if war comes we can get the emergency equipment needed. Did not the Bethlehem Steel Co. tell our committee last year, and we submitted that to this House, that so far as ordnance is concerned they can turn it out as fast as we want it? One gentleman on the committee asked the question, Suppose we should get into war and the demand should be a war demand? The president of that company answered that it made no difference what the demand was, "You need have no fear that the American manufacturer can meet the demand." Asked about submarines, the Bethlehem Steel Co. said, when they were asked how many submarines they could turn out and how fast, that they could turn them out without limit.

Mr. KEARNS. How fast?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Without limit. The submarine is the war craft that is now being used. The submarine is the war craft that is doing the business. Suppose we are dragged into this. Let us be sensible. The allied nations to-day have unqualified control of the surface of the sea. All of the surface fleet that Germany has is bottled up. She is in exactly the same position so far as the surface-craft is concerned as though she had none. The only thing she has on the high seas is her submarines. Can we add anything to an absolute and unqualified control of the surface of the sea should we engage in this war on the side of the allies? Not a single thing.

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

Mr. CALLAWAY. Wait until I get through with this statement and then I will yield. We can not add anything to the unqualified control of the surface of the seas. Then why talk about building surface craft to meet an emergency that we say now exists that possibly will involve us in a war on the side of the allies against Germany? There is no reason for it, nor can the three-year program add anything to that equipment. At present prices we have to pay from 50 to 100 per cent more than we would have to pay under normal conditions, and if the war goes on we can and will commandeer yards and use them for public business. Then why not hold on to see what the demand is and shift our building to meet the emergency under war conditions and not pass this bill that does not provide for any emergency and which could not furnish anything should we become involved? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman has stated that in the hearings before his committee the Bethlehem Steel Co. representative had made a statement that that company could get out sub-

marines as fast as the United States would want them at any time. How soon could they get out one submarine if we were to order it to-day? How long would it be before they would have that submarine ready?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Edison said we could have it ready in 15 days.

Mr. KEARNS. And the Bethlehem Steel Co. can manufacture a submarine from beginning to end in 15 days?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Well, this is what the Bethlehem Steel Co. said in reply to the question:

The program as outlined in No. 1 could be more than doubled, or 4 battleships or battle cruisers, to be delivered in 38 months; 8 scout cruisers, to be delivered in 32 months; 16 destroyers, to be delivered in 24 months; 20 auxiliary vessels, to be delivered in 24 months; submarines in unlimited numbers.

Mr. KEARNS. Well, how soon could they turn out these unlimited numbers for the Government?

Mr. CALLAWAY. They did not say how soon but they gave the months for the others. I suppose they meant from that statement they could turn them out according to the types already designed as fast as you need them; that is what they say.

Mr. KEARNS. It certainly takes some time to build a submarine?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Oh, yes; it takes some time to build a submarine and it takes some time to build a 3-inch shell, but they say they can furnish all we want as quick as we want them.

Mr. KEARNS. Of course it does, and I was trying to get at the facts.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I suppose it takes some time to build a Ford automobile. I suppose the Bethlehem Steel figured they would do like Mr. Edison says, give one part of it to this concern and another part to another concern and another to another and then assemble them all together and you can build the submarines as fast as you want them.

Mr. KEARNS. I am asking for facts, I want information. Suppose we ordered 50 submarines and want them to-day, how long would it be before we could get them?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman has yielded to me. How long would it be before we could get those 50 submarines delivered to the Government?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Edison says as quick as you want to.

Mr. KEARNS. We would want them in five minutes—no—

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield at that point? Did not the president of the Fore River Shipbuilding Co. state that after they had made a contract to build submarines to deliver to France or Great Britain—I have forgotten which—in 10 months, that after the contract was let the time for delivery to Great Britain was 10 months?

Mr. HENSLEY. If the gentleman will permit, the contract was for delivery in England within 10 months, and it would take only 5 months, as I understand it, to complete the submarines.

Mr. KEARNS. How many were there?

Mr. HENSLEY. They contracted for 20, and they were ready to deliver 10.

Mr. KEARNS. How long did it take to build the 20 submarines?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has the floor.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I will.

Mr. KELLEY. In answer to the query of the gentleman, as I remember the testimony, Mr. Grace said that it would take a certain number of months to deliver the first—six or seven months—and after that they could turn out a certain number every week; I have forgotten the number.

Mr. CALLAWAY. That was for developing the type and starting at that time. Now, in regard to this contract, I want to show in what a predicament we would be, so far as appropriations in this bill are concerned, should we pass it.

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

Mr. CALLAWAY. Just as soon as I get through with this statement. Material is twice as high, or from 25 per cent to 200 per cent higher now than under ordinary conditions, and the different concerns in making their contracts give themselves the benefit of present prices and time to deliver. They have given themselves from 22 months for submarines to 4 years for battleships. Suppose we really got into trouble. We do not want these things in 22 months, we do not want battleships in three or four years, but we want them now.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. So we are bound up in contracts if we proceed under the terms of this bill or under the program of last year, and instead of facilitating matters it would tie the

amount appropriated in this bill up at present prices for ships to be delivered possibly after every need for them has passed. Now I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CLINE. What I wanted to inquire was this: Has the Government decided upon any specific type of submarine that we ought to go and construct?

Mr. CALLAWAY. The Government decided a year ago on the *Schley* type seagoing and a small 450-ton coast submarine. This year they have reversed themselves and adopted a type different from that of a year ago. This bill provides for wholly a new type of 850 tons that we have never had in this country.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MADDEN. I just wanted to ask the gentleman from Texas how soon we would be able to complete a battleship under this program if we had to wait until our own armor-plate plant is ready?

Mr. CALLAWAY. We can complete a battleship, though we wait to construct our armor-plate plant, long before it is worth a dime. The battleship is a fraud.

Notwithstanding what naval officers may say or how loath they may be to give up magnificent floating palaces that provide all the comforts and conveniences of modern life for the submarine that is uninhabitable and only a work ship, the foreign war shows that the battleship is worthless.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I will.

Mr. PLATT. As a defense against the battleships and cruisers, has not the submarine in this war been proved a failure? It has been used against merchant ships.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I asked all the naval officers who appeared before our committee what a battleship would do in face of a submarine, and they said it would run in a zigzag course. I asked, "Can a battleship or cruiser fight a submarine?" "No." "What can she do in the presence of a submarine or in submarine territory?" The reply was, "She could run in a zigzag course." There is your battleship. Naval officers tell us that submarines have not accomplished anything in the foreign war, but when confronted with the facts as to what occurred at the Dardanelles they are confounded. I will quote Ashmead-Bartlett, famous English war correspondent, on what occurred at the Dardanelles. The British effected a landing on April 25, 1915:

Up to May 20 an immense fleet of predreadnaught battleships was able to lie off the coast and render the expeditionary army immense moral support by protecting its flanks and encouraging the troops, who love to hear the great shells whistling over their heads. On May 13 the *Gotha* was sunk in the straits during the night by torpedo attack. On May 20 the first submarine was sighted. The entire fleet had to weigh anchor and steer about to avoid giving a sitting shot.

And now we come to these superdreadnaughts that my friend from Illinois [Mr. Foss] told you were the fighting strength of the Navy. Dreadnaught! The dread nothing. Watch what they did at the Dardanelles:

The more valuable battleships, like the *Queen Elizabeth*, the *Agamemnon*, and the *Lord Nelson* (they are among the finest ships afloat) faded away toward the west and were not seen again. On May 25 the *Vengeance* was narrowly missed by a torpedo and the battleship *Triumph* was sunk. On May 27 the battleship *Majestic* was also sunk. On the following day there was not a single battleship off the Gallipoli coast. All had been obliged to fly to protected harbors for safety.

And the statement was that when the last battleship was sunk the smoke from stacks of the light surface craft, there to guard against submarine attack, which steamed toward the stricken vessel to rescue the drowning, obscured the sun, and they never knew from what source the shot came that turned her belly to the sun. I asked Secretary Daniels, when he was before our committee, why the German battleships and the battle cruisers had not been destroyed by submarines, and he said they were locked up in the Kiel Canal.

Mr. PLATT. The gentleman must admit that the British send out destroyers and cruisers to hunt submarines with success right along.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I will not admit such a thing, because if they had any success, why are we confronted with the Germans surrounding Great Britain in a cordon of submarines and denying the world to send supplies to them?

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. Is it not true that the British have captured and destroyed from 100 to 150 German submarines?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I do not know whether it is or not.

Mr. PLATT. That is what our Navy Department says.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Possibly they stated that for military reasons. The Naval Committee has no such information. I asked Capt. Sims if the report was true that the submarines did not take an effective part in the battle off Jutland. He said it was not true. Then, I asked, "Why did Admiral Beatty make a false report about it?" He said, "For military reasons." They make

reports sometimes for military reasons, and you can not rely on the reports. We asked him what evidence he had, and he said, "The way they went down, that the stern and prow stuck out of the water after the middle had gone under, showing that she was blown in two in the middle, and nothing could have blown her in two in the middle but a submarine torpedo."

The trouble is that we are too everlastingly ignorant and credulous. Let us look at these things as they appear and reason them out like honest, capable men, and then call in our honest judgment and not be so helplessly dependent on interested experts and the public press. In Congress we are dominated by the press. I do not care anything about the newspaper reports. I am as unconcerned about what the newspapers say as I am of what posterity may say. What I want is a Government that insures liberty of thought and action, and does not grind the faces of the people for a lot of folderol and flummery.

Listen! Here is how we are dominated. Let me quote from Mr. RAINEY, of Illinois, member of the Ways and Means Committee. Talk about economy:

Mr. RAINEY. We are face to face with the proposition of lowering the income exemption to \$1,000, and even if you do that also you will not raise this enormous sum of money. You can not progress here by proceeding along the line of least resistance. You can not conceal your head in the sand and flounder around here helplessly listening to the demands of 500,000 Government employees who want their salaries raised.

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

Mr. RAINEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMS. I fully agree with what the gentleman says, but is it not a fact that the estimates for military and naval expenditures this year are \$300,000,000 more than they were last year?

Mr. RAINEY. That is exactly true.

Mr. SIMS. And all the world talking peace and permanent peace.

Mr. RAINEY. And when we discuss lowering those expenditures for the Army and Navy from every metropolitan paper in this country comes the charge that we are guilty of treason against this Government. You can not lower those estimates.

Because the metropolitan press says that we are guilty of treason against this Government? Let me tell you something. This was written out and handed me by a man in a position to know. He would not allow his name disclosed unless he be brought before a proper tribunal, with power to summon witnesses, and put them on oath and follow the investigation to a conclusion, because he feared he would be fired from his job and he knew he would be hounded to death by newspapers.

In March, 1915, the J. P. Morgan interests, the steel, shipbuilding, and powder interests, and their subsidiary organizations, got together 12 men high up in the newspaper world and employed them to select the most influential newspapers in the United States and sufficient number of them to control generally the policy of the daily press of the United States.

These 12 men worked the problem out by selecting 179 newspapers, and then began, by an elimination process, to retain only those necessary for the purpose of controlling the general policy of the daily press throughout the country. They found it was only necessary to purchase the control of 25 of the greatest papers. The 25 papers were agreed upon; emissaries were sent to purchase the policy, national and international, of these papers; an agreement was reached; the policy of the papers was bought, to be paid for by the month; an editor was furnished for each paper to properly supervise and edit information regarding the questions of preparedness, militarism, financial policies, and other things of national and international nature considered vital to the interests of the purchasers.

This contract is in existence at the present time, and it accounts for the news columns of the daily press of the country being filled with all sorts of preparedness arguments and misrepresentations as to the present condition of the United States Army and Navy, and the possibility and probability of the United States being attacked by foreign foes.

This policy also included the suppression of everything in opposition to the wishes of the interests served. The effectiveness of this scheme has been conclusively demonstrated by the character of stuff carried in the daily press throughout the country since March, 1915. They have resorted to anything necessary to commercialize public sentiment and sandbag the National Congress into making extravagant and wasteful appropriations for the Army and Navy under the false pretense that it was necessary. Their stock argument is that it is "patriotism." They are playing on every prejudice and passion of the American people.

And here we have it.

What does Mr. RAINEY say when we talk about cutting down the military appropriations which are responsible for our deficit? "You can not do it, because the metropolitan press would denounce every one of us as traitors."

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

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

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. I quite approve of a great many of the things the gentleman has said; but, speaking of capital ships, is not the large difference between the navies of Great Britain and of Germany the predominance of capital ships in the British Navy, and as a result have we not the open ports of Great Britain and the closed ports of Germany?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I can not understand, if we have the open ports of Great Britain, why we are raising such a howl at this time because Germany has closed them. We are confronted with this proposition where, according to the gentleman from Nebraska, the ports of Great Britain are open, and held open by the predominant fleets of the allies, which outnumber the ships of Germany three to one and so far as effectiveness is concerned, they are a thousand times the superior of Germany's fleet, and yet we are thinking of jumping into the war ourselves to open English ports. The allies' fleets have unqualified command of the surface of the sea, to which we could not add one iota by the addition of our entire fleet.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. Is it not true that the same metropolitan press are the ones that are always howling "pork barrel" against the public buildings bill and the river and harbor bill?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes; but their preparedness "pork" is pork by the hogshead instead of by the barrel. They delude the public. They howl at a little thing and favor the big. I am against river and harbor pork and all other kinds of pork. But all these other kinds of pork we are talking about are a mere bagatelle as compared with this.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I have but one minute, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is it true that if our merchant ships are accompanied by a destroyer they would be able to make these ports in safety?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I have just stated that the British forces were accompanied by all the kinds of ships in the Dardanelles campaign, and yet all those ships left there when a German submarine appeared and began to sink battleships. A destroyer is as powerless in the presence of a submarine as is a battleship itself. Through a periscope not broader than your hand the submarine can ascertain the position of a battleship without the battleship being aware of its presence. Do you not remember one submarine sank three British battleships, and they went down without knowing where the shots came from?

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

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. CALLAWAY. The thing that I am interested in with respect to this bill and the thing that the minority is trying to cut out, that is beyond question of no benefit at all, is the additional authorization of capital ships that we can not possibly get in time for use in any emergency; an authorization that would tie up our money so that even if an emergency comes we could not use it for other things; an authorization that would give the department the right to make contracts at the enormous advance over even the prices that we have at the present time. I believe we ought to save that money to use in an emergency, should an emergency come.

If we get into war with Germany on the side of the allies at this time, what can we do? We can not send a man to that country, and our fleet will not be worth anything to them. They outnumber Germany now three to one. They have Germany bottled up. They have absolute control of the surface of the seas. You can not add anything to complete control.

We can furnish money; then why divert our money to the manufacturers who have grown rich already beyond the dreams of avarice, supplying materials and munitions to the belligerents at four prices?

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

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes.

Mr. CLINE. How many ships have we had contracts for under the present authorization?

Mr. CALLAWAY. The battleships have been contracted for and the battle cruisers have not been contracted for.

Mr. CLINE. Have some of the types been reversed?

Mr. CALLAWAY. We have not a single submarine of the type which this bill provides.

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

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The House is interested in the gentleman's statement that if we are drawn into the European war a single American soldier will not be sent to Europe. I would like to know why the gentleman makes that statement.

Mr. CALLAWAY. For the same reason I make the statement that our surface craft would be worth nothing to them. The allies together now have all the men they can concentrate on the lines, and what more do they want? They also have all the surface craft that they need to completely control the surface of the sea. What more do they want?

Mr. FESS. It is irreconcilable to me that we shall be drawn into the war and not be called upon to send—

Mr. CALLAWAY. I hope it is irreconcilable to everybody, and that we will not be drawn in. [Applause.] I can not conceive of America rushing into a war over the character of fighting that Germany is going to engage in against the allies, not us, in a little zone of 20 miles surrounding the isles of Great Britain. I can not see why our children should have a debt imposed upon them that they will not be able to shake off in two generations, because of the character of warfare Germany is going to carry on against the allies in a little zone of 20 miles around Great Britain. I can not see sufficient cause for involving 100,000,000 American lives and their future because of the character of warfare Germany is going to conduct against the allies in a little scope of 20 miles around the isles of Great Britain.

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

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I just want to read from the hearings a statement of Admiral Badger bearing out the position of the gentleman.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I hope the gentleman will read it quickly.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. This is what I wish to read:

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not a fact that the mines, submarines, and air-craft prevented the great fleet controlled by the allies from invading the shores of the enemy?

Admiral BADGER. I think it has had a very considerable effect, not forgetting the fortifications.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Has it not been the main thing?

Admiral BADGER. Yes; I should say it has been the main thing.

[Applause.]

By unanimous consent, Mr. ESTOPINAL, Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois, Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. GALLIVAN, Mr. TAGUE, and Mr. CONNELLY were given leave to extend remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR], a member of the Naval Affairs Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of great astonishment to me that at this time, with a great crisis confronting us, men on this floor should advocate a retarding of the movement for preparedness, so essential to the protection of the rights of this great country. A little more than 100 years ago similar sentiments were expressed on this floor, and for that reason we were compelled to submit to all kinds of imposition and forced to tolerate conditions similar to those which exist to-day, because we were not equipped to contend for our rights. That is the condition in which this great country is to-day.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. Let me proceed a little while.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. FARR. We are no better prepared than we were in 1812, and relatively, on close analysis, we are less prepared than we were in those days. The men who at that time opposed the plan to have this country prepared to defend its people, its rights, and its property carried with them to their graves a tremendous responsibility, because in all our history if one thing stands out more than another it is the sacrifices that we were compelled to make on account of our unprepared condition. The War of 1812, as well as several of the wars which followed that tragedy, ought to have been averted. And experts tell us that while we might not have prevented the Civil War, it should have been closed in six months if we had been prepared to blockade the ports of the South. That may not be true, but what a blessed thing it would have been had we been able to stop that awful war in six months, thereby escaping the rancorous, bitter feeling, the great loss of life, and destruction of property that occurred after the first six months of that dreadful contest. Now, we are just where we were in 1812, and right on this spot we are as vulnerable, or more so, than we were at that time. Experts frankly tell us that it will not be difficult for an enemy to invade Washington and get into Baltimore, New York, and Boston. We have 119 unfortified places on our Atlantic coast where the enemy could invade us easily. That seems so ridiculous as to be almost preposterous, but the facts will confirm the truth of these statements.

The great admiral who has so recently passed to his reward pleaded with his country almost with his last breath to get into a state of preparedness, and had we carried out his urgent recommendations and those of his associates on the General Board, by 1921 we would have had 48 battleships, of which 40 would now be equipped for service. To-day we have only 12 ready for action. Every expert tells us that if we go out with our 12 battleships without battle cruisers, of which we have none, we will be in the position of a man fighting with his eyes blindfolded. This Nation would have no eyes for its Navy with which to locate its enemy. The situation to-day is just what it was a year ago. Great Britain has twice the naval strength of Germany, and Germany with Austria, and, I believe, without Austria, is twice as strong as we are. If we had carried out the injunction of Admiral Dewey and his colleagues there would be no trouble confronting us to-day. We would not be compelled to meet this crisis. There would have been no attempt to hold up our commerce and to kill our people, as has been done.

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

Mr. FARR. Not just now. When Admiral Dewey at Manila Bay said, "Gridley, you may fire when ready," Gridley was ready and fired, and we know the result. The Spanish Navy was not ready, and our Navy, in a better state of preparation, had an easy victory.

Every expert who has appeared before the Committee on Naval Affairs concedes that the submarine is a dangerous enemy—a sneaking, dangerous, menacing craft, but not one says there is any possibility of its displacing the great battleships. If a cordon of submarines extended along the entire Atlantic coast the enemy could invade our shores unless we had sufficient battleships to act in cooperation with the submarines. We have 3,000 miles of coast line on the Atlantic and some 3,000 more on the Pacific.

What is the situation on the Pacific? Admiral Winslow—and no one will question his integrity, his sincerity, or his patriotism—stated to us without hesitancy that one modern ship would be able to destroy the entire Pacific fleet. That is true to-day.

What has the Navy of Great Britain done, and to what extent has the submarine interfered with her fleet? How has Great Britain transported nearly 5,000,000 soldiers to different ports in this great war field with the loss of hardly a transport? How could she have done it unless the big ship was more powerful than the submarine? How could she cross the English Channel as many times as she has with all of the troops, with the millions and millions of tons of munitions of war, with the millions of tons of foodstuffs, unless she had absolute control of the situation there? Great Britain's powerful fleet has been her salvation and that of her allies. Without it she would have been crushed.

There are people who believe that when we have completed the present program of 10 battleships and 6 battle cruisers, which will require about five years to build, we shall be second in the world's navy. Let us not deceive ourselves. We are a poor fourth to-day, no change between now and last year; indeed, I think, if anything, we have lost ground—that France, notwithstanding she is engaged in war, has built more ships than we have; that Germany has increased her fleet very largely, and we know that Great Britain has. At the best we shall be third.

Germany has wonderful building facilities. She can construct at one time, or have in construction at one time, 25 dreadnaughts, and that will not interfere with her building a great many of the smaller ships.

England has facilities practically as great as Germany. What now concerns us more than anything else is the construction of ships that we have authorized.

There is trouble somewhere. I am not going to say an unkind word against anybody. I am not in harmony with all the talk against Secretary Daniels. I think Mr. Daniels is an earnest, honest, patriotic man. [Applause.] He has done many good things for the Navy and is a sincere advocate of preparedness, but there is a weakness somewhere in the system. The apparent friction between the Secretary and the private shipbuilders is unfortunate and to be deplored. Therein seems to be the cause of delay in construction of the needed ships.

Neither do I concur in this attack on our munition makers or our shipbuilders. I regard it as contemptible. If we have war, we can not succeed without them. I can not conceive of a man with normal characteristics who would want to-day to plunge us into war in order to make money. I can not conceive that any such human being as that is in existence, and I do not believe.

there is. I believe these shipbuilders and munition makers are just as patriotic as people in other vocations. I think they want to serve this Government, but there is a difference of opinion between the Secretary of the Navy and the shipbuilders. There is a state of unfriendliness, a friction, that should not prevail. It is the duty of the Navy Department and the shipbuilders, particularly in this time of stress, to harmonize their differences so that we may go on with the construction of this program. The country needs the ships.

There appeared before the committee Mr. Ferguson, representing the Newport News Shipbuilding Co., which has built many ships for the Government. He said, "The Secretary, Mr. Daniels, and I are personally good friends. But," he continued, "if I could see that Mr. Daniels would consider the shipbuilding people in a friendly sense, we at Newport News by this time would have had the ways ready for the beginning of the construction of a battle cruiser." That was his frank statement to our committee. That was a vital point, and I shall quote from the hearings to emphasize it:

Mr. FARR. Did I correctly understand you to say that if the Navy Department were just friendly toward the shipbuilding interests, your company would be now ready to begin the construction of a battle cruiser?

Mr. FERGUSON. I meant friendly in the business sense. They are very friendly in a personal sense.

Mr. FARR. Yes; but the sense that concerns us is the business sense.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. If we had felt that the attitude of the Navy Department toward us was favorable in a business sense, and that we could get contracts from them, we would have put in the ways to take a battle cruiser. At least, I would have so recommended.

We have felt, whether we are right or wrong, that the Navy Department would not give us work which it itself could do; and, as I understand, that has been the attitude of Congress. Now, that does not encourage you to extend your plant.

Mr. FARR. And regardless of the price at which you are willing to do the work?

Mr. FERGUSON. If price becomes the criterion, we are entitled to fair treatment. Congress can get facts as to costs in navy yards. I think that it is not fair to presume to do a thing for a reason when that reason is not the true and complete reason.

That is the situation, and I want to say that there seems to be the obstacle in the way of building more expeditiously.

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

Mr. FARR. Yes.

Mr. BROWNING. Did he not also say that they had 72 per cent of the yards in Government contracts?

Mr. FARR. Yes.

Mr. BROWNING. And another one of the yards has also the same amount—72 per cent—taken up with Government contracts?

Mr. FARR. Yes. Mr. Chairman, great difficulties confront us as regards the construction of the battle cruiser. I can not imagine anything more wonderful in mechanism than this battle cruiser. It is the greatest ship ever conceived. It has 180,000 horsepower, and it will go through the water at the rate of 40 miles an hour. It used to take 40 days to cross the ocean, and this ship would go over in 4 days or thereabouts. These shipbuilders are in doubt concerning this proposed greyhound of the ocean. They frankly admit that there are many experiments connected with it. They are not ready on the instant to make contracts for it, and there has been a growing congestion in the yards. The price of material has advanced and the cost of labor greatly increased. I met a delegation of my constituents in Philadelphia on my way here on Sunday night, working at Eddystone, unskilled men, men who were taught to do something with munitions, and yet who were getting higher pay than the skilled men in our navy yards. Those conditions confront the shipbuilders. Because they do exist is no warrant to make the charge of unpatriotism against them or attempting to take advantage of our Government. They have just so much money for their business. They have to consider things as they are, and if it costs them more to do this work they must get more money for what they do.

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

Mr. FARR. Yes.

Mr. FOSS. Has the Navy Department gotten out plans and specifications for this battle cruiser as yet?

Mr. FARR. I think they are practically ready, and I will ask the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING] to speak as to that.

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. FOSS. Have they been submitted to the private shipbuilders?

Mr. FARR. I think they have been submitted. There is a difference as to the amount of money.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, they have called for bids on four of them.

Mr. FOSS. Have any bids been submitted up to this time?

Mr. FARR. I think bids have been submitted, prices have been submitted, and propositions made that these yards are willing to go right on with the building of these ships.

Mr. FOSS. What is the trouble?

Mr. FARR. The friction between the Secretary of the Navy and the private shipbuilders—this apparent unfriendliness that Mr. Ferguson in his sincerity and honesty told us prevailed.

Mr. FOSS. It seems to me that at a time like this they ought to all pull together.

Mr. FARR. I want to say to the gentleman that is the statement I want to press upon this House. There ought to be no friction at this time; that it is our duty not only to back the President with our sentiment but to give him the means to protect our country, and we have not got them to-day.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS] that the bids are only in a tentative condition. They have not made an out-and-out bid. It is upon the percentage plan.

Mr. FARR. The proposition which the Fore River Shipbuilding Co., which is a subsidiary of the Bethlehem Steel Co., made was this: That if the amount asked by the ship company was not satisfactory they would produce their books and provide full information as to cost to the Federal Trade Commission and build the ships for the sum determined by that commission. The obstacle in the way is the friction between the department and the private interests. Let them get together and build the ships, and let them start battle cruisers, without which we would be absolutely helpless as against any reasonably formidable navy.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I understand that one of the difficulties is the time that the contractors require to build these battle cruisers, running into a large number of years. Can the gentleman inform the committee whether, in view of an emergency which might arise, they could not expedite that a whole lot?

Mr. FARR. It is difficult with present congestion in work to expedite it, but I believe, however, it can be done.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. England has built that type of ship in one year.

Mr. FARR. Oh, no.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes; she has.

Mr. FARR. England has put down a ship—that is, constructed a ship from the laying of the keel—I do not know how much work preliminary to the laying of the keel is necessary, and I would ask Mr. BROWNING as to that—

Mr. BROWNING. They can make arrangements for the material and have it on hand when the keel is laid so that they can go right on with the work, but no battle cruiser can be constructed in two years.

Mr. FARR. How long does it take to prepare for the laying of the keel?

Mr. BROWNING. It would not take very long for that.

Mr. FARR. A few months?

Mr. BROWNING. A few months.

Mr. FARR. I will state to the gentleman from Minnesota that England is building battleships in two years and two months from the laying of the keel to the first commission. That was before the outbreak of the war.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I mean battle cruisers.

Mr. FARR. The battle cruisers we contemplate are so much larger, more powerful and speedy than the ordinary battle cruisers that builders say there is much that is experimental connected with their construction. The battle cruiser of the existing size, I believe, can be built as quickly as a battleship.

There are many clouds hanging over us. This Mexican situation is not settled, and if it were not for this great war in Europe foreign interests would have intervened before this.

When this war is closed unless peace comes to Mexico we must look for trouble there. Then look across the Pacific Ocean to Japan. The differences between us and Japan with respect to what California did have not been settled, and never so long as the Japanese character continues as it is to-day will they forgive this country for discriminating against their citizenship. I do not believe that Japan wants to fight this country and I know we do not want to fight Japan, but there are human elements that we can not dominate or determine.

The foreign view of the Monroe doctrine is that it is a question of might and not of right, and more and more as the South American Republics and the Central American countries develop in business opportunities will the question of the Monroe doctrine be an acute one. I realize we are spending a lot of money for the Navy, and sometimes it is a question of how

we shall get this money, but we have either got to go on and build a fleet powerful enough to protect our interests or else stop building. Unless we have a fleet that is strong enough to protect us it is a useless fleet. If we are to have a navy, it must be strong enough to protect our country, strong enough to deter an enemy from attacking us, and strong enough if they do attack us to win. Any other kind of a navy is a worthless navy, and every dollar spent on a navy that will not be sufficiently strong to defend and protect us is a dollar wrongfully and uselessly spent. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, in my own time I would like to say this: That if I were to be consulted alone I would have this committee rise and pass this bill unanimously to-day before the President of the United States reaches this House. [Applause.] But, inasmuch as I am but one Member of it and can not control the order of the House, I will ask the House to listen to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] for five minutes.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the newspaper that I hold in my hand carries a headline that is ominous. Severing diplomatic relations with a great country is not tantamount to war, but may lead to it. The hour has passed for us to speculate upon what is to come. We are neither militarists, militants, nor pacifists. We ought not to be partial to one or to the other, but certainly we ought all to be strictly American this hour. [Applause.] I do not believe it is the best policy now to discuss unduly what we ought to do. I think the hour of debate ought to be past. If I had the right, which I have not, I would move that we pass this bill immediately. [Applause.] Differences of opinion on detail count for nothing, but whether we are going to say to the world at this time that nothing will deter us for one moment from standing solidly behind the President at this hour of crisis is all important. [Applause.] Nothing that would question that decision ought to come from this Chamber at this time. I hope, speaking as a Member who is not inclined to be free from criticism of those in authority, but always independent in my criticism when I think it justified, I hope that there will fall from the lips of no man here such criticism that might be regarded by the powers of Europe as unfriendly to the situation that the President now is placed in. I therefore simply speak my own convictions that we ought with one voice, without a dissenting vote, pass this bill immediately, calling upon the country, too, that every skilled laborer and every private shipyard employing them should be utilized to the fullest extent to put the United States immediately in a position of defense. [Applause.]

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

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. CANNON. I have listened to the gentleman with much interest. I am not particularly familiar with the details of this bill, which carries money into the hundreds of millions of dollars, most of it to be expended for a building program reaching through the years. I am not quite in harmony with passing it at once. What we need now in our present condition, I dare say, is something for immediate defense.

Mr. BUTLER. If the gentleman will permit, I will state that we had a resolution ready to offer which will authorize the Government to proceed immediately to the construction of the existing program, throwing aside all sorts of other work in the yards so that this program may be completed at once.

Mr. CANNON. Very well. Rumor says that the President is to be here at 2 o'clock—I believe the House has been notified—to ask us to take into consideration what he has to say. I would like to hear what he has to say. I stand second to no man for helping by my vote to provide for the public defense, but let us wait until 2 o'clock. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield me a minute?

Mr. BUTLER. I will be glad to do so, or even a longer time. I think the House on this occasion will not cut us off.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if anybody is going to take decided or decisive action, the wisest thing is to keep cool. [Applause.] And I think what we need just now is to keep cool, wait for what the President has to say to us, and keep cool then [applause]; and whatever we do, do it, and not get excited. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it has been asserted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] that he was surprised that anyone should now be willing to delay a building program. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I must say that if to anyone's action delay can be charged, it might be to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. OLIVER. Not at present. In the report of the minority, which I hope you have read, it is clearly shown that you can not hasten the building of the program authorized and appropriated for at the last term, unless heed is given to the suggestions of the Secretary of the Navy, in which he calls attention to the fact that the shipbuilders are now unwilling to construct, or even undertake to construct, your program unless given a time limit of from 48 to 52 months, although the same shipbuilders had assured Congress, before the appropriations were made last August, that they could, yea, were fully prepared to construct these ships within 38 months. The minority have said, and now repeat, that it would be a mistake to appropriate for additional capital ships and scout cruisers until you can provide some method to insure the construction of the seven ships of these same types heretofore appropriated for, and which the Secretary has been unable to have shipbuilding companies contract for, either within the limit of time or amount fixed by Congress.

Certainly this Congress will not now consent to give private shipbuilding companies 48 months to build battle cruisers in, when the same companies assured us that they could be built within 38 months, and will not give 42 months to these companies to construct scout cruisers, when they assured us that they could be constructed in 32 months. The same companies stated that the construction of these ships could be hastened and final completion had earlier than the limits just named, and Congress appropriated a bonus of 20 per cent to secure earlier construction. The companies now demand the bonus of 20 per cent over and above the amounts fixed and appropriated as a fair price for building these ships within 38 and 32 months, respectively, and in addition thereto demand that the time limit shall be fixed at 48 and 42 months, respectively.

Why should we now double the number of these types of ships, although imperatively needed at this time by the fleet, when you find that those who control, or think they control, the building of these ships will use what they know to be your great need simply as an opportunity to demand more time and a larger sum for the building of the ships than we are advised should be given?

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. OLIVER. Not now.

Mr. FARR. I will wait until you are ready.

Mr. OLIVER. We pointed out in the minority report this fact, that if an emergency arises the Government should and would, no doubt, commandeer all shipbuilding yards and build not only the program authorized last year but might add thereto, and in this way construct the entire three-year program in half the time, which private shipbuilding companies now demand exorbitant prices for. Why, since we are agreed as to the immediate need of these ships, should we delay their completion for four years just to meet the unreasonable demands as to time and price demanded by the shipbuilding companies, and which the gentleman seeks to defend?

It is significant that last year you appropriated for each of the capital ships \$16,500,000, and for each of the scout cruisers \$5,000,000; and in view of the assurance of the shipbuilding companies that they could, by speeding up construction, complete the battle cruisers in less than 38 months and the scout cruisers in less than 32 months, you appropriated for speedy construction 20 per cent additional for each battle cruiser and 20 per cent additional for each scout cruiser.

Now, what do we find? The Secretary promptly advertised for bids on these ships, and the shipbuilders then demanded approximately \$20,000,000 for the construction of the battle cruisers and approximately \$6,000,000 for the construction of the scout cruisers; and, in addition thereto, 48 months as a time limit to build the battle cruisers and 42 months to build the scout cruisers, and actually urged on the Secretary of the Navy that the contracts should be awarded them, since, although the 20 per cent which they had included in their bid was appropriated as a bonus for speedy construction, yet since they then claimed that the battle cruisers could not possibly be built earlier than 48 months and the scout cruisers earlier than 42 months this, they told the Secretary of the Navy, would meet the requirement of Congress for speedy construction.

There are some whom, it seems, are now willing to give this additional price and this additional time in order to secure contracts from these shipbuilding companies. The minority is opposed to this, because they feel, as pointed out in their report, that the ships can and should be constructed earlier and for less money.

Now, in all fairness I ask, Who is trying to delay the building of ships for the Navy? Read the minority report, and you will find that if you will provide in this bill authority for the

President to commandeer the shipbuilding plants and supply plants, so that the Government can take charge of them and see that these ships are built, the purposes of the minority report will have been fully met. [Applause.] The sole motive and purpose of the minority was to insure speedy construction, without yielding long time and large profits to shipbuilders. The report of the minority distinctly points out that they do not dissent from a single appropriation in the proposed building program, except where the Secretary has been unable to let ships of that same type previously appropriated for. Yet the gentleman undertakes to defend the shipbuilding plants under these conditions and to assert that the Secretary of the Navy is unfriendly to "big business."

The Secretary has been a real and loyal friend to the Nation. He has defied the subsidized press. He has defied the paid advertisements of the Bethlehem Co. and has said to Congress and to the committee: "My duty is to the Nation. You have authorized a building program, you have said what you wanted to pay for it and the time within which it should be completed, and so far as it lies within my power I shall not suffer these companies to demand more, either in money or in time." [Applause.] And let me say now you will find that, if an exigency should occur, your Navy to-day is stronger than ever before, and that they can shoot with wonderful accuracy. You will find, further, that it is better organized than ever before, and no matter to what duty you may call it, it will be ready to efficiently answer your call and uphold the proud traditions of your past. [Applause.]

Mr. FARR. Now, will the gentleman yield there just for a moment?

Mr. OLIVER. I will.

Mr. FARR. Will not the gentleman admit that in all my talk I have not said one unkind word relative to the Secretary of the Navy? And will he not also say that during all our hearings last year—the extended hearings—I was among the earnest ones contending for the equipping of the Government yards in order to build these ships? Do you not recall that?

Mr. OLIVER. I am glad to say that the gentleman has been a genuine friend to a greater and more efficient Navy, and at no hearing has the gentleman ever intimated that the Secretary was not doing his full duty, and doing it to the best of his ability. But the things I complain of are not what the gentleman has said or done in the past, but what he in the heat of debate to-day has thoughtlessly, as I think, given expression to, impliedly charging an effort on the part of some to delay this building program and that there was some justification for the claim of shipbuilders that the Secretary of the Navy was unfriendly to big business. Those statements are not in keeping with the past record of the gentleman, so far as my knowledge extends, and that is why I was so surprised that the gentleman should have given utterance to them on the floor to-day.

Mr. FARR. Did I not quote a shipbuilder—Mr. Ferguson, a friend of Mr. Daniels, in a personal sense—and did I not use his testimony that was before us?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes; and Mr. Ferguson became friendly only when, after a few questions, if you will read the record, his attention was called to the feeling he was exhibiting in his references to negotiations between the Navy Department and the Newport News Shipbuilding Co., and was asked this question: "You are an ex-naval officer, are you not, and have not always entertained the views now expressed against the Government going into the building of its ships and the improvement of its yards?" And if you will read the hearings you will find that he had softened down considerably before saying that his relationships were so very friendly with the Secretary, in response to the questions of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. [Applause.] Oh, when you make statements let all the facts come out, because no man can get a true idea of the picture unless he knows all the facts and circumstances that attend the taking of it.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman permit me to say that that is the very thing we do want?

Mr. OLIVER. I am glad the gentleman insists that he has always defended the Navy under the present administration.

Mr. FARR. Oh, no; I did not say that. It is not an adequate Navy, and I want one that is adequate.

Mr. OLIVER. It is deserving of anyone's defense, and the day will come when those who are in charge, and whose motives have been impugned by disappointed contractors and by a subsidized press, will be fully vindicated. It will be found in the hour of need that the Navy, which some, for selfish purposes, have sneeringly referred to, fully justifies Admiral Dewey's recent tribute, "that it is now more efficient and better able to meet any emergency than ever before, and its efficiency limitation is one of size only." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I will here insert as a part of my remarks the minority report.

Mr. OLIVER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, submitted the following

MINORITY REPORT.

[To accompany H. R. 20632.]

The undersigned members of the Committee on Naval Affairs dissent from the report, submitted by the chairman of the committee, in respect to the appropriations providing for three additional battleships, one battle cruiser, and three scout cruisers, to be built during the fiscal year 1918, and assign, in part, as their reason the following:

Four battle cruisers and three scout cruisers, authorized and appropriated for by this Congress at the close of its first session have not yet been let, and the Secretary of the Navy, in a letter on this subject to the chairman of the committee, says:

"The department has done its utmost in this connection about getting ready to build these ships, but finds that the private shipbuilders of the country are unable or unwilling to complete the program with any assurance of speed in completion, even at prices which the department regards as unreasonably high."

The report of the committee at the first session of this Congress pointed out and specially emphasized the Navy's imperative present need of these two types of ships, and the chairman of the committee, in a speech on the floor of the House, urged the speedy building of these ships to the exclusion of battleships. If there was necessity then for the building of these types, the reasons are now more compelling, since foreign powers are steadily increasing these types of vessels, which they already possess in considerable numbers.

The committee, in recognition of these facts and to insure the construction of these ships, has in the present bill recommended an authorized increase in the appropriation for each of said battle cruisers of from \$16,500,000 to \$19,000,000 and for each of said scout cruisers of from \$5,000,000 to \$6,000,000, and have further recommended an appropriation of \$12,000,000, in addition to the \$6,000,000 carried in the last bill, to enable the Secretary of the Navy to equip the Government yards to build these ships, if contracts can not be let for their construction within a reasonable time at a reasonable price.

If Congress continues to offer to private shipbuilding companies contracts for the construction of battleships, which cost more money than battle cruisers and promise larger profits to shipbuilding companies, we will continue to receive no bids from these companies for the construction of these battle cruisers. In this connection it may be interesting to note that some of the shipbuilding companies are owned and controlled by corporations engaged in the manufacture of steel, munitions, and other materials that go into warships, and in a large measure fix the market price of such materials.

The facts are that, when the committee, at the first session of this Congress, authorized building these ships, the shipbuilding companies then estimated that the battle cruisers could be built within 36 or 38 months and the scout cruisers within from 30 to 32 months. The Navy Department estimated that the battle cruisers would cost not exceeding \$16,500,000 and the scout cruisers not exceeding \$5,000,000. One of the scout cruisers authorized at the last session has been let within the limits of the appropriation.

The shipbuilding companies now refuse to contract for the building of the scout cruisers in less than 41 months, and for the battle cruisers in less than 46 or 48 months. The shipbuilding companies have also refused to fix any given price for the construction of battle cruisers, and have been willing to undertake the building of these ships only on what may be termed a percentage basis; that is, the Government to pay for all materials, for all labor, and all indirect cost, known as overhead charges, and a net profit of approximately \$1,500,000 to the shipbuilding company for building the same. An expert accountant from the Navy Department has estimated that the battle cruisers should be constructed now for approximately \$17,500,000, which includes a fair profit, and which represents a saving of from \$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000 on the estimated cost of such ships, as proposed by the private shipbuilding companies, on the percentage basis.

The facts submitted to the committee further show that the price of materials and the cost of labor are abnormally high at this time, and that there is only a limited amount of labor now obtainable for shipbuilding purposes, and that such labor is now worked to its full capacity.

An expert from the Navy Department estimates that the materials for a battle cruiser, which will now cost approximately \$11,000,000, could, in normal times, be bought for \$6,000,000, and that the present cost of labor is from 22 1/2 to 30 per cent over normal times.

Officials of some of the shipbuilding companies stated that it would require 9 or 10 months to equip their yards for the building of battle cruisers, and that such equipment would entail an expense of about \$1,000,000, and that at the conclusion of the European war this additional equipment would be worth about 50 per cent of the present cost for installation, since they claim there will then occur a horizontal drop in the cost of materials and the cost of building. They assign this as a reason for requiring the Government to include in the overhead charges demanded for the building of battle cruisers on the percentage basis, hereinbefore referred to, a special depreciation charge of \$500,000.

In other words, the Government must, as a penalty for the conclusion of the European war, pay shipbuilding companies who may now make contracts with the Government the sum of \$500,000, which represents their estimated difference of the price of a permanent improvement built at this time and what the same improvement would cost if built when peace is restored.

Without undertaking to now set out in detail further facts justifying our dissent from the report of the majority of the committee, we beg to state that it is our opinion and judgment—

First. That a postponement of appropriations at this time for the four additional capital ships and the three additional scout cruisers, carried in the present bill, will materially aid the Navy Department in providing the best possible terms for the construction of the battle cruisers and scout cruisers, which were authorized and appropriated for at the first session of this Congress, and are still uncontracted for.

Second. The delay in appropriating for the building of additional ships of the types of those now appropriated for, and uncontracted for, until the next Congress meets will result in a reasonably probable saving of many millions of dollars to the Government, and at the same time will probably insure an earlier completion of said ships than if now appropriated for and a long time limit thereby impliedly given for their completion.

In support of these conclusions the following facts may be briefly adverted to, namely:

With the shipyards already overcrowded with Government and private work and all labor available for building ships being now worked to its full capacity, it is a mistake to largely increase the Government contracts to be let out until some promise of real competition by shipbuilding plants can be assured. This competition will be assured:

First. When the European war is concluded (and this is not beyond the pale of reasonable probabilities during the present year).

Second. When our navy yards are equipped to build any type of ships that Congress may order (and this may be accomplished, so the Navy Department advises, with the appropriation carried in this bill for such purpose, in the same limit of time that will be required for private shipbuilding companies to equip their yards for the building of battle cruisers).

It will be noted that we have not dissented from that part of the bill carrying appropriations for additional destroyers, submarines, and other ships, contracts for the construction of which the Navy Department has heretofore been able to secure, and we suggest that if the appropriation for additional capital ships and scout cruisers is postponed until the next Congress meets the Secretary of the Navy can be authorized to prepare the necessary drawings and specifications for said ships, so that bids may be asked for thereon in time for the submission of the same to the first session of the next Congress, which can then make immediate appropriation therefor if advisable.

It may be interesting to call attention to the five-year building program, which the President in his annual message at the first session of this Congress recommended and which the Navy Department then strongly urged. An examination of this five-year program will disclose that if appropriations for additional capital ships and scout cruisers are now postponed until the next Congress meets the building proposals recommended in the five-year program referred to will by this Congress have been substantially complied with for the fiscal years of 1917 and 1918.

In conclusion, we will state that the bill as reported simply follows the authorizations provided for in the bill passed about five months ago by this Congress and does not undertake to provide a building program for any emergency. If a real emergency should arise, the Government would at once commandeer all navy yards and would wholly change the building program authorized in the bill passed at the first session of this Congress, and by thus assuming control of all private shipbuilding yards and devoting the same to the building of Government ships the completion of any building program required would be largely hastened, and it would be a serious mistake to have contracts outstanding whereby the Government had impliedly assented to a time limit of 48 months or more on some of its capital ships and 41 or 42 months on its scout cruisers. Even if there should exist in the minds of some ground for apprehending that emergency legislation may be required, this suggests the wisdom of the recommendations hereinbefore made, so as to prevent committing the Government to contracts that would not be completed within the limit of time required.

WILLIAM B. OLIVER.
WALTER L. HENSLEY.
OSCAR CALLAWAY.
JOHN R. CONNELLY.
FINLY H. GRAY.
FRANK BUCHANAN.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

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

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I want to ask this question: If we are confronted with an emergency, one that develops quickly—and it looks as if we are—is it not idle to talk about building the authorizations made in 1916 to meet this emergency? Have we not to complete the work on the old authorizations in order to in any wise deal with the emergency?

Mr. OLIVER. Unquestionably so, and the only way to do it is to give authority to commandeer the steel plants and yards should the emergency arise.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The gentleman feels that to continue along the lines of the authorizations of 1916 is really to enfeeble our powers?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes; you may change your whole program, as you suggest, by reason of the conditions that may arise at any time.

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

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I do not say that I could not under any circumstances be induced to make a partisan speech. We all indulge in that here at times. But in my judgment this is one of the times when there should be no partisanship displayed—a time when we are considering the question of the defense of the whole country.

There has been a good deal said during the course of the debate about the present state of preparedness of the Navy. A good deal has been said about the length of time that it has taken the Government to build the ships authorized by Congress; and I want to say here that this is practically the only criticism of the Navy under the present management that I have heretofore indulged in, namely, that the department did not quite seem to realize that it could not proceed in troublesome days in the same deliberate manner in which we had proceeded for years before, when there was no cloud in the sky.

It may possibly be recalled by some of you gentlemen that shortly after the President made a trip through the country urging the country to build a greater Navy, particularly, I introduced a resolution in the House calling attention to the fact that at that time we had under construction \$185,000,000 worth of ships. I made a statement upon that resolution in which I said it seemed to me that the Navy Department ought to take notice of that fact and bring about, if possible, a more speedy construction. While I have found more or less fault with the department because of the slow progress made, I have not been as critical as some, because I realize that there were some reasons why certain types of ships have taken a long time to construct.

Let us first take up the question of the submarine. It is true that it takes but a few months to build a submarine, and I think that has been one of the real reasons why they have not been built. We have really been experimenting all the time with the submarine, knowing that when the time came, if such a time should ever come when we would need them, that was one of the easiest types of ships to put into the water and would require the shortest length of time of any of the ships of the Navy for construction.

You gentlemen will realize that when we started in with the submarine it was a very small ship of 65 tons displacement, and the steady progress of the submarine has been toward a constantly increasing size, until a session or two ago when we authorized submarines with as high a displacement as 1,100 tons.

The reason why we have been trying to get a larger submarine is because the larger you get it the more efficient a weapon of warfare it becomes. In the first place, a small submarine is most uncomfortable for the men in even an ordinary sea. A little craft of 200 or 300 tons displacement, tossed out there on the sea, is like a cork on the waves, and the men become deathly seasick, and after a few days upon a submarine they have to come ashore and rest up for a number of days. Further than that, with a small submarine you can not go very far away from home. You can not take enough provisions. You can not take oil enough for fuel to go far. You can not take the necessary torpedoes for a long cruise. So the Navy Department from the beginning has steadily tried to work up to a larger submarine. Every time the size has been increased the difficulties of construction have been increased. When they got so they could make a 200-ton submarine they said, "Let us try a 300-ton submarine," and when they got the engines for a 300-ton submarine to work efficiently they said, "Now, let us go to 400 tons," and then 500 tons, and now in this bill we are providing for 800 tons and discarding the manufacture of the small ones altogether. Every time we have increased the size of these ships all kinds of engine difficulties have been encountered, and the Government necessarily assisted in this experimental work as far as it could. As I recollect, one submarine company failed utterly and the Government had to take those ships over and complete them. And so, while a number of these submarines have been a long time in construction, the fact that perfected types could be constructed quickly and that the weapon was in its infancy are probably the chief reasons for many delays. That, I think, would have been a perfectly valid excuse until this great war on the other side started, but for the two years and a half that that war has been going on I have been firmly of the belief that we should have completed the best submarine that we knew how to make and get the country ready with as many of them as we possibly could.

But that is neither here nor there. We did not do it. We took the other course, and the question now is what to do in the future?

The same policy has been pursued about the battleships. I have complained particularly about the two battleships that were authorized on the 3d of March, 1915, two years ago, which have not yet even been started. The Secretary of the Navy, undoubtedly exercising the best judgment that he had, awarded the building of those ships to our navy yards, one in New York and one in San Francisco. The reason given for that was that the bids of the private companies were not within the limit of cost. It has been stated that had certain elements of expense which the Secretary of the Navy had a right to exclude, been excluded, they might have been awarded to private yards. But be that as it may, one of them was awarded to the Mare Island yard and one to the New York yard. At the Mare Island yard there was at that time no equipment for building such a ship, and Congress was not in session. We adjourned on the 4th of March, and there was no way for the Secretary of the Navy to get an authorization until Congress convened again in December.

When Congress did convene, a resolution was introduced by the distinguished chairman, Mr. PADGETT, and passed through the House, to fix up the Mare Island Navy Yard, which was done. The ship could not be started in the New York yard until a ship already under construction there was launched and out of the way. That ship has not yet been launched, so that the keel of the ship awarded to the New York yard has not yet been laid down.

Mr. PADGETT. There were no bids submitted by private contractors for either one of those ships within the limit of cost, and the navy yards proposed to build them within the limit of cost, and that forced them into the navy yards.

Mr. KELLEY. I think I made that statement. Perhaps the chairman of the committee was not listening to me all the time. I stated that the bids were not within the limit of cost, but I was under the impression that there were certain charges, such as paying for the expense of the trial trips, which the Secretary of the Navy had a right to exclude if he wanted to do so, which would have brought the bids within the limit of cost. I may not be quite accurate as to that. But be that as it may, looking backward over the situation, we can realize that it was rather expensive to defer the building of those ships.

Mr. BROWNING. If the gentleman will allow me, what he says could have been eliminated, is correct.

Mr. KELLEY. You will understand that the award of these two ships to the navy yards was not upon a guaranty of completion at the price named, but merely upon an estimate by the yards. Since that time, of course, the price of material has increased 30 or 40 per cent, so that the chances are that when we come to buy the material and count the cost which the Government will have to pay for these two ships to be built in the New York yard and the Mare Island yard, we will lose something like a million dollars on each ship because of the rise in the price of material.

But be that as it may, the question whether we lost or whether we gained in the matter of price, under the present circumstances, is not of great consequence, because the fact remains that two great ships, carrying each twelve 14-inch guns, firing shells weighing 1,400 pounds each, and with gun power enough to hurl those projectiles nine miles and put them through 14 inches of steel at that distance—two great ships of that kind authorized two years ago have not yet been started.

Mr. MADDEN. Was not their range 18 miles?

Mr. KELLEY. I want to be moderate in stating the distance. Now, those were the two ships which have been delayed, and I have stated the reason for the delay.

Mr. FOSS. What ships are those?

Mr. KELLEY. The *California* and the *Tennessee*.

Mr. FOSS. Have they not been started yet?

Mr. KELLEY. No; except, of course, some of the material has been purchased and is ready for the ship.

Mr. FOSS. Why were they not contracted for at the time?

Mr. KELLEY. I think I stated just before my friend from Illinois came in that the Mare Island yard was not equipped to construct ships when ordered there. The New York yard had the *New Mexico* on the ways, and this new ship could not be laid down in the New York yard until the *New Mexico* was launched.

Mr. FOSS. Could not they be built by private contract?

Mr. KELLEY. Bids were received, but they were not quite within the limit of cost. But, as I stated a moment ago, the Secretary of the Navy had the power to eliminate certain charges, such as a charge for the trial trip, and if he had, it would have brought the bids within the limit of cost, and they would have been awarded to a private shipyard and three-fourths finished by this time. Ships of the same general type that were authorized by Congress many months later are now 50 or 60 per cent completed.

Mr. PADGETT. If he had waived those charges they would have had to come out of other appropriations.

Mr. KELLEY. Yes; but I understand in more recent contracts they have adopted that course, or at least they are contemplating that course in awards to be made.

Mr. PADGETT. Not in awards. The shipbuilders are trying to get the department to do it in the case of battle cruisers, but the department has declined.

Mr. KELLEY. What we have gained by that course we have lost ten times over by the rapid rise in the cost of material. I am not blaming the Secretary of the Navy for not having the gift of prophecy to see the rise in the cost of material or labor but am simply stating a fact.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. Congress at the last session ratified what was done in relation to building the ship in the Mare Island yard by appropriating \$500,000 to equip the yard.

Mr. KELLEY. I am only stating the facts and explaining how the delay of two years has come about in the construction of these two great dreadnaughts which ought to be at this time almost fully completed.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman is discussing the delay in the construction of authorized vessels. That same question has been discussed on the floor in the last day or two. May I ask the gentleman if he intends to offer any cure therefor?

Mr. KELLEY. I do; I will discuss that in a moment.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I will.

Mr. WINGO. How many capital ships that are not yet completed and how many of these authorized ships under contract have been let? In other words, what is the total number of capital ships authorized and not completed, and how many have not been started?

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman will find all of that in the hearings.

Mr. KELLEY. Then I will not take the time to answer the gentleman from Arkansas now.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I want to get some information as to the details of construction or authorizations made by this House. I understand the gentleman refers to two ships authorized two years ago.

Mr. KELLEY. Just two years ago.

Mr. SAUNDERS. After the authorization is made, what in the due course of things is the next thing to do looking to the ultimate construction?

Mr. KELLEY. After the authorization the plans are prepared.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Are these plans of a nature that calls for careful work?

Mr. KELLEY. I will say that three ships authorized by the House six months later than the two ships I speak of are half completed.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The same type of ship?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes; but better and bigger ships.

Mr. SAUNDERS. What is the explanation of the delay in these two particular ships?

Mr. KELLEY. I have explained that three times already, but to satisfy the gentleman, who has come in since I started to speak, I will state it again. I do not know as I ought to take the time to explain it again, but the gentleman from Virginia is interested in this matter and I will go over it once more.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I wanted information on this point. There are of necessity certain preliminaries that have to take place. I want to know if there was any negligent delay in this matter.

Mr. KELLEY. No; the situation is this: The Secretary advertised for bids and those bids came in. They were outside of the limit of cost. So the Secretary accepted an estimate from the Mare Island Navy Yard and also an estimate from the New York yard. The Mare Island yard was not equipped to build this type of ship, and we had to build ways and get extra machinery. Congress was not in session, as I recollect, and so it had to go over until Congress did convene in order to fix up the yard to build the ships.

In the New York yard there was another ship previously on the ways, and we could not construct this ship until the other was launched, and that has not been launched yet. So the two ships authorized way back two years ago are not yet begun.

Now, the bids, as I say, were outside the limit of cost. There are certain charges that the Secretary of the Navy has the right to waive if he desires. One of these is the charge for conducting the trial trip; another, the cost of insuring the ship during the progress of construction. All of these are optional with the Secretary, and he might have waived them and awarded the contracts to private yards. Had he done so he would have lost a few thousand dollars, but he would have saved a million dollars on the cost of the raw material for each ship. I am not blaming the Secretary for not having the foresight to have seen that.

Mr. SAUNDERS. What I wanted to ask was whether there was anything in good administration that the Secretary ought to have done with reference to the facts of the situation as understood that he did not do.

Mr. KELLEY. I am blaming the Secretary only because we were living in a time of war. If we had been living in a time of

peace it would have been all right to postpone the work as he did.

Mr. CANNON. When all this was taking place the Secretary knew that the world was then on fire and the sparks might explode in this country at any time.

Mr. KELLEY. That is the proposition. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois has stated my objection that at that time when we ought to have been putting our house in order, when even the President was insisting that conditions were dangerous, and shortly after made a trip through the country in which he said it had been very hard for him to keep the country out of war, and from the further fact that he was elected at the last election because he had kept the country out of war, the Secretary should not have delayed the building of these two great dreadnaughts for two years.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I am not trying to get into that sort of thing. I am trying to develop the facts.

Mr. KELLEY. I will ask the gentleman not to take too much of my time.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I have not taken much of the gentleman's time. I want to ascertain if there was anything that the Secretary in good administration ought to have done which he did not do, and what that was. That is all that I wanted to determine.

Mr. KELLEY. I am telling the gentleman that, in my judgment, under these conditions, with the world on fire as it was—

Mr. SAUNDERS. That he had authority—

Mr. KELLEY. I would have let the contract to a private contractor instead of letting it to a yard which could not be gotten ready for six months, even after Congress had convened to appropriate the money.

Mr. SAUNDERS. In other words, that he had the authority to have done something—

Mr. KELLEY. Yes; he had.

Mr. SAUNDERS. And if he had exercised that authority in the course of good administration, these ships would be more advanced than they are now?

Mr. KELLEY. These ships would have been two-thirds done.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is all I want to develop.

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

Mr. KELLEY. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. I know that the gentleman wants to be entirely fair in presenting all of the facts connected with those ships, and in reply to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], I am sure the gentleman from Michigan will state that part of the delay was occasioned by an inquiry on the part of the Engineering Department into the question of how the ships could be made immune from torpedo attack.

Mr. KELLEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. OLIVER. And that report was filed with the committee, and that inquiry did lead to very material changes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I wanted to get those facts.

Mr. KELLEY. I will say to the gentleman that the inquiry business has been carried too far, in times like this, and that instead of making so much inquiry we ought to build something that we know we can build. Now, in reference to the delay in the construction of new work.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, would it suit the convenience of the gentleman from Michigan to suspend his argument at this point and let the committee rise, so that the House may stand in recess until about 5 minutes of 2 o'clock?

Mr. KELLEY. I am entirely willing to yield for that purpose.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I intend to ask unanimous consent before we go back into the committee that the gentleman may have a few minutes of additional time. He has been interrupted a great deal.

Mr. PADGETT. That can not be done in the committee.

Mr. BUTLER. I intend to do that in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has only three minutes remaining.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to try to get some more time when we are in the House.

Mr. KELLEY. I will defer to the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PADGETT. 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. PAGE of North Carolina, 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. 20632 and had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.

AFTER RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR TO-MORROW.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker appoints the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] to preside over the House to-morrow.

JOINT MEETING OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE.

At 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper, J. J. Sinnott, announced the Vice President of the United States and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Members of the House rose.

The Senate, preceded by the Vice President and by their Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Chamber.

The Vice President took the chair at the right of the Speaker and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints Messrs. KITCHIN, FITZGERALD, FLOOD, MANN, and COOPER of Wisconsin as a committee to wait on the President and escort him into the House. The Vice President will make the announcement for the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Vice President appoints Senators KERN, STONE, SIMMONS, GALLINGER, and WADSWORTH.

At 2 o'clock and 1 minute p. m. the President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House and stood at the Clerk's desk amid prolonged applause.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the Sixty-fourth Congress, I present the President of the United States. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT.

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, and gentlemen of the Congress, the Imperial German Government on the thirty-first of January announced to this Government and to the governments of the other neutral nations that on and after the first day of February, the present month, it would adopt a policy with regard to the use of submarines against all shipping seeking to pass through certain designated areas of the high seas to which it is clearly my duty to call your attention.

Let me remind the Congress that on the eighteenth of April last, in view of the sinking on the twenty-fourth of March of the cross-channel passenger steamer SUSSEX by a German submarine, without summons or warning, and the consequent loss of the lives of several citizens of the United States who were passengers aboard her, this Government addressed a note to the Imperial German Government in which it made the following declaration:

"If it is still the purpose of the Imperial Government to prosecute relentless and indiscriminate warfare against vessels of commerce by the use of submarines without regard to what the Government of the United States must consider the sacred and indisputable rules of international law and the universally recognized dictates of humanity, the Government of the United States is at last forced to the conclusion that there is but one course it can pursue. Unless the Imperial Government should now immediately declare and effect an abandonment of its present methods of submarine warfare against passenger and freight-carrying vessels, the Government of the United States can have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the German Empire altogether."

In reply to this declaration the Imperial German Government gave this Government the following assurance:

"The German Government is prepared to do its utmost to confine the operations of war for the rest of its duration to the fighting forces of the belligerents, thereby also insuring the freedom of the seas, a principle upon which the German Government believes, now as before, to be in agreement with the Government of the United States.

"The German Government, guided by this idea, notifies the Government of the United States that the German naval forces have received the following orders: In accordance with the general principles of visit and search and destruction of merchant vessels recognized by international law, such vessels,

both within and without the area declared as naval war zone, shall not be sunk without warning and without saving human lives, unless these ships attempt to escape or offer resistance.

"But," it added, "neutrals can not expect that Germany, forced to fight for her existence, shall, for the sake of neutral interest, restrict the use of an effective weapon if her enemy is permitted to continue to apply at will methods of warfare violating the rules of international law. Such a demand would be incompatible with the character of neutrality, and the German Government is convinced that the Government of the United States does not think of making such a demand, knowing that the Government of the United States has repeatedly declared that it is determined to restore the principle of the freedom of the seas, from whatever quarter it has been violated."

To this the Government of the United States replied on the eighth of May, accepting, of course, the assurances given, but adding,

"The Government of the United States feels it necessary to state that it takes it for granted that the Imperial German Government does not intend to imply that the maintenance of its newly announced policy is in any way contingent upon the course or result of diplomatic negotiations between the Government of the United States and any other belligerent Government, notwithstanding the fact that certain passages in the Imperial Government's note of the 4th instant might appear to be susceptible of that construction. In order, however, to avoid any possible misunderstanding, the Government of the United States notifies the Imperial Government that it can not for a moment entertain, much less discuss, a suggestion that respect for German naval authorities for the rights of citizens of the United States upon the high seas should in any way or in the slightest degree be made contingent upon the conduct of any other Government affecting the rights of neutrals and non-combatants. Responsibility in such matters is single, not joint; absolute, not relative."

To this note of the eighth of May the Imperial German Government made no reply.

On the thirty-first of January, the Wednesday of the present week, the German Ambassador handed to the Secretary of State, along with a formal note, a memorandum which contains the following statement:

"The Imperial Government, therefore, does not doubt that the Government of the United States will understand the situation thus forced upon Germany by the Entente-Allies' brutal methods of war and by their determination to destroy the Central Powers, and that the Government of the United States will further realize that the now openly disclosed intentions of the Entente-Allies give back to Germany the freedom of action which she reserves in her note addressed to the Government of the United States on May 4, 1916.

"Under these circumstances Germany will meet the illegal measures of her enemies by forcibly preventing after February 1, 1917, in a zone around Great Britain, France, Italy, and in the Eastern Mediterranean all navigation, that of neutrals included, from and to England and from and to France, etc., etc. All ships met within the zone will be sunk."

I think that you will agree with me that, in view of this declaration, which suddenly and without prior intimation of any kind deliberately withdraws the solemn assurance given in the Imperial Government's note of the fourth of May, 1916, this Government has no alternative consistent with the dignity and honour of the United States but to take the course which, in its note of the eighteenth of April, 1916, it announced that it would take in the event that the German Government did not declare and effect an abandonment of the methods of submarine warfare which it was then employing and to which it now purposes again to resort.

I have, therefore, directed the Secretary of State to announce to His Excellency the German Ambassador that all diplomatic relations between the United States and the German Empire are severed [applause] and that the American Ambassador at Berlin will immediately be withdrawn; and, in accordance with this decision, to hand to His Excellency his passports.

Notwithstanding this unexpected action of the German Government, this sudden and deeply deplorable renunciation of its assurances, given this Government at one of the most critical moments of tension in the relations of the two governments, I refuse to believe that it is the intention of the German authorities to do in fact what they have warned us they will feel at liberty to do. I cannot bring myself to believe that they will indeed pay no regard to the ancient friendship between their people and our own or to the solemn obligations which have been exchanged between them and destroy American ships

and take the lives of American citizens in the wilful prosecution of the ruthless naval programme they have announced their intention to adopt. Only actual overt acts on their part can make me believe it even now. [Applause.]

If this inveterate confidence on my part in the sobriety and prudent foresight of their purpose should unhappily prove unfounded; if American ships and American lives should in fact be sacrificed by their naval commanders in heedless contravention of the just and reasonable understandings of international law and the obvious dictates of humanity, I shall take the liberty of coming again before the Congress, to ask that authority be given me to use any means that may be necessary for the protection of our seamen and our people in the prosecution of their peaceful and legitimate errands on the high seas. [Applause.] I can do nothing less. I take it for granted that all neutral governments will take the same course.

We do not desire any hostile conflict with the Imperial German Government. We are the sincere friends of the German people and earnestly desire to remain at peace with the Government which speaks for them. We shall not believe that they are hostile to us unless and until we are obliged to believe it; and we purpose nothing more than the reasonable defense of the undoubted rights of our people. We wish to serve no selfish ends. We seek merely to stand true alike in thought and in action to the immemorial principles of our people which I sought to express in my address to the Senate only two weeks ago,—seek merely to vindicate our right to liberty and justice and an unmolested life. These are the bases of peace, not war. God grant we may not be challenged to defend them by acts of wilful injustice on the part of the Government of Germany! [Applause.]

At 2 o'clock and 16 minutes the President retired from the Hall of the House.

Thereupon the Vice President and Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. 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. 20632, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20632, the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. PAGE of North Carolina in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20632, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20632) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time have we remaining on this side, if any?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has one minute remaining.

Mr. BUTLER. And the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] has how much remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the only minute that is remaining. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will allow, the Chair desires to state the gentleman from Michigan had three minutes remaining when the committee rose.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Michigan begins, I understood the Chair to announce that he had three minutes remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. He has three minutes remaining.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] has one minute which he proposes to yield to the gentleman from Michigan, as he informed me, and I have 52 minutes remaining, and I was going to yield 12 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has one minute remaining, which he yields to the gentleman from Michigan, and the gentleman from Tennessee yields 12 minutes additional, and the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 16 minutes.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, before the House went into recess I was discussing the delays in the construction of the Navy in the past, and now I want to discuss the question of the construction of the ships heretofore authorized that are not now begun or contracted for. In the bill we passed in August we authorized the construction of four dreadnaughts and four battle cruisers.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield for me to ask him a question?

Mr. KELLEY. I have only 16 minutes.

Mr. CRISP. I want to make a suggestion to the gentleman. I would like to know if under existing conditions, when we should all be careful of what we say and do, if the gentleman would not be willing for the chairman of the committee to ask unanimous consent that the bill be read through without discussion, reported to the House, and passed by unanimous consent. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I will relieve the gentleman from Michigan from answering the question; I should object.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying in the last bill, we authorized the construction of four dreadnaughts and four battle cruisers. Contracts have already been awarded for the construction of the four dreadnaughts, but as yet no contracts have been awarded for the four battle cruisers. The reason why no contracts have been awarded for the battle cruisers is that the bids ran about \$2,000,000 in excess of the amount authorized in the bill last August. Under those circumstances it was impossible, of course, for the Secretary of the Navy to let a contract for those ships. Now, in the bill which was passed in August we realized that it would be pretty difficult both for the Government and the shipbuilders to ascertain what would be a fair price for ships of this character, as they were entirely a new type of ship, especially at a time when the prices of labor and materials were constantly rising. Business men naturally hesitate about going into a \$20,000,000 contract, or thereabouts, covering a period of three or four years, when the price of labor and materials is steadily advancing. So we put in the bill at that time a provision that if it were advisable and the circumstances at the time warranted it the Secretary of the Navy might enter into a contract for these ships upon a percentage plan—that is, the Government to pay for the cost of the labor and material and a certain percentage for overhead and profit on top of that. This is the only kind of a bid that any of the shipbuilders of the country desired to make, and it seemed, in the judgment of the department and in the judgment of the shipbuilders, that under all the circumstances it was a reasonable sort of contract to make at a time when nobody could tell what the price of labor or materials might be month by month. As I say, the estimate of cost is higher than that provided in the bill, and so this bill provides for increasing the authorization from sixteen and a half million dollars for machinery and hull to \$19,000,000. Now, of course, if the contracts are awarded on that basis, as the construction of the ships proceeds, if the price of labor or material falls, then Congress will get the benefit of such decline in price, and so it is thought that with this authorization of \$19,000,000 there will be no difficulty, probably, in arranging for the contracts of all the ships of this type which were authorized in the last bill.

But the time for construction which these shipbuilders place finally after much canvassing of the situation between themselves and the Government, is 46 months at the best. This introduces a further element of delay which was not contemplated by Congress when the authorization was made and which under all the circumstances of the situation to-day, it seems to me should not be permitted if there is any way to avoid it. Now, this bill makes an appropriation for three more dreadnaughts and one more battle cruiser. There will be no difficulty in making contracts for these ships probably on the same basis as the others. But the time question, as is proposed by the present authorization, is 44 to 46 months. Now, the reason which they give for not being able to complete these ships any sooner than 46 months is the fact that they claim it is absolutely impossible to get the labor with which to do the work; that it is not a question of material, or question of extending the facilities, because they are willing to extend them and have them all ready by the time the material is ready, but that it is absolutely impossible to increase the number of shifts because the entire shipbuilding skill of the country is already employed. Much of it, of course, employed upon private contracts for American citizens and for citizens of foreign countries.

And so we come squarely up to this proposition, it seems to me: This Government is entitled to have such protection as we here, representing the American people, deem it wise that we should provide. But it is utter folly for us, it seems to me, under the conditions now confronting the country, to make contracts that will run over 46 months before the ships are ready.

Now, the Secretary of the Navy himself has suggested a remedy in the form of some proposed legislation, and I will read the Secretary's proposition:

Draft of proposed provision for insertion in the naval appropriation bill giving the Navy Department authority to require private manufacturers to give preference to Government work.

In all cases where contracts have been made or orders placed for ships, or munitions, or material entering into the construction of ships or the making of munitions, the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and empowered, when in his judgment the exigencies of the public service demand it, to require the contractor or the individual company, association, or corporation with which such order may have been placed to give preference to the fulfillment thereof and precedence of the work over all other work except for the Government.

Now, gentlemen, if we are going to have these ships, there is only one way to get them. There is not labor enough of this character in the United States to complete the work for private individuals now in these yards and also complete the work for the Government inside of a period of 46 months. And therefore, it seems to me, in justice to the people of the country at large, we ought to take steps in this bill to see to it that the protection of the American people is attended to first before other work is carried on. Now, as I take it, there is no other course open. I know of no other possible way. Forty-four to forty-six months is too long a time, but if we withdraw the men from private contracts and put them onto these Government contracts and perhaps temporarily suspend the eight-hour provision, so that the men might work 10 hours instead of 8—and I am only suggesting that—we could shorten the time of construction of these ships from 46 months to somewhere about 20 months. And that perhaps might even be shortened. At any rate, it seems to me, whatever the future may have in store for this great people, we ought not to take any chances by deferring the needed and necessary work for this Government for anything like 44 months. [Applause.]

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I can not yield just now.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] has made a minority report, a gentleman for whom I have the very highest esteem and who has rendered great service to this House in the Committee on Naval Affairs. His objection to this appropriation for ships is not because he does not desire that the ships shall be built, but that they are being deferred too long. And, while he is in company on the minority report with some members of the committee who perhaps would not build any ships at all, I want to say for the distinguished gentleman from Alabama that I believe if this provision, or some such provision, is inserted in the bill as would insure the speedy construction of these ships, he will withdraw his support from those making the minority report.

Mr. OLIVER. And I think I can state that is true of every member who signed the minority report.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield at that point? I would like to get it straight in the RECORD as to why there is a delay. Is it due to the refusal of the private shipowners to do the work for the Government?

Mr. KELLEY. No; they can not get the men to do it. They are willing to do the work without any question, willing to go ahead and make the necessary improvements to get their yards ready, so as not to delay the construction of the ships, but the shortage of men, owing to the great amount of work in the private yards of the country, makes it impossible to do this work in any shorter period of time. And that is why the Government of the United States, exercising its sovereign authority, is entitled to go into these yards and ask that the Government business be given precedence.

Now, it seems to me, if we are going to be sure as a people, that the rights of our citizens are to be protected everywhere in the world, when they are where they have a right to be, and when they are behaving themselves. And I want to say that the nation that does not protect its citizens on land or on sea, under these circumstances, is apt to wake up too late to find that, on the other hand, it has lost the protection of its citizens. [Applause.]

This matter of protection is not a one-sided proposition. If the American people should ever get it into their heads that they were to be called upon when the Government was in danger, but that the Government would not respond in like degree when the citizen was in danger, the beginning of the decline of patriotism and love of country would be at hand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, this is an hour for reflection and serious consideration, and I desire to address myself to the best intelligence and patriotism and wisdom of the Members of the House.

It has been my practice as well as my belief in the years gone by that there should be no partisanship in the Navy or in the legislation for the Navy. It has been my conviction that partisanship should stop at the water's edge, if not before, and I believe that under the circumstances and conditions in which

we find ourselves at this time that sentiment will find a cordial reception and expression from every Member of the House.

In the discussion that has taken place there are two matters that have been presented to which I desire to call attention: One of them, that was presented in one phase, but which during the discussion has been very much modified and mollified, was that there should be a postponement of the construction of the battleships and the battle cruisers and the scout cruisers proposed in the pending appropriation bill. That may be an unimportant matter as to which Members may disagree, but to me it is a very important question. In the last session of the Congress this House by a very large majority, free from partisanship, in which both sides joined, adopted a three-year program to build a definite number of battleships, battle cruisers, submarines, torpedoboot destroyers, and other auxiliary ships not necessary to enumerate in detail, and in the bill last year we made appropriation for the immediate construction of a certain number of these vessels of various types. We are now approaching the question of appropriating for the second year's portion of the three-year program.

Let me sum up in a few words. In the last session of Congress by solemn enactment of law we declared in favor of and provided for a definite program of construction. We put our hands to the plow. I do not propose to look back. We made a covenant with the people, and I regard that covenant with the people of this country with the same sincerity and solemnity as I regard a covenant with my God. [Applause.] Gentlemen, this is not the hour to hesitate. In this hour "he who hesitates is lost, and he who doubts is damned." [Applause.]

Again, my friends, I shall take no further notice of that, because I do not believe there is any serious purpose or intention on the part of the membership of this House not to carry out in the utmost good faith the program that was determined upon at the last session of the Congress.

Now, another question has been raised, and that was a very severe criticism of the administration of the Navy Department. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTON], a member of the committee, deemed it proper, in very caustic language and by a demeanor that indicated an intense feeling, to subject, or attempt to subject, the Secretary of the Navy to a very severe arraignment and criticism with reference to the construction of ships, and I deem it well to call attention to some of the matters with reference to that.

The gentleman from Illinois called attention to the submarines. Let me invite your attention for a moment, if you please, to some matters in that respect. You will bear in mind, as was so well explained by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], who has just taken his seat, that the submarine has been and is now in a state of development and transition. He stated that the first submarine was of about 200 tons' surface displacement. He overstated it. They were about 65 feet long and of about 65 tons' displacement, as I now remember. They were very small. Construction of a number of them was authorized June 7, 1900. The contracts were signed August 25, 1900. The contract date of completion was April 25, 1901—eight months. The contracts provided for the completion of these little 65-foot 65-ton submarines in eight months. And yet, as a matter of fact, they were not completed, one of them, until June 24, 1903, and the earliest one on January 9, 1903; in other words, more than two years after the time of expected completion.

Why? Because there developed difficulties—things that were never contemplated. Complications arose, so that in respect of these small submarines that they contracted to deliver in eight months they were two years and eight months in delivering them.

Several years ago, when Admiral Cone, Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering, was before our committee during the administration as chairman of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss], the question was asked, "What about the engines in the submarine?" They were telling us of the troubles and the difficulties, and I asked, "How many parts or pieces are there in one of these engines?" And he said, "Between 1,400 and 1,500 different pieces." Later on, by reason of improvements and developments, they had reduced them down to 700 or 800 pieces.

You see at once in this an illustration of some of the troubles that have been encountered. We have not yet been able to get satisfactory storage facilities or batteries for the electricity. Only a few months ago experimenting with the Edison battery in a submarine there was an explosion that killed 5 or 6 workmen and injured 8 or 10 or 12 additional workmen.

These troubles have been well spoken of by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY]. We have not been content to

rest on what we had. The duty of the administration to the people of this country was to progress and secure the very best that could be had in the study and development of the submarine construction, as well as in the batteries, in the engines, and in the hull and machinery. I could take up, if you please, the history of this and show you that it has been one continued development in all the types. As they have progressed from a better to a better and still better submarine they have experienced difficulties. My friends, bear in mind also when you read in the newspapers about foreign accomplishments, that they are advertising their exceptional successes, and that in this country we are advertising our failures.

You can take the same thing with reference to destroyers and the same with reference to the building of battleships. Why, back in the other days, when the battleships were of a displacement of from 12,000 to 16,000 tons or up to about 20,000 tons displacement, they were from six to seven years in constructing them, though they were much simpler. And you could take the various other types. I am mentioning this not for the purpose of invidious comparison, but to show you that this administration and the preceding administrations have had their same difficulties, and it has always been to me a matter of comfort that, as chairman of this committee during the latter two years of the administration of President Taft, when there was a Republican Secretary of the Navy, I realized and appreciated the difficulties under which we were laboring in these matters, and I attempted to lend him a helping hand, and not to go after him in bickering and in violent denunciation and criticism. [Applause.] The department had its difficulties and its troubles, and upon several occasions the former Secretary of the Navy saw fit to express to me his thanks and his appreciation of the way in which I had labored and cooperated with him.

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

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman knows my great feeling for him, but I have been on that committee, and the gentleman may know that we had differences with Secretary Meyer when he was there.

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly. I did not agree with his policy in many respects. Many of his policies I did not agree with. I have not seen fit to agree with all the policies of the present Secretary. And yet, as a matter of fact, while I have differed with him upon many of his policies, while I saw fit to criticize some of his acts, I always saw fit to do so upon the merits of the matter.

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

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I think we will all agree that no matter what may have been done in the past, we ought to do everything we can to expedite the work now.

Mr. PADGETT. Exactly.

Mr. TOWNER. I want to ask the gentleman this question. It has been stated to me that there is a feeling in the Government, by those who are immediately in charge of the work in the Government yards, that they will not operate more than one shift of workmen a day. That is, they discourage it. They do not attempt to operate more than one shift a day. What can the gentleman say to the House with regard to that? Is there anything in that?

Mr. PADGETT. Let me read you something that bears on that question. And that brings us to the question of labor.

Mr. TOWNER. Let me make this further inquiry, so that the gentleman can give attention to that if he will, because I think in the minds of most Members of the House that is the most important proposition now.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman knows I made the inquiry to ascertain the fact about it, because I think it is vastly important that we should do everything we can to expedite the work.

Mr. PADGETT. Just exactly so.

Mr. TOWNER. I made that inquiry with regard to Government plants. It is stated with regard to private plants that in the past private plants have always put the Government work at a disadvantage, because whenever a more paying contract was made they wanted to be able to take workmen away from the Government work, and have done so continuously. What is the fact in regard to that? I do not limit the criticism to this administration. I want it to apply to any administration. If we can remedy those conditions we ought to do so.

Mr. PADGETT. I shall take that up very fully a little later. It has also been said that the present administration was lacking in business adaptation and business success, and that it was making no progress and accomplishing nothing for the

Navy. I want to call your attention, if you please, to a fact or two. I am reading from a table sent down by the General Board of the Navy. The *Delaware* was the first ship constructed that is now recognized as a dreadnaught, and it is taken as the basis, and represents a fighting value or efficiency of 100. Those that have been constructed since show you whether there is development, whether there is progress and efficiency in the work of the department. Take for instance the *Arizona*. It represents a fighting efficiency of 230.84. The *New Mexico* represents 267.83. The *Mississippi* and *Idaho* the same. They are sister ships, authorized at the same time. The *Tennessee* and *California* represent a fighting value or efficiency of 273, as against 100 for the *Delaware*, which is taken for the standard. Last year we authorized four battleships to be known as the *Colorado*, *Maryland*, *Washington*, and *West Virginia*. Each of these represents a fighting value or efficiency of 286.

In the bill now pending we are providing for three battleships of larger tonnage and larger guns, and they represent a fighting efficiency of 380 as compared with 100, the standard of the first dreadnaught, or nearly four times its fighting efficiency.

The same may be said of the submarines and the torpedo boats. Why, you hear gentlemen speak of our torpedo boats. I will read to you in a moment what Capt. Sims said about torpedo boats. First, I want to call your attention to another matter, as to whether there has been any increase in efficiency. Take the increase in officers. Under Mr. Roosevelt's administration, in the last four years of it, there were appointed to the Naval Academy 978. In the four years of Taft's administration, 945; under Wilson, 1,473 in three years.

Take the enlistments. Under Mr. Roosevelt in 1905 we had authorized 37,000 men. In 1908 the number was raised to 44,500. In 1909, under Mr. Taft, it was still the same. In 1912, under Mr. Taft, the authorization was raised to 51,500. Under Mr. Wilson it has been raised to 78,200, with an additional emergency provision for still more.

Take the navy-yard increase in the number of men working. On June 1, 1913, there were 16,898 men working in the navy yards. In 1916 there were 24,383. Take the daily pay. In 1912 the daily pay was \$46,027.35. In 1916 it was \$73,091.12. Comparison of pay showing daily pay: In 1912 it was \$2,723, and in 1916, \$2,997.

Take the enlisted men promoted. Warrant officers appointed ensigns: Under Roosevelt 10, under Taft 3, and under Wilson 17. Mr. LONGWORTH. Before the gentleman leaves that, can he state what is the present actual shortage in enlisted men?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; we have at the present time to-day enlisted men 53,441, and in addition we have 1,309 assigned to the Naval Militia, not a part of the Naval Militia but training and developing, making 54,750 in enlisted personnel, exclusive of prisoners.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Out of the total authorization of how many?

Mr. PADGETT. Seventy-eight thousand two hundred.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Can the gentleman tell what the gain in the past year has been?

Mr. PADGETT. I can give you the gain for the last three months. In the bill that we passed on the 29th of August last we made an increase in benefits for enlisted men, and that had to be advertised over the country and gotten out to the people. In November we had a net gain of 384 over the discharges. In December we had a gain of 573, and in January we had a net gain of 1,344.

I have a monthly statement of the increases or decreases only as far back as 1913, but beyond that the records do not show.

In November, 1913, the net gain was 1,623. In 1914, November, 102. In November, 1915, it was a loss of 14, and in 1916 it was a gain of 384. In December, 1913, there was a net gain of 646. In 1914 there was a net gain of 39. In 1915 there was a net loss of 151. In December, 1916, there was a net gain of 573. In January, 1914, there was a net gain of 793, and in 1915 there was a net gain of 375. In January, 1916, there was a net gain of 576, and in January, 1917, there was a net gain of 1,344.

Mr. LONGWORTH. One more question. How near does the present authorization bring the Navy to the full fighting strength?

Mr. PADGETT. If the authorization was full, it would take care of all the ships that we have ready and in commission. It would not take care of those not completed. We have a number of ships that are not completed. The present authorization will take care of all the ships completed.

Mr. TOWNER. Before the gentleman leaves that point, the principal question I would like to have discussed is why the Government yards can not work more than one shift a day.

Other yards are working two and three shifts a day. There is hardly a munition factory but what is working two or three shifts. Our emergency is just as great as theirs, and why can not the Government yards work more than one shift?

Mr. PADGETT. The Government is working but one shift a day for the reason that shipbuilding yards in this country can only work one shift a day. The gentleman is in error in saying that private yards are working more than one shift a day. They can hardly get the labor for one shift a day. The labor question is the trouble. I want to say to the gentleman that there has been a great deal of criticism of the Government and the private shipbuilders. I want to be entirely fair to both. I do not want to stand here and improperly criticize either one of them. Both of them are up against the same difficulties and the same trouble. Let me give you some statements. We had shipbuilders before us, and we went into this matter very fully with them. We had Mr. Powell, president of the Fore River Shipbuilding Co., and he said:

It seems to me, in looking over the testimony that the committee has heard for the last two days, that very little stress has been laid on what is really the one big important topic, and that is that the carrying out of this program does not depend on facilities; it depends on labor.

Again, he said:

The important factor that controls the building of these ships at the present time is the skilled iron-working trades, and until we can boost up our production along those lines, the production of ships can not be increased. It does not make a bit of difference whether this committee gives the Secretary of the Navy all the money there is in the Treasury to put into the building of ships, ways and shops in Government yards; you are not going to get your ships built any faster than the supply of skilled labor in the metal-working trades is built up.

Again:

Mr. ROBERTS. Do you know whether or not the other private yards have had the same difficulty in getting their labor?

Mr. POWELL. I know that some of them have; yes. This is not a local question; it is a national question to-day.

Mr. SABATH. When was the report made of the shortage of labor?

Mr. PADGETT. This that I am reading from is January 15, 1917, in the hearings before the committee. And, then, here is Mr. Mull, from the Cramp shipbuilding yards. Speaking of the troubles they have, he says:

In the last year we hired 8,407 men to gain 1,916.

Mr. ROBERTS. It is about like the enlistments in the Army and Navy?

Mr. MULL. A little worse.

Then Mr. Knox says:

Mr. BROWNING. I think the difficulty is further back than that. I will give you my personal opinion now. I do not believe that it is possible for this program to be completed, either by the private builders or by the Government yards, in the length of time that the Navy Department or the Government or your committee hope to get it, for the reason that the labor does not exist. I think it makes very little difference whether you appropriate six million or twelve million or eighteen million or any number of millions of dollars more. There is only just so much shipbuilding labor in this country, as I see it, and that labor can only build those ships in a certain length of time. You can not make this shipbuilding labor in time to finish this program in the few months that you hope.

Furthermore, Mr. Snyder, vice president of the Bethlehem Corporation, stated:

It should be understood that labor competent to do work of this kind must be especially trained. Shipbuilding construction on a large scale is new in this country, and the necessary men already trained to do such work are simply not to be found. Some 61 per cent of the steel workers in our Fore River plant, for instance, have been with the company less than one year, and in order to do the work now in hand we have found it necessary to organize systematic forces of instruction, which are now being conducted at all our plants in an effort to develop skilled workmen.

I am simply calling your attention to what we have run up against. Again, I refer to statement of Mr. Snyder, the vice president of one of the companies, speaking of the fact that this labor has to be educated, has to be trained; and Mr. Powell stated to the committee that they had established schools and were, at their own expense, training and educating and developing the labor to expedite shipbuilding. These private yards are up against that. The Navy Department officials say that they are up against that also. There has sprung up in this country a number of commercial shipbuilding yards that have started up overnight since the beginning of this war, and they are taking commercial ships only. They do not take Government work at all; they do not ask for it; they do not bid for it. Those concerns are offering such large prices that they are taking the labor from these yards that do Government work and putting that labor into private commercial industry. One of them, Mr. Powell, said that at a certain date—I have forgotten the date, but it is in the hearings—their company had 5,000 employees on their pay roll, and that, notwithstanding all of their efforts, they had been cut down to 3,000.

Just here I wish to read what Capt. Sims stated about torpedo boats in the Skagerrack battle in reply to comments of Mr. BRITTEN:

Mr. OLIVER. What was the effect of the torpedo attack?

Capt. SIMS. The effect of the torpedo fire was more or less disappointing. We would have expected it to be more effective than it was. The torpedo destroyers they have there are not as powerful as ours. Their boats are sometimes fitted with 3 or 4 torpedo tubes, while we have from 6 to 12 tubes. Our newest destroyers have 4 triple tubes, or 12 altogether. Many of them are less able boats than ours are; but they were not driven home the way we would have expected when opportunities occurred like that.

I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a year ago I propounded some questions to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] and also to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], and I never did get very much information from either. What I asked then and what I ask now is how does it happen that other nations can construct battleships so much more quickly than we can?

Mr. PADGETT. We have the list there showing the time, and if the gentleman will examine that he will find that there is not a very great difference between our country and England in time of peace.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What about war times?

Mr. PADGETT. In war times they commandeered and force the labor into the shipyards.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the least time in which England ever builds a battleship?

Mr. PADGETT. I think it is about two years and two months. I think that is the best time they have ever made, from the laying of the keel until the boat is in commission.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We have been going on here for the last two or three years voting large amounts of money to build battleships. If we can not get them when we need them, what is the sense of voting the money?

Mr. PADGETT. We are building just as fast as we can. England is an old shipbuilding country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But we have been building ships in this country for 125 or 130 years.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, but in a very limited way.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Can not a navy yard that can construct a merchant ship build a battleship?

Mr. PADGETT. But the navy yards do not construct commercial ships. We have had only one navy yard in this country up to last year that attempted to build battleships.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We have plenty of money, and there is no trouble of getting it if we have not got it; and what is the reason they do not put all of these navy yards or building establishments to constructing battleships?

Mr. PADGETT. Simply because there is not one of them that is fitted up for it. It takes millions of dollars to fit a navy yard for building a battleship, and in the bill last August we carried an appropriation of \$6,000,000 to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to equip certain yards, and he is going ahead with it. In this very bill we are submitting an additional appropriation of \$12,000,000 to enable him to do it, but that does not relieve the labor situation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What I was trying to get at is whether we can not go on and build these battleships that we have authorized. We must have eight or ten of them authorized.

Mr. PADGETT. There are five in course of construction, and then there are four that were authorized in August last, making nine.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The way we are dawdling along we are liable to get these battleships constructed about three or four or five years after we need them.

Mr. PADGETT. I hope it will not be as bad as that; but the Navy Department is doing the best it can with the labor in the country. Bear in mind this, and we must not overlook it: England is a country of large capacity for building ships. It is a great industry there. They build ships for all the world. We have not even been building for ourselves, except our naval ships. England has a large population, millions of people, who are engaged in the shipbuilding industry as laborers. We have not got them; we have not trained them; we have not developed them. Since this war came on there has sprung up this great demand for ships, and, as I said, yards have sprung up all over the country for the building of ships, and they are paying tremendous prices for the labor. One of the gentlemen stated that they were paying ordinary workmen \$6.50 a day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time was fixed in the House. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAY, MISCELLANEOUS.

The Secretary of the Navy shall send to Congress at the beginning of its next regular session a complete schedule or list showing the amount of money of all pay and for all allowances for each grade of officers in the Navy, including retired officers, and for all officers included in this act and for all enlisted men so included.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to ask me any more questions?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I do not want to ask any more questions.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. The preparedness movement in which we have been engaged, I assume, is a recognition of the fact that there is need of ships, pretty nearly as much as if we were at war. Has anything been done to counteract the movement of transferring men from Government yards to private yards?

Mr. PADGETT. They are bidding against each other. The private yards are trying to get all of the men they can, but the navy yards have been holding their forces pretty well.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Yes; but the gentleman mentioned one case where 2,000 men were lost.

Mr. PADGETT. They went to private yards.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. From Government yards?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; they went from a private yard to another private yard. For instance, the Fore River Co.; the president of that company, Mr. Powell, stated that he had 5,000 men on his pay roll working, and that when these other yards had sprung up over the country they had no nucleus and they needed men to come in there, and they are paying extraordinary wages, and that they have taken away from the old-established yards that are building Government work, as these new works that are bidding for commercial work had two or three times the profits they could get out of Government work.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Are these men who are being transferred from private yard to private yard qualified to do the work in Government yards?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Now, is the necessity so great that there should be some method of commandeering their services?

Mr. PADGETT. Well, that is the question the gentleman is prepared to answer as well as I am.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I thought the committee might have given that question consideration.

Mr. PADGETT. I will say here it is my purpose, and I have here an amendment which I will read for information and as a tentative draft. This is an amendment suggested by the Secretary, with this change: That instead of authorizing the Secretary of the Navy the authority is given to the President of the United States.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I will.

Mr. GARNER. If I understood the gentleman's statement correctly, it is this: That Congress has appropriated the money; that the ships are being built as fast as labor can be secured to build them.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. GARNER. And if the fault lies anywhere at all, it is the fault of not having trained labor in this country to build ships?

Mr. PADGETT. That is just what it is. And not only that, you must bear in mind that in a battleship there is somewhere from three to four million dollars' worth of steel that has to be manufactured in the steel plants. They have to have their trained metal workers, and they are short there. The armor plate is made by the private manufacturers, and that requires time.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Tennessee does not want to convey to the House the impression that you can not get steel from the steel plants or the armor plate from the armor-plate plants and at the time lead the country and the House to believe we ought to build an armor-plate plant that would not be able to build a pound of armor plate in the next 25 years?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know how long it will take them. Of course, there have been delays in time. I am only calling attention to what Mr. Knox, the president of the Bethlehem Steel Co., stated about getting steel. I have it here. He said they were up against the question of getting steel and they had several times been in a famine where they could not get from the manufacturers what they needed in steel.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee this question: With all of these appropriations that we have made for battleships, because we supposed we might need them, are we building a battleship any faster now than two or three years ago?

Mr. PADGETT. About the same rate. Those that have been authorized in the bill passed the 29th of August they had to advertise for bids, and the bids were opened, I believe, in November and the contracts awarded early in December. They have to give out their orders when the contractors get them; they have to give out orders for three and a half or four million dollars' worth of steel plate, steel fittings, and so forth, that go into the ships, and they have to be manufactured and manufactured according to specifications.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, now, these newspapers are always bullying Congress about Congress being stingy about these appropriations—

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and there is no ground for bullying.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Not a bit in the world; it is all a lie; but what I wanted to know is, is there any way known to man by which we can hurry up the building of the battleships?

Mr. PADGETT. The only one I know of is for the Government to exercise the right of eminent domain on labor, which we call commandeering, and put them into the yards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five more minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman be given five minutes, as we have taken up his time.

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

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to make another statement in this connection while I think of it: The officers of the Fore River Co., the Newport News Co., and the New York Shipbuilding Co. have stated that at the present time from 71.6 to 75 per cent of their building facilities are occupied with Government work. The lowest one was 71.6 and the highest one was about 74.4 per cent at the present time devoted to Government work.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. In the last year's bill, the current year's bill, we provided \$6,000,000 to rehabilitate the Government navy yards.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. And this bill provides \$12,000,000, I understand, so that would make \$18,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, will the gentleman be able to state to the House how long it is going to take the Navy Department to spend this \$18,000,000 so it can put itself in a position to do any work in the construction of battleships?

Mr. PADGETT. About from a year to a year and a half.

Mr. MADDEN. And up to that time nothing whatever can be done in the way of construction?

Mr. PADGETT. A great deal can be done. Let me explain that if the contracts be awarded, as I stated a moment ago, they give out contracts for steel, for plates, fittings, and all that, amounting to three and one-half or four million dollars. They have to be manufactured according to specifications to meet the particular work for which they are intended.

Mr. MADDEN. And they assemble that in anticipation of preparing the yards?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir. They spoke about the battleship *Tennessee* in the New York Navy Yard. I have a letter here from the Secretary of the Navy, dated to-day, and I ask permission to insert it in the RECORD, explaining about the construction and what has been attempted. I do not have time to read it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of the Navy referred to. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letter is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 3, 1917.

MY DEAR MR. PADGETT: Replying to your request for information bearing upon alleged delays in the construction of naval vessels under this administration, the following is furnished:

When I took office I found a number of vessels just authorized by the act of March 4, 1913. Although these vessels were authorized technically in the preceding administration, of course their construction has been wholly under this administration. All vessels prior to March 4, 1913, had been contracted for by my predecessor, except three submarines, for which bids had been opened in December, 1912, and awards made by my predecessor, though the contracts had not been formally signed. These contracts were signed on March 15, 1913. But within the first year the company to which the awards had been

made found itself in financial difficulty, and it was necessary to abrogate the contracts. In the case of two vessels whose construction was advanced, the Government, as provided by the contract, took them over for completion. They were commissioned February 6-March 22, 1915. The other three were, after some unavoidable delay, contracted for with a new company completely reorganized from the former company and under different management, though of nearly the same name. This accounts for the fact that three submarines authorized in 1912 were not finally contracted for until 1914. These vessels are now practically completed, one of them undergoing builder's trials at present, and should be delivered about a year behind their contract time.

The other submarines authorized at the same time did not have the same complications in connection with their contracts and have now been delivered, but they also were in every case a good deal more than a year behind their contract time.

It does not appear, then, that if the department at the time the old Lake Co. failed had assigned these boats to the only other private company building submarines the result as regards time would have been materially better, and the country would now be in the position of having only one private concern able to undertake the construction of submarine vessels.

In this connection it may be remarked that one of the submarines delivered within the last year was completed within the contract time. The last time that this happened was in the cases of the *D-2* and *D-3*, completed in 1909, which share with the *L-11* the distinction of having been completed within their contract period.

Statements have been made that American shipbuilders have completed 20 submarines for England in five months and an 800-ton submarine for Spain, of the *U-53* type, in 12 months. It is a fact that 2 years ago a combination of American and Canadian shipbuilders completed in approximately 5 months not 20 but 10 small submarines, duplicates of the *H* class of the United States Navy—a type which would not be built at this time. The testimony of Mr. J. W. Powell, the president of the Fore River Co., before the Naval Committee explained this transaction, it being pointed out that the work was done in a time of depression in this country and under extraordinary inducements for speed which could not be given in time of peace by any nation. No 800-ton submarine has been built in this country for Spain or any other nation within 12 months. There is a submarine under construction for Spain, which is practically a duplicate of our *M-1*, and of something less than 500 tons displacement. The *M-1* is long overdue. She is completed, but so far the contractors have been unable to meet her contract trial requirements. It is not known whether the foreign submarine has been finally accepted or whether her trial requirements are equal to those of the *M-1*.

As regards submarine construction in navy yards, the *L-8* at Portsmouth is building upon the plans of the Lake Co., the results being guaranteed by them. Her construction has been delayed by delay in the completion of the engines, which are not being built by the Government but by a private contractor. Had it not been for the engine delays this vessel, as well as the *L-5*, *L-6*, and *L-7*, would have been completed some time ago. The *O-1* and *O-2* will be built in navy yards upon the plans of the Electric Boat Co., being duplicates of the other *O* vessels assigned to that company. The hulls are to be constructed at Portsmouth and Puget Sound; the engines at the New York Navy Yard. The engines are now more than 25 per cent completed and further along than the engines of the sister vessels building by contract. In order to avoid the experience of the *L-8*, where the vessel is practically complete but compelled to wait months for engines, the hulls have not been pushed so far, but material is assembled, and it is expected to complete them in time to receive the engines.

The department has urged contractors with all its power from the first to speed up the construction of naval vessels. A typical case occurred recently in connection with bids for the coast submarines, authorized at the last session of Congress. The department, in advertising, named 22 months as the maximum time for beginning delivery. The principal bidder named 25 months as the time for having the first vessel completed ready for trial, which would mean 26 months at least for beginning delivery. The department refused to accept this bid. After prolonged negotiations the best that the contractor would undertake was to begin delivery in 23 months. Congress, in the act, authorized premiums to be paid for speedy delivery. The department in its advertisement considered \$475 a day an adequate premium for advanced delivery. One submarine bidder refused to bid on the premium basis at all; the other demanded a much larger premium. The contract was finally closed upon the basis of \$700 a day premium. The department regarded this as very high, but in view of present conditions felt it necessary to accept it.

As regards the *Henderson* and *Bridge*, the circular called for their construction within 24 months. Bids received were so much higher than the estimates for their construction in navy yards that the department recommended to Congress that navy yards be fitted up for their construction. This necessarily involved delay. The vessels were authorized by act of March 4, 1913, but the authorization of Congress to fit navy yards for their construction was contained in the act of June 30, 1914. Navy yards were promptly fitted up, and the keels of these vessels laid in June, 1915. They would both have been completed this month except for delays in obtaining forgings from which the whole shipbuilding industry has recently suffered, but they will be completed within less than two years each from the date of laying the keel.

As regards destroyers: The first navy-yard-built destroyer was the *Shaw*, ordered built at the navy yard, Mare Island, because the estimate of the yard was far below the estimate of private contractors for vessels of the same class. Other work in hand delayed somewhat the laying of the keel of this vessel, but the keel was laid February 7, 1916, and the vessel is now practically completed, a very few months behind sister vessels. This would seem to be a fairly creditable record. There has been delay in the destroyer being built at Norfolk owing to the destructive fire at that yard.

As regards battleships: The record of this administration in connection with their construction is far different from that alleged. The *Arizona*, authorized March 4, 1913, built entirely under this administration, was commissioned in October, 1916. This time compares favorably with that of any previous battleship, particularly when it is considered that the *Arizona* is much larger than any vessel previously constructed. The *Arizona* was three years and seven months from authorization to commissioning. The *Pennsylvania*, a sister vessel built by contract was 3 years and 10 months. The *New Mexico*, which succeeded the *Arizona*, was directed by law to be built in a navy yard, and the New York Navy Yard was the only yard available for it. The *Arizona* occupied the only battleship ways at that yard, resulting in some delay in laying the keel.

It is true that the work upon the *New Mexico*, owing primarily to the shortage of labor, has not advanced as rapidly as the department would have liked, but the record of the New York yard on this vessel is creditable. Of the three sister vessels—*New Mexico*, *Idaho*, and *Mississippi*—the former being built at the New York Navy Yard and the latter by contract, the *New Mexico* hull construction progressed 44.4 per cent during the calendar year 1916, the *Mississippi* progressed 30.4 per cent, and the *Idaho* 17.7 per cent. At the present rate of progress it may be expected that the *New Mexico* will be completed certainly before one of the sister vessels building by contract, and probably before both of them. In the case of the *Tennessee* and *California*, as has been repeatedly explained, it was originally intended to build these vessels by contract. There was delay in advertisement due to the necessity of making changes in the designs as a result of experience in the European war to date. When advertised, no bids were received which would enable the vessels to be constructed within the limits of cost set by Congress. This necessitated their assignment to navy yards, requiring the Mare Island yard to be fitted up, and has involved delay in the laying of the keel of the *Tennessee* until the *New Mexico* at New York can be launched.

So far from nothing being done, the material for these ships was advertised immediately when it was found they would have to be built in navy yards, and contracts for it placed in December, 1915, at prices but little more than half of present prices. Over 7,000 tons of material have been delivered at New York for the *Tennessee* and a good deal more than this at Mare Island for the *California*, whose keel was laid in October last. The total progress of the *Tennessee* as measured by the standard methods of the department is 11 per cent to February 1. The machinery is under contract, and the contract provides for delivery well within the necessary time, not to delay the vessels.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the naval tonnage authorized to be constructed under this administration was greater in the very first act than in previous administrations, culminating in the unprecedented act of last year; also, that conditions in the shipbuilding industry are radically different from what they were in years gone by when work was at a low ebb, labor was plentiful, and material could be obtained easily and promptly. At present there is an unprecedented tonnage of private construction under way, in addition to the unprecedented naval program. Nevertheless the speed of naval building under this administration compares very favorably with the speed in years gone by, when conditions were infinitely more favorable.

The *Arizona* was completed in 3 years and 7 months from the date of authorization at the New York Navy Yard, and her sister ship, the *Pennsylvania*, in 3 years and 10 months by contract. Contrast this with the case, for instance, of the *Nebraska*, of less than half the displacement, authorized March 3, 1899, and completed May 31, 1907. The *Georgia* was authorized on March 3, 1899, and completed September 21, 1906. The *Virginia*, *New Jersey*, and *Rhode Island* made but little better showings, the shortest time from authorization to completion of any of these vessels being a little under six years.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

Hon. LEMUEL P. PADGETT, M. C.,
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives.

Mr. PADGETT. The keel of the ship *Tennessee* has not yet been laid. There were no bids received within the limit fixed by Congress, and they have assigned the *Tennessee* to the New York Navy Yard and the *California* to the Mare Island Navy Yard for construction. In the New York Navy Yard, on the ways, was the battleship *New Mexico*. The Secretary has met this labor condition that has delayed the construction of the *New Mexico* somewhat, so that the *Tennessee* has not been placed upon the ways. But in the meantime he has been gathering and assembling the materials that go into that ship, and I have his letter here to-day stating that he has more than 7,000 tons of that material already assembled awaiting the opportunity to get to work upon the ship, and when they do that they will expedite the work. They are prepared for it.

Now, one of the shipbuilders—I forget which one it was, but it is in the hearings—stated that if the contracts were awarded to the shipbuilding companies they would have to construct their ways. They have not ways for battle cruisers. A battle cruiser is so much longer than a battleship that they would have to construct these ways for it themselves. I asked, "How long will it take you?" He said, "At least a year." I then said to him, "Suppose we give you two, what about two ways?" He said, "One way in 12 and the other one some months longer than that." "But," I said to him, "Would that delay the final completion of the battle cruiser, the length of time it took to build the ways?" He said, "It would not delay at all, for the reason that while we were building the ways we would be carrying on concurrently the assembling and the manufacture of the materials that go into the ship that we have to have when we begin the construction."

Mr. MADDEN. They would not assemble it, they would simply store it. They could not assemble it until they got the material where the ship is to be built. Assembling means putting them together.

Mr. PADGETT. They would get them together up there. I mean gather them together and get them where they can put them into shape.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Have there been any improvements made in battleships in the last 12 or 18 months?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir. I just read a moment ago—

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. PADGETT. The first dreadnaught that was constructed was known as the *Delaware*. The *South Carolina* and *Michigan* were constructed prior to that time, and for a while were designated as dreadnaughts, but they are classed in what is called the predreadnaught type of ship. They are all battleships. Then the *Delaware* is taken as a standard of comparison. That represents the fighting efficiency of 100. The *Tennessee* and the *California*, that were authorized in the session of Congress before the last, represent a fighting efficiency of 273, and the four ships that were authorized on the 29th of August last represent a fighting efficiency of 286, because there are improvements made in the designing and in the contemplated construction. And in this present bill that we are now considering we are recommending the construction of three battleships that represent a fighting efficiency of 380. In other words, nearly four times the fighting efficiency and value of the *Delaware* that was the first dreadnaught a few years ago.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I followed the gentleman closely, and I gather from his argument that the problem is a labor problem.

Mr. PADGETT. Largely so, from what they tell us.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If these yards as equipped have skilled men enough to work two or three shifts a day, that would largely solve the problem?

Mr. BUTLER. It would.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Then how can we simplify it by expending \$12,000,000 to fit up other shipyards when we have not the skilled labor to efficiently build ships in the shipyards already in commission?

Mr. PADGETT. The question is this: There is more than a question of labor in the phase in which you state it. The question is of competition between the Government and the private shipbuilders. The department believes that in many instances the private shipbuilders ask them exorbitant prices and that the Government yards, as is insisted by the Secretary of the Navy, should be equipped to do construction, and then he would be prepared to construct in the Government yards, and he would purpose to give two-thirds of the construction to private yards and he would do one-third of it in the Government yards if he could get satisfactory prices from the private shipbuilders. But if he can not get satisfactory prices and satisfactory terms on time limits, then the Government would undertake to build them. And it would be a competition in the Government getting the labor from the private yards.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Is it not a fact that it is more the fault of Congress than the Navy Department that we have not now the facilities to go ahead and build battleships?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; I can not say that Congress is at fault, because the question of Government construction is a question and a policy that has arisen in late years.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Have they not kept on here trying to deny the right of the Government to construct battleships to a great extent and to do away with navy yards also?

Mr. PADGETT. I will answer the gentleman by saying that the policy in general has been to build in the private yards until recently.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I know it was considered a joke on the floor of the House when it was mentioned that three or four battleships were to be constructed in Government yards.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. PADGETT. With pleasure.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The gentleman from Tennessee has been giving some facts that I was trying to elicit in a colloquy a little while ago with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY]. I do not care to ask about the preparedness program authorized last year, because we all understand that practically little could have been done under that in the limited time that has elapsed since that authorization; but what I want to ask is this, with respect to the authorization which antedates that time: Has there been on the part of the department or on the part of the Secretary of the Navy any negligent delay, particularly with respect to those two ships that were authorized some time ago?

Mr. PADGETT. No; none whatever. I have inserted in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary, which gives the whole history of that matter. The gentleman was speaking of those two battleships?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes. Has there been any delay that could be called negligent delay?

Mr. PADGETT. No. I will give you the facts. In the first place, after those ships were authorized the war broke out in Europe, shortly following, and there were developments coming from that, so that the department thought it would be very advisable to take advantage of those developments and to vary to that extent the construction of these two ships from preceding types, and so they changed somewhat their plans.

In addition to that, no bids were received within the limit of cost, and the Secretary could not award those ships to private bidders because their bids exceeded the limits fixed by Congress. Thereupon the Secretary came to the first meeting of the Congress afterwards and laid all the facts before the Congress in the letter which I have put in the RECORD, and Congress passed a resolution appropriating \$500,000 to fit up the navy yard at Mare Island for the construction of one, and several hundred thousand dollars—I do not remember the precise amount—for additional facilities at the navy yard at New York. And then the department started to assemble and get together all the material, which takes a year or more to get.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Then in altering the plans of those two particular battleships, in order to get the benefit of the developments, he was then only exercising the discretion for which he should be commended instead of condemned?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. I have so stated on several occasions.

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

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY. Does not the gentleman think, as the matter has turned out now, that these two ships must be built in private yards where the price can not be named? Is not the Government thereby likely to lose two or three million dollars? The gentleman and I agree partly as to the facts.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; we agree as to the facts. You know what the Irishman said, that "One's hindsight was better than one's foresight by a damned sight." [Laughter.]

Mr. KELLEY. Yes; and I said I did not blame the Secretary for not being able to foresee the conditions. I agree with the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee.

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

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Tennessee is going to offer the amendment when we get to the right place, allowing certain powers to the President to compel the execution of contracts made with private parties?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. I have modified it somewhat. I have made it to read in the beginning—

In all cases where contracts have been made or may hereafter be made or orders heretofore or hereafter placed for ships—

So as to make it apply to the past as well as to the present and future.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman be good enough to read it, so that we can turn it over in our minds before we get through it?

Mr. GARDNER. It is rather long.

Mr. GARDNER. It is only a page of paper.

Mr. PADGETT. It is not very long. Here is what I propose to offer tentatively; I read it now for information:

In all cases where contracts have been made or may hereafter be made or orders heretofore or hereafter placed for ships, or munitions, or material entering into the construction of ships or the making of munitions, the President is hereby authorized and empowered, when in his judgment the exigencies of the public service demand it, to require the contractor or the individual, company, association, or corporation with which such order may have been placed to give preference to the fulfillment thereof and precedence of the work over all other work except work for the Government, and compliance with the requirements of the President in such cases shall be obligatory on the contractor or the individual, company, association, or corporation to which the same may be directed, subject to liability for damages to the Government for breach of contract: *Provided*, That in case of delay, neglect, or refusal on the part of a contractor or an individual, company, association, or corporation with which such orders may have been placed to proceed with the work to the satisfaction of the President, he may declare such contract or order forfeited and may take possession of the plant, shops, or works of the contractor, individual, company, association, or corporation and proceed with the completion of the work and charge to the account of the contractor, individual, company, association, or corporation all costs of completing the work in excess of the stipulated price.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee may have 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, that amendment which has been proposed in the hearing of the gentlemen present only takes care of the situation when a contract has already been made.

Mr. PADGETT. I have proposed "hereafter made" too.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; but if they decline to make a contract hereafter, then you have no way of compelling them. You have no way of commandeering the whole yard or any part of that yard.

Now, the gentleman remembers that when we passed the national-defense act last year we put into that act a provision—

Mr. PADGETT. I see the gentleman's point clearly before he states it, and if he will submit his suggestions I will be glad to consider them.

Mr. GARDNER. I have an amendment, and I will be very glad to offer it. I have it drawn. It was drawn on the principle of the national-defense act of last year, with an extension.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman allow me to make a suggestion in connection with his proposed amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. I notice that in the amendment which the gentleman proposes there is no provision to compensate the man whose property is taken over by the Government for any loss that he may sustain by reason of the Government taking possession of that property, although there is a provision that compels him to pay any excess cost that may be incurred by the Government. It does not seem to me that is fair or right.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is not legal either. That is more important. You can not take a man's property without compensating him for it.

Mr. PADGETT. I am bringing this before you tentatively.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand the gentleman has read the provision for the information of the committee.

Mr. PADGETT. It is simply tentative, because I want to get the benefit of the suggestions of gentlemen.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has pointed out what may be a very serious objection, that you are proposing to take property without any provision for compensation. That can not be done. Now, there is another suggestion that the gentleman ought to consider, and that is the power of Congress to change, or to modify, or to interfere with a contract already in existence. We can not now pass any law that adds to a contract a condition not in it, and declare it forfeited if that condition be not fulfilled.

Mr. MANN. Why not?

Mr. PADGETT. I think Congress might do it by paying damages.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no.

Mr. PADGETT. By paying the additional cost, I think Congress has the power.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not think it has.

Mr. PADGETT. I think the limitation the gentleman has in mind is upon States, and not upon Congress.

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

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LOUD. Would it not be well to embody in the amendment some provision doing away for the time being with the eight-hour limitation upon Government employees and Government contracts, by which the President might be empowered to set it aside temporarily in case of emergency?

Mr. PADGETT. The shipbuilders who were before us stated that their workmen individually would be glad of an opportunity to work more than eight hours. They say that it is almost unanimous on the part of the workmen. That is one of the limitations upon the capacity to build. The Government can get only men enough for one shift. These private yards can get only men enough for one shift, and they can work them only eight hours. Mr. Powell stated that he got it directly from one of the members of an English shipbuilding company, who told him personally, as he expressed it, over the table, that in England they work 24 hours, and work two shifts, one of them, as I remember, 14 hours and the other 10 hours, and that that is the way they are building ships there at the present time. But you know, as well as I know, that when you come to tamper with the eight-hour law, there are many Members in this House who would not follow the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Let me yield to the gentleman from Illinois first.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman believe there is a single Member of this House or of the Senate, or a patriotic citizen anywhere, who, if the stress of war were upon us, would hesitate to provide the proper legislation to enable men to have the opportunity to work who were willing to work, all the labor unions to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman has expressed his opinion, and each one is able to judge for himself of the temper of the individual Members of the House as well as I am. I have seen something in this House from time to time with reference to labor legislation. Personally I have always believed that an individual had as much right to sell any amount of his labor as he had to sell any amount of his corn or wheat.

Mr. CANNON. I am speaking now of a war condition.

Mr. PADGETT. You may be given an opportunity to test that matter.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is nothing in the law, as I understand it, that prevents men working.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I had not understood heretofore that the chairman of the committee purposed to offer the amendment that he read a few moments ago—

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman will understand that the conditions are shifting and changing very rapidly at this time.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I understand that very well, and that is my purpose in endeavoring to offer a suggestion to the chairman of the committee, which I think will help his amendment, if adopted.

Mr. PADGETT. I shall be glad to receive it.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. As I understand from the reading, he proposes to permit the President to take charge of private shipbuilding yards where the Government has a contract being performed, or where it hereafter makes a contract to be performed. Now, that is very well as far as it goes.

Mr. PADGETT. We also have under consideration a proposition with reference to taking them over where there is no contract.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I did not understand the gentleman had such a provision.

Mr. PADGETT. My amendment did not propose that, but the gentleman's colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] called attention to that, and I asked him to let me have it for the benefit of consideration, and it is a well-suggested amendment; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] also made a valuable suggestion with reference to providing compensation.

Mr. BUTLER. The payment of damages.

Mr. PADGETT. With reference to providing in the law what the courts would enforce, namely, compensation for the taking of property, if it should be taken.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I should like to suggest to the chairman, for his still further consideration, an addition to his amendment permitting the President, by his Executive order, to close private shipyards in order that the men might be taken out of the private yards and mobilized in such yards as the Government desires to use for construction. My object in that is to get at the shipbuilding establishments around the Great Lakes with which we do not make any naval contracts. There are thousands and thousands of tons of commercial ships being built every year on the Great Lakes, and there are thousands upon thousands of skilled shipbuilders around the Great Lakes who, under the amendment proposed by the chairman of our committee, could not be reached unless there were some power in the President to close down those yards. There is no object in making contracts with those yards, because you could not get their product out into the ocean where we need it, but we do want the benefit of the services of the men employed there.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Tennessee allow me to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] a question in his time?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Whether he thinks the Government of the United States should be permitted to go on the Great Lakes and personally seize possession of workmen and take them down to Massachusetts and put them in a shipyard there and set them to work? That is a fair and easy question.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That is a fair and easy question, and I will say this in answer—

Mr. PADGETT. It is an easy question to ask.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. When we are in war and need the services of skilled men to build fighting ships I am ready to go to any extent to compel private shipyards on the Great Lakes to let go of the skilled workmen, that they may come down on the seacoast—Massachusetts, if you please, or elsewhere—and get employment.

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

[By unanimous consent, Mr. PADGETT's time was extended five minutes.]

Mr. PADGETT. I want to say that the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts leads us far afield, and I am not prepared just now to discuss that.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. If I understood the gentleman from Tennessee, he said that the workmen who are now engaged in building ships in Government shipyards are almost universally in favor of longer hours?

Mr. PADGETT. I did not say Government yards. The shipbuilders told us that the men working in private yards favor that; but I have not gotten that from the men themselves. My authority is in the printed hearings.

Mr. GARNER. Is there anything in the law that prohibits them from working more than eight hours a day?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; by direct statute, passed several years ago by Congress, which expressly provides that all private yards doing Government work by contract shall operate their yards upon an eight-hour basis.

Mr. GARNER. Does that prohibit men working more than eight hours a day?

Mr. BROWNING. I want to say that it not only says that they shall work only eight hours, but eight hours in one day.

Mr. GARNER. That is what I want to get at. I want to ask the gentleman whether or not the law prohibits them from working more than eight hours in this way: Suppose they work eight hours and desire to work overtime. Does the law prohibit them from doing so?

Mr. PADGETT. It does. I will go still further. I asked Mr. Knox if that eight hours was a basic day, and if men wanted to work more than eight hours they could do so if they were paid extra. He said no; that although he had about 71 and a fraction per cent of his facilities engaged in Government work he could not operate his plant for 71 per cent on an eight-hour basis and the remaining 29 per cent on another basis. Therefore he had to operate the whole establishment on an eight-hour basis.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The eight-hour law applies to the Government plant in the same way?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They work more than eight hours a day in the Government yards.

Mr. PADGETT. No; except in emergencies.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; and they are doing it right now in the Government yards, and they pay them overtime. Eight hours a day is a standard day's work; but if they work more than eight hours a day they pay them extra wages. They are working two shifts now.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. There seems to be a feeling on the part of the House that a resolution of the kind the chairman has indicated should pass. I suggest that in view of the very great importance of that matter, in view of the fact that some doubt exists in the minds of some Members as to the exact authority and power of Congress in the matter, it might be well to refer it to the Department of Justice.

Mr. PADGETT. I will say that I thought when I got all the suggestions I would take the matter up personally in regard to framing the matter; but if we should send it officially down there to the Department of Justice I do not know when we would get it back.

Mr. BROWNING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BROWNING. I want to make a statement for the benefit of Members. The employees in the New York Shipbuilding Co. waited on me and asked if I could not introduce a bill that would allow 48 hours a week, so that they could have a Saturday half holiday, as every establishment in the city of Camden has. I introduced such a bill and had it referred to the Committee on Labor, and that committee refused to report the bill out. Mr. Knox said that he was perfectly willing that they should have the 48 hours a week, and stated how much efficiency he lost by these men not working Saturday afternoon. The bill is now pending before the Committee on Labor.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I ask this question for information. I understood the chairman to say that there are nine battleships authorized, five of which are partly constructed. Is that correct?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The information I want is, if the three additional battleships and the scout cruisers are authorized under this bill, if the appropriation is agreed to, can any one of them or how many of them can be completed in the year 1918?

Mr. PADGETT. They can all be begun, but none of them can be completed, because you can not build them in that short time. They can begin the construction of them. The shortest time that the shipbuilding companies bid on a battle cruiser in a written bid was 48 months, and one other 51 months, and the other one did not fix any time limit at all, but said it would do it as quick as it could. In consultation with the Secretary of the Navy in personal conversation the Secretary tried to see if he could not get them to agree to shorten the time, and they did verbally say that they would take 46 months, but that is practically four years.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Can they all be completed in the year 1918, even if none of the ships were authorized under this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. Not all; some will be. Four of the battleships that were authorized in the bill of August 29, 1916—the contracts were let in December and they are just assembling the material and getting ready.

There were four battle cruisers authorized in the act of August 29, 1916, but no contracts have been made for any of them. We have not been able to get the contracts. The shipbuilders say that they can not build them under \$19,000,000. The limit of cost fixed in the act is \$16,500,000. We have a provision in this bill increasing the limit of cost to \$19,000,000, so that the Secretary can make contracts or proceed with the construction himself. We authorized also four scout cruisers.

The Secretary advertised, and under the first advertisement he got one bid. The limit of cost was \$5,000,000. He got one bid for \$4,875,000 or \$4,975,000, I have forgotten which. He accepted that bid and awarded the contract. He then advertised the second time for the remaining three. He got bids for two and no bids for one, and the bids for two were upon the basis that if one were awarded it would cost \$5,900,000, and if two were awarded it would be \$5,825,000 each. In this bill we propose to raise the limit of cost to \$6,000,000 upon those. Under all of these bids there must be a leeway for changes, and the smallest safe margin would be 5 per cent.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Then, if I understand the chairman of the committee, the only expedition that could be made in carrying out this naval program by voting to appropriate the money to build the battleships and cruisers set forth in the bill would simply be that the contracts could be closed at an earlier date?

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, no; the men could go ahead and get ready to build them. If contracts were made with private yards, a number of yards have said that they would enlarge their facilities, and the Government is asking for money to enlarge its facilities, and while they were enlarging the facilities, in the private yards and in the navy yards, they would be getting together and assembling the materials. It takes a year to have the materials prepared. All of these steel products, amounting to three and a half or four million dollars for one of the battleships, have to be constructed according to specifications.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The point I am trying to get at is this: I understood the chairman to say that the program already authorized for 1917 could not be carried to completion in 1918.

Mr. PADGETT. You can not complete it. You can go ahead with the contracts, and the sooner you begin the sooner you will complete it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. If the 1917 authorizations can not be completed in 1918—

Mr. PADGETT. The contracts can be made for them.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Certainly, they could be made, but can we expedite the business any more by appropriating for this authorization when last year's authorization can not be completed in 1918?

Mr. PADGETT. We knew it could not be completed when we made the authorization. You can not build a battleship under three or four years.

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I know the chairman of the committee wants to be fair, as he always is on the question of the attitude of the labor organizations and the eight-hour day. In discussing the attitude of labor organizations with the gen-

tleman from Illinois, I understood the gentleman to say that the labor organizations were opposed to working overtime?

Mr. PADGETT. I have been so informed.

Mr. NOLAN. Does not the chairman know that in each and every one of our navy yards in time of emergency the men work, and are now working, over eight hours a day and being paid overtime?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; the law provides for it in case of emergency, but in these private yards they are limited to eight hours.

Mr. NOLAN. Let me follow that up by saying this: If you intend to legislate for the taking over of these private establishments by the Government, is it not reasonable to assume that the same conditions will prevail there?

Mr. PADGETT. They may, but I am simply speaking in general terms of the extreme sensitiveness of the labor organizations with reference to interference with the eight-hour law. I remember that several years ago we had before our committee the same proposition that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING] spoke of a moment ago, which was to establish a 48-hour week instead of eight hours a day for six days in the week, and the labor organizations had numbers of their representatives come before us and they solidly opposed it.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman does not state that correctly. It is not eight hours for six days in the week, but it is eight hours for five days and four hours for Saturday, making 44 hours for the week.

Mr. NOLAN. The gentleman is mistaken. The private yards can work six days a week at eight hours a day.

Mr. PADGETT. That is correct; that is what the law authorizes. I do not know what the practice is.

Mr. LOUD. Custom will not permit it.

Mr. NOLAN. Excepting during three months; that is the custom in the navy yards.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. NOLAN. The gentleman wants to be fair. Does the gentleman think that any labor organization in the country in time of emergency or in time of stress, when called upon to render patriotic service to the country, would object to their members working 16 or 18 hours a day?

Mr. PADGETT. I think not, and I sincerely hope not.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman a question, which I consider to be the one vital question of the whole controversy, and that is, What will be the value of these dreadnaughts when they are built? Now, early in the war in Europe three armed British cruisers, manned by 2,440 experts, were sent to the bottom of the North Sea by one submarine, costing the Kaiser \$380,000, manned by 12 undersea experts, and there were 1,242 sailors food for sharks. More men lost their lives in 40 minutes than were lost in five years in the War of the American Revolution. Furthermore, the *Queen Elizabeth*, the greatest dreadnaught ever constructed since the world began, was set afloat. We read in the London papers what that great dreadnaught, the *Queen Elizabeth*, would do in the Dardanelles. They were going to sail up the Dardanelles and bombard the imperial castle of the Sultan of Turkey and throw the imperial harem into hysterics. Now, what did all this vast array of the ships of Italy, of France, and of England do in the Dardanelles? It was stated on the floor this morning by a member of the gentleman's Naval Committee that one German submarine put them out of commission. Now, another question is this, and this is a vital question: If the dreadnaught is obsolete in Europe—and it does not take a military expert, a man with as much brains as two gray geese should know it—that the dreadnaught will be obsolete in our oceans in case we have a war.

Mr. PADGETT. I would agree with the gentleman if I could admit his premises, but I can not admit them. Every naval officer who appeared before the Committee on Naval Affairs and every naval authority clearly showed that the command—

Mr. SHERWOOD. What is a naval authority good for in the presence of actual experience in ocean warfare?

Mr. PADGETT. It is very clearly shown that the command of the sea is absolutely controlled by the big guns, and if we were to do away with the large ships carrying the big guns they could destroy the submarines in very short order. They must operate and be protected under the big guns.

Mr. DEWALT. Referring to the amendment proposing to take over the different shipyards and manufacturing plants, is it not true that the managers, directors, and the president of one of the largest munitions plants of this country, which also controls the Fore River Shipyard, has repeatedly expressed his willingness and their willingness to turn over their plants to the Government and let the Government manage them, at their own expense, without any charge at all except such expenses?

Mr. PADGETT. I am not prepared to say in the language in which the gentleman stated it. I understood from them that they said they were willing to devote all their facilities to Government manufacture, but I did not understand that they would turn it over to the Government, under Government administration.

Mr. DEWALT. Just one more question. Was not the statement of Mr. Grace, of the Bethlehem Steel Co., and of Mr. Schwab, of the Bethlehem Steel Co.—they controlling the Fore River yard—that they would turn over, or allow the Government to control their plant, even to the exclusion of private contracts which they had, they being patriotic citizens?

Mr. PADGETT. I have not had any conversation with Mr. Schwab; he has not been before the committee.

Mr. DEWALT. Did not Mr. Grace's statement—

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Grace was before the committee last year with reference to the armor-plate matter. The shipbuilding construction was not gone into, as I remember, at that time, but we were then discussing the armor-plate matter.

Mr. DEWALT. Does not the gentleman know as a fact that Mr. Grace did make such a statement and was willing to abide by it, so far as the promise to the committee was concerned?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not recall it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD on this bill.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the same privilege.

Mr. GARDNER. I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to these requests? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, endeavoring to answer the question put to the chairman of our committee by my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT], I remember with great distinctness the answer that was made by Mr. Grace, the president of the Bethlehem Steel Co., that if the Government needs their plant it is at the Government's disposal. Knowing these people as I do, I venture to say now that if the Government needs their plants for the purpose of preparing us for the sea the Government will have them at once. I know some of these business giants well enough to know they will not stand behind any technicality which the courts might afford them in an effort to retain these plants if our need is at hand. If the Government requires the assistance of these cannon makers and these shipbuilders, that assistance will be rendered immediately. Now, Mr. Chairman, our Speaker last year asked me some questions which I endeavored to answer. I find that he is dissatisfied with the answer which I gave him, and I am also dissatisfied with it. I told him then if the appropriations could be increased that this great construction could be accomplished at an early date. I did not know then of the great difficulties the shipbuilders and manufacturers were having in procuring skilled labor. I believe it was largely owing to the inquiry which he made that this House offered a bonus of 20 per cent to the shipbuilders to complete within a reasonable time these ships of war. Now, we put the question to the shipbuilders, and they said 20 per cent bonus would do us no good.

That will satisfy your mind that the difficulty is not there. The 20 per cent upon a \$19,000,000 battleship would, as you say, be \$4,000,000, nearly, a tremendous bonus. The answer was that it would not enable them to obtain the necessary skilled labor to complete these ships with the promptness we demanded. It is my recollection that the answer was made that in this country about 60,000 men were engaged in shipbuilding, and perhaps nearly one-half of that number engaged in the manufacture of commercial ships. The situation, to my mind, is quite plain that if by any manner or by any method or by any means they will put aside for the time being the work upon commercial ships we can finish the ships provided for and included in the program within 25 or 30 months. If the yards partly filled with the ships of commerce, about one-third, according to my recollection, are not relieved, the delay will be one-third longer. And I do not believe it is a question of money, sir. No. These builders and makers alike all answered the question when put to them that it was a question of labor and material alone.

I believe the whole problem could be solved by seizing the yards, if necessary. I do not believe that step will be necessary. If this House will authorize this Government to negotiate with these builders, they will construct these ships. The Union Iron works have no ships to-day. They are capable of preparing within six or eight months to construct two of the largest ships of war. The offer was made by Mr.

Powell, the president of the Fore River Shipbuilding Co. to put this yard in order at once for warship construction under certain conditions, and, with others, join in the absorption of this whole program. Of course it will be necessary to increase these proposed appropriations to enable these shipbuilders to prepare for the great undertaking. Some of them will be ready when their ways are completed. It is my judgment, however, if we start at once and put the authority in the proper place, and if great expedition and great skill are used, within six or eight months we will have this whole program upon the ways. These ships can not be built in a day. They can not be built in a year.

The best offer they will make to us now is the long term of 46 months, which is greatly disappointing to men like me. I would ask this committee—I would ask this House—to help us make a program. We will work it out with you quietly and reason with you here in our common effort to assist our Government to devise some means that will give it the great armament. First of all, let us plan to lay aside the commercial ships. If we do that we are a long way ahead.

Then, let us appeal to the workmen. I know that they will never desert their country. I have lived among them, and I know them well. They will feel that the country needs their services, and they will not hesitate. They will volunteer for their country's cause as they have always done. Let us suspend the eight-hour law, if necessary, during the grave emergency, to be left to the judgment of the President of the United States. [Applause.] I do not believe that any American who realizes that at this very hour we are standing in a place of peril will for one moment object to suspending the operation of this law, to be again put in force when the dark hour passes, in the judgment of the President. The men may then work for 10 hours a day, or 12 hours a day, as the workmen may see fit. Then three shifts can be obtained. It is a fact that the Bethlehem Steel Co. built 20 submarines for England in six months, and those ships are to-day employed in the North Sea by England.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks that the gentleman from Pennsylvania have five minutes more. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. NOLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I will.

Mr. NOLAN. I do not believe the gentleman intended to state that the Union Iron Works were idle at the present time?

Mr. BUTLER. No, sir.

Mr. NOLAN. I believe he meant to say that they were idle so far as Government ships are concerned?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. NOLAN. Does the gentleman know that they have on the books to-day \$85,000,000 to \$100,000,000 of private contracts?

Mr. BUTLER. I understand they have a great deal of work.

Mr. NOLAN. In regard to the statement that it is difficult to get skilled mechanics, does the gentleman know that the Union Iron Works has increased its force at Alameda and San Francisco from 3,500 to 10,000, and that it is not a question at the time of getting skilled men as much as it is a question of paying them?

Mr. TAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. TAGUE. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that some of these private shipyards have established yards in Canada and have sent a good many of our good mechanics over there to take care of them?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know. What I know I will speak of, and of what I do not know I will remain silent. We have nothing more than the statement of the president of this shipping company, the Fore River Shipbuilding Co., that they could build and would build, and begin to build at once, as soon as they could extend their ways, two of these great big battle cruisers at the Union Iron Works. I was never at the Union Iron Works, and therefore never saw them, but I have seen the president of the Union Iron Works, a very responsible man.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. McGregor?

Mr. BUTLER. No.

Mr. NOLAN. Then you have not seen the president of the Union Iron Works.

Mr. BUTLER. Those works, as I am informed, are controlled by the Bethlehem Works.

Mr. NOLAN. The Union Iron Works are controlled by Mr. McGregor.

Mr. BUTLER. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not see Mr. McGregor. I saw Mr. Powell, who speaks for the Union Iron Works. Let that be as it may, there is room there to construct ships, and I have heard of no complaint of wages received in these shipyards. This Government offered 20 per cent bonus to the shipbuilders to complete this program, and they say they can not use this bonus. As against that and in accord with that—

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him just a moment?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. PADGETT. Notwithstanding the 20 per cent bonus that was provided every shipbuilder in the country refused to bid for it, and they all stated before our committee that they would not bid for it in the future or make contracts upon that assumption because of the labor question.

And then, just in that same connection, I want to say a word about the submarines which were authorized and for which contracts were made. There are only two concerns in the United States that contract or bid for submarines. The lowest term that they bid for was 26 months. The Secretary declined to make contracts or accept their bids for that time. By negotiation they finally cut the time down to 23 months. A premium of \$700 a day was offered them for every day that they will shorten the 23 months in completing the submarines. And yet it is said that the Secretary has not been endeavoring to hasten the construction. Now, that shows you how anxious the department was and how far they are going to get these submarines. The total amount of the premium not to exceed the 20 per cent authorized by law.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs is absolutely accurate in his statement, and I want now, while I am here and on my feet, to be allowed to say that I believe that in the effort to have this program constructed in obedience to the demand made by Congress the Navy Department under the circumstances has done its best. I do not believe, if we have any differences of opinion—and we do have, and have heretofore ventilated those differences on the floor and made them known to the public—that now is the time to speak of them. I want, however, to say, and I believe it is only just to say, that the department under the circumstances has done its best to get this program under way. We might differ as to methods employed. Another party might be willing to go further in the expenditure of money and make greater efforts to reconcile differences to complete the program than the other.

But let me give you the situation now as I have it. The Secretary of the Navy and these shipbuilders do not greatly differ on the price or cost of ships. We are not confronted with a question of wages. It may be that many men do not go to the navy yards. But I happen to live quite near to one, and I believe they do. They may not be quite satisfied with the wages they receive, but the trouble is not here. The steel that is in one ship is the same kind of steel that goes into another ship. What it costs the shipbuilder, I do not know; because in some instances the shipbuilder makes it himself. But I believe from statements made and from what I have learned that there is but little difference in the cost of the raw material used in either the navy yard or the private yard.

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

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. NOLAN. I think the gentleman misunderstood me in what I said about wages. I said that the Union Iron Works had in two years' time increased the force of their men from 3,500 to 10,000. It is easier for us to get men than for some of the shipyards of the East to get them. In the East the munition factories have been able to offer more money and greater inducements to mechanics than we give in the shipyards.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman from California is correct. I know that in my district there is the greatest munition factory ever seen on the earth, and my constituents who are employed in this factory are receiving, perhaps, from \$5 to \$8 a day for their labor.

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

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY. Just for this, in connection with the suggestion of the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN], that the Union Iron Works build no Government ships.

Mr. BUTLER. No.

Mr. KELLEY. And in these days of shipbuilding for private concerns the profits are immensely large, larger than for Government yards or for yards where Government ships are built, and the tendency for yards not doing Government work is to take the labor away from the yards that are doing Government work.

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two minutes more.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will proceed for two minutes more.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, if I can sum up in a word, in answer to the query that our Speaker put to us, that if we will authorize the Government to use such means as we have authority to give to the Government either to seize these yards or to compact with the owners of the yards, to the end that they will agree to lay aside all the commercial work in their yards, we can not only absorb this program but complete it at an early date. We can further hasten it by authorizing the President of the United States, when in his judgment a great emergency exists, to suspend the eight-hour law during that emergency, so that men who care to work more than eight hours may have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of money that we have to solve. It is a question of opportunity; that is all. Give it to the Government and it can complete the program with promptness. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if it would not be improper, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee about the bill before reading it under the five-minute rule. We have not commenced doing anything but general debate. What is the meaning and purpose of this paragraph providing that "The Secretary of the Navy shall send to Congress at the beginning of its next regular session a complete schedule or list," and so forth, as to the pay and allowances of each grade?

Mr. PADGETT. The number of officers is being increased every year, and the number of enlisted men is being increased every year, and this report is intended to keep Congress advised as to the status during the current year.

Mr. MANN. I had supposed that when this paragraph first went into the law that it was designed to give Congress information which we have never been able to extract and which would enable us to know how much a naval officer gets under his pay and the various kinds of allowances that are given. But I ascertained, when I read the report made in accordance with this provision, that that is not the purpose. I have read the report. That information is furnished to the committee, anyhow. It is the total pay of the Navy. That is all that it amounts to.

Mr. PADGETT. It gives detailed information as to the number of officers, the various grades in which officers are employed, and the enlisted men, and the ratings of the men, and the number.

Mr. MANN. It bunches it as to the men, and you can not ascertain from that how many men are drawing \$50 a month, or how many are drawing \$40 a month, or \$20 a month, or anything of the sort. You can not ascertain from this how many naval officers are getting longevity pay for 5 years and how many are getting it for 20 years. The purpose of this item in the first place was to get that information. The Navy Department does not give it. What is the use of keeping it in the law? However, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. PADGETT. Just a moment. If the gentleman will take, for instance, Appendix E in the estimates—

Mr. MANN. Oh, I am not taking Appendix E in the estimates.

Mr. PADGETT. This is the report that is sent down.

Mr. MANN. I have read the report made by the Secretary of the Navy in compliance with this requirement in the law.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but he sends down as a part of that report in the estimate the list, and here is the active list of the line, and the Medical Corps and the Pay Corps—

Mr. MANN. That is the regular estimate. That is the statement always furnished in the estimates.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. It comes down with the estimates as a part of them.

Mr. MANN. Yes; that is a part of the estimates, but this was in addition to the estimates, and it means nothing, except the expense of printing a document of Congress. However, I really rose to suggest that this is Saturday, and we met at 11 o'clock, and have had a rather exciting day, and before we really get into the bill I think we ought to have a little rest.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Speaker of the House, can we have Monday?

Mr. MANN. Monday is unanimous-consent day.

Mr. PADGETT. Can we dispense with it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No.

Mr. PADGETT. Then we will not get back to the bill until Tuesday.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I started this shindy that has run here for about an hour and a half, I would like to have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. First, I want to ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs how it happens that it took from August last until now to let these contracts to build these new ships?

Mr. PADGETT. The naval appropriation bill was passed on the 29th of August. The contracts were let, I believe, either the latter part of November or early in December. Under the law the department is required to advertise for a number of days, and then the contracts had to be prepared, and so forth. There has been no delay in that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I started this interlocutory performance to get some information; I have secured a good deal; and it turns out that nobody can give the rest. The whole object I have in view is to have this program expedited. Notwithstanding what some people say in the newspapers, Congress is not stingy with the Army or the Navy.

Mr. BUTLER. That is right.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We have voted them all the money that seemed reasonable and proper, and I am sick and tired of having Congress hammered all the time and never given the slightest credit for anything that we do. [Applause.] That is the first proposition.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] and the chairman of the committee, Mr. PADGETT, have both been very kind about contributing information, and some of it is very valuable. I am in favor of giving the President of the United States the power to commandeer these shipbuilding yards if he needs them. But the United States Government must be honest and just. It can not afford to be anything else, and if these private parties are damaged by this process of commandeering, then the Government ought to compensate them for it, and I have no sort of doubt but that it will—not a bit of doubt. I think if we get into trouble—and I hope we will not—the percentage of the American people in high life or low life or middle life, laboring men or professional men, merchants and business men, farmers, and every sort of men, who will prove recreant to the best interests of the country, is almost infinitesimal, I do not care a straw whether they were born in this country or born across the sea—not a particle. [Applause.]

I believe the union-labor men of this country, if they felt it was necessary, would be willing to work 14 or 15 hours a day to save this Republic from humiliation or defeat. [Applause.] Of course there has been a great deal of unwise talk in the United States in the last two or three years about who are the most patriotic. My judgment is that we are all patriotic when the time comes, and the only difference on earth that there ever has been between us on that is on the question of expediency and what is best to be done. I am glad to learn from these gentlemen that the shipbuilders and these other people are willing to do their part if we need their services and need them quick. But, as I see it, the great trouble about these battleships—and it has been pestering me ever since I first studied about them—is that if you build one of the things to-day it is out of fashion to-morrow.

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think that is any reason why a lady should not buy a hat?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; not a bit in the world. The hat business is all right, but it is different with a ship.

Mr. MANN. The hat is out of fashion to-morrow.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield just a moment?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. Battleship construction began comparatively a few years ago.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I know that.

Mr. BUTLER. Twenty-four years ago.

Mr. PADGETT. And it has been going through a process of transition and development. When I first went on the Naval Committee, 12 years ago, we were building battleships of 12,000 and 15,000 tons' surface displacement, carrying four 12-inch guns, costing \$5,000,000. We are proposing in this bill to build battleships of 42,500 tons displacement that carry twelve 16-inch guns. These ships that were carried, as compared with the *Delaware*, represent a fighting efficiency of about 25 or 30, while the ones we are proposing in this bill represent a fighting efficiency value of 380. That shows the marked progress. The ships we are building now and for several years past are not

going out of fashion, but we are reaching up to the limit of achievement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, with all due respect to the chairman, and everybody else, the chairman does not know that. Nobody can tell that some genius is not going to make an invention to-morrow revolutionizing the whole business. I am in favor of going on with the program. I am in favor of this bill. I am in favor of the resolution that the chairman talks about. When we had this subject up a year ago I asked the question if any battleship was recognized to be the queen bee of the whole business; and if it was, why, instead of fooling around and making new plans every time they want to build a new ship, they did not take that one for a model, reach into the pigeonhole, pull out the specifications, and copy them. I have come to the conclusion after hearing the debate that that plan I suggested is absolutely impracticable.

The committee is doing the best it can, and it seems to me the department is; but, if it is necessary, I am in favor of taking every shipbuilding yard into the hands of the Government and putting these great sea fighters on the ocean at the earliest possible date, with all the resources that the American Republic will furnish. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he is in favor of having this program completed at a very early date, not having in his mind the condition abroad, which may involve us, but, Congress having authorized the program to be built, that we should proceed to complete it as quickly as possible?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Precisely; with not a minute of delay about it; without reference to any particular nation, but with reference to all the nations on the face of God's earth which would attack us. We are not building battleships for purposes of aggression, but for defense—solely for defense.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. When they say they can not complete these ships within 48 or 52 months, does the Speaker believe that they are lying about it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I do not, because they all testify clearly and you can not have any doubt about it.

Mr. BURNETT. They say they can not do it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know that they do.

Mr. BURNETT. Does the Speaker think they are lying?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I do not, because they are talking about things they know about and of which I know very little.

Mr. BURNETT. They know whether they can complete the program in 48 or 52 months, do they not?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. Does the gentleman think they are lying?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I think they are telling the truth.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman from Missouri—

Mr. BURNETT. I am interrogating the gentleman from Missouri. How does the gentleman reconcile those statements when they say they can not do it, and you say they are not lying about it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I say that if you commandeer the shipyards you can carry it out on schedule time.

Mr. BURNETT. Who can commandeer them?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We authorize the President to do it.

Mr. BURNETT. Does the gentleman think that the President can have it done in a shorter time?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; if he can commandeer the shipyards and put them to building battleships instead of commercial ships. I think they can do it within the time the gentleman has been talking about.

Mr. BURNETT. Does the Speaker believe that we ought to do that when they are lying about the time they can do this in?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think they are not lying about it.

Mr. BUTLER. I hope the gentleman from Alabama will not go away. The Secretary of the Navy through his chief constructor, Admiral Taylor, in whom we have the greatest confidence, says that he could not build the ships in the navy yards in less time.

Mr. BURNETT. Then that settles it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; it does not.

Mr. BURNETT. Does the gentleman think that Admiral Taylor is lying?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No.

Mr. BURNETT. He puts him in the same position as the other liars.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman from Alabama leaves out the main proposition that has been discussed, or proposed in the resolution that we are to discuss, and that is that which gives the President of the United States the authority to take over all the shipbuilding yards and hurry this program up if it is necessary.

Mr. BURNETT. Does this bill do that?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. This bill will do it if we can get votes enough next Tuesday.

Mr. BURNETT. Is it in the bill now?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; it is not, but it will be before Tuesday night.

Mr. BURNETT. I hope so.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. PADGETT. 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. PAGE of North Carolina, 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. 20632, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 5126. An act giving the consent of the United States for the bringing of certain suits in the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 865. An act granting to certain States public lands for the construction, repair, and maintenance of public roads;

S. 5395. An act to repeal sections 2588, 2589, and 2590 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

S. 6716. An act to provide for stock-watering privileges on certain unallotted lands on the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.;

S. 4360. An act authorizing the President to exchange land set aside for military purposes in the Territory of Hawaii for private land; and

S. 7486. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of the retirement of Federal judges.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the order heretofore made, the House adjourned until to-morrow, Sunday, February 4, 1917, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the service for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 2021); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate for the reappropriation of the unexpended balance on June 30, 1917, for new fence at St. Elizabeth's Hospital to be made available for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 2022); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, requesting an increase of salaries of certain messengers of the War Department (H. Doc. No. 2023); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, submitting tentative draft of a provision of legislation for incorporation in the

general deficiency appropriation bill (H. Doc. No. 2024); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, transmitting annual report of the Federal Reserve Board, covering operations for the year 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1888); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20297) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Beltrami, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in said county, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1410), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STOUT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 4761) providing for the classification, appraisal, and disposal of certain lands within the former Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1415), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee to which was referred the bill (S. 6829) to provide for the disposition of public lands withdrawn and improved under the provisions of the reclamation laws, and which are no longer needed in connection with said laws, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1416), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2, of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. STOUT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6130) to authorize the issue of a patent to certain land in Alabama to William M. Wilson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1411), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 6671) to validate the homestead entries of Anna W. Thraikill, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1412), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 784) to authorize the sale of certain lands at or near Belton, Mont., for hotel purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1413), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 6783) for the relief of William F. Carter, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1414), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20628) for the relief of Elizabeth R. Nicholls and Joanna L. Nicholls, heirs of Joshua Nicholls, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 20728) to provide for the military and naval training of the citizens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 20729) to amend section 76, chapter 5, of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 20730) authorizing internal-revenue collectors of the United States to transmit lists of names of persons, firms, or corporations who have paid revenue tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Resolution (H. Res. 483) directing the Secretary of War to furnish copies of cablegrams between the Bureau of Insular Affairs and the Governor General of the Philippines, relative to the binder-twine monopoly; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SLOAN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, favoring an amendment to the revenue laws requiring internal-revenue collectors to furnish the governors of the several States lists of persons and firms who have paid revenue taxes on sale or manufacture of liquors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 20731) granting an increase of pension to Emma F. Buchanan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20732) granting a pension to Samuel W. Dickson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK: A bill (H. R. 20733) granting a pension to Julian A. Wiggins, Company M, First Texas Infantry, United States Army; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 20734) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Thodey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 20735) granting a pension to William L. Buck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20736) granting a pension to George F. Kratz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 20737) granting a pension to Frederick E. Bogart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20738) for the relief of The Pateros Transfer Co., D. J. Garrison, secretary, Pateros, Wash.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 20739) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Gaskill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 20740) granting an increase of pension to Annie N. Sullivan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20741) granting an increase of pension to Margaret R. Brevard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 20742) for the relief of Marion H. Henderson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20743) for the relief of Elizabeth Granger and Mary Granger, daughters of Dan B. Granger, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20744) for the relief of William D. Kirkland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 20745) granting a pension to George W. Keenan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 20746) granting a pension to Mrs. Ophalal Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 20747) granting an increase of pension to James H. Flynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Ruthenian National Union, favoring House joint resolution 350, relative to funds for relief of the Ruthenians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of New York Produce Exchange, against literacy test in immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Mary D. Davis, of Altoona, Pa., relative to bill to establish a probation system in the United States courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the American Forestry Association, relative to the pine-blister disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Petitions of farmers in vicinity of Franklin and Cairo, and Progressive Farmers' Club, of Cairo, Minn., relative to cooperation of the States of Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Iowa with the United States to control flood waters and proper outlet drainage; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of R. N. Harper, favoring passage of Senate joint resolution 157, relative to caring for Confederate veterans during reunion; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the American Forestry Association, relative to measure for fighting pine blister; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of E. B. Lord and M. L. Parmly, of the State of New Jersey, favoring passage of House bill 20080, to protect migratory birds; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the National League Branch No. 35, Government Employees, relative to the placing of St. Elizabeth's Hospital on eight-hour basis; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Milwaukee Daily Newspaper Publishers' Association, against passage of House bill 15843, corrupt-practice act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of American Forestry Association, relative to the pine-blister disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Milwaukee Daily Newspaper Publishers' Association, against passage of mail-exclusion bills; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of United Leather Workers of the World, against militarism; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, against prohibitory legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of board of governors of the Illinois State Bar Association, favoring increase of salaries of Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of sundry members of the Massachusetts Branch of the League to Enforce Peace, relative to the adoption of the league's proposals by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the American Forestry Association, relative to a national quarantine of the pine-blister disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of Local Union, No. 1840, United Mine Workers of America, Shady Side, Ohio, relative to investigating high cost of living; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING: Petition of Frank B. Gamel and sundry citizens of Rio, Ill., urging passage of prohibitory legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the South Side Boat Club, of Quincy, Ill., signed by Messrs. A. G. Weisenburger, Elmer Mertz, and A. B. Weisenburger, urging the establishment of an armor plant at Quincy, Ill.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKER: Memorial of Women's Christian Temperance Union Federation, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, Memorial of the Women's Christian Temperance Union Federation, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of House bill 3107, relative to race gambling bets; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT: Memorial of International Forestry Association, favoring measures toward eliminating pine blister; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSON: Petition of sundry farmers of the State of Wisconsin, asking for investigation of the binder-twine situation, with a view to obtaining relief from excessive prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OLNEY: Petition of citizens of Brockton, Mass., relative to lengthening hours during which migratory birds can be legally hunted; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of H. D. Bailey, R. T. Holand, and sundry others of the Methodist Church of Enfield Center, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of Los Angeles (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring bill for protection for navigators along the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Committee, against bill to discontinue pneumatic mail-tube service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Schmidt Lithograph Co., of San Francisco, Cal., against House bill 18986, mail-exclusion bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers and Dealers' Association of America, against prohibitory legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of E. S. Brashers, relative to a referendum on prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of California Associated Societies for Conservation of Wild Life and California Audubon Society, against amending game-sanctuary bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Julius Gabriel, of San Francisco, and Federated Trades Council of Sacramento, Cal., against passage of

mall-exclusion bills; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Federation of Applied Arts and Sciences, Los Angeles, Cal., favoring passage of vocational-education bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Langley & Michaels Co., of San Francisco, Cal., favoring passage of Kern-Doremus bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: Memorial of the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring food embargo; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Minnesota Anti-Saloon League, favoring prohibitory legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Coopers' International Union, Labor Union No. 62, of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against prohibitory legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of A. N. Chadbourn, of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring prohibitory legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 335 citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., against prohibitory legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, Local 804, against passage of the Adamson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Petition of citizens of the first congressional district of Wisconsin, protesting against prohibitory legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of citizens of Jaffrey, N. H., favoring passage of House bill 20080, for protection of migratory birds; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of John W. Ashman and others, of Laconia, N. H., favoring passage of House bill 20080, for protection of migratory birds; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Mrs. Svenagard and others, of Bowdon, N. Dak., favoring legislation to prohibit sending liquor advertisements through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SUNDAY, February 4, 1917.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by Mr. ADAMSON as Speaker pro tempore.

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

O Lord, our God, whose name evokes awe, reverence, gratitude, trust, which men hallow upon their lips in worship, be with us, we beseech Thee, as we assemble on this holy Sabbath day to pay our tribute in sacred memory to a Member of this House who has been called to the higher life, and who was chosen by his constituents year after year to represent their interests, an earnest of the trust reposed in his ability, sincerity, and nobility of purpose. His heart went out not only to the interests of his people but to his State and nation with patriotic zeal and fervor, a consistent member of the church of his choice, an earnest and faithful worker in the Sunday school, beloved by all. Peace be to his ashes and repose to his soul. Be Thou with his colleagues, friends, his bereaved wife and children, that they may cherish his memory, copy his virtues, and look forward with faith to a happy reunion beyond the confines of this world, where peace, joy, and happiness shall reign forever. Through Him who lived and died that we might know Thee and dwell with Thee evermore. Amen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the Journal. Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] asks unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the special order for this day's session.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE TRIBBLE, OF GEORGIA.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. RUCKER of Georgia, by unanimous consent, Ordered, That Sunday, February 4, 1917, be set apart for addresses upon the life, character, and public services of Hon. SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE, late a Representative from the State of Georgia.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolutions which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 484.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended in order that opportunity may be given for tribute to the memory of Hon. SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE, late a Member of this House from the State of Georgia.

Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his distinguished public career, the House, at the conclusion of these exercises, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions.

The question was taken and the resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, these are always sad occasions, and out of them should come lessons to the living as well as tributes to the dead; and I earnestly hope the tributes to-day will at least give a measure of comfort and consolation to the bereaved family and to the thousands of friends who loved the late Congressman SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE, to whose tender memory these eulogies are paid as our last tribute of respect and affection.

It is called death, but there is no death for those who believe in God and live true to that belief. The body passes away and goes to its last long sleep to awaken no more until the dawn of the morning on that great day when "we shall know each other as we are known" in that beautiful realm beyond this vale of tears, and we miss our friend Mr. TRIBBLE from the places where we used to see him—he has gone to that long sleep—but there is no death for such a soul as was a part of the Christian-hearted SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE. His body is dead, but for the soul of the Christlike there is no death, and his spirit, tender and courageous, has winged its flight to mansions in the sky to claim its sweet reward in that "Temple not made with hands, eternal in the heavens," where it was bidden with the glad greetings of "Well done, thou good and faithful servant"—enter thou in the joys of my heavenly kingdom.

"SAM," as he was affectionately called by his friends, has left testimony of a noble character among men; and he has left a record, pure and spotless, worthy of our emulation. The memory of him is so sweet and full of tender thoughts, and there is so much to commend his life to us, in the blameless way in which he lived and moved among us, that this should be an hour of rejoicing rather than one of sorrow and grief. Try as we may, sorrow and grief can hardly be taken from death; there is that something about it that strikes awe to the human heart, and but for the hope of eternity and the salvation of the soul I can not see how anyone could meet the awful ordeal. The promises of salvation and of eternal life, the hope of resurrection, with which God's word is so abounding, takes the sting away from death and robs the grave of its victory; and to those who keep His commandments and walk in the path of uprightness, as did our friend TRIBBLE, death and the grave are but gateways to a more delightful realm and death has no terrors.

It was while I was a student at the University of Georgia in 1897 that I first had the pleasure of meeting Mr. TRIBBLE. I only knew him casually and did not have an intimate friendship with him until after he came to Congress. He had not been long a member of the House before he had impressed himself upon his colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, as an able and fearless legislator, guided by but one light and that light was his conscience. He had not long been a member of this House before he had won the friendship and esteem of all his fellows, and all respected him for his determination, at all times, to stand for what he thought was right.

Since I became a Member of Congress, 10 years ago, I have seen many occasions of this kind, and many good men with whom we have served here have been called "from labor to rest" and have answered death's unavoidable summons, and their fellows have felt a keen loss and deep grief; but I have not known of a death of any Congressman that caused deeper grief and over which there was more genuine regret than was expressed by his colleagues in the House and the Senate when the sad news of SAM's death reached them. He made warm friends and his friends loved him, because he loved his friends and was true to them. He was fearless and tireless in the performance of his duties, yet he was one of the most tender-hearted men I have ever known and one of the most obliging.

I can hardly think of the late Congressman Anderson Roddenberry, of Georgia, who served here so ably, without thinking of the late Congressman TRIBBLE. They were strong friends and worked together like brothers and they were almost as devoted as brothers. I recall, soon after Mr. Roddenberry died, SAM said to me one day: "Roddenberry hastened his

death by hard work," and it was true; but it was true also in SAM TRIBBLE'S case. He was a slave to duty and took but little thought of his own physical weakness. We are all frail and realize often when it is too late that we have taken too little thought of the frailty of the body. His only thought was to serve, and to do something worth while for his people and his country.

Mr. TRIBBLE was a lawyer; and a good one, too; he was solicitor of the city court in his home city of Athens, Ga., and later was elected solicitor general of the western circuit of Georgia. It is known that he filled these positions of honor and responsibility with that splendid ability which later marked him in Congress as a faithful public servant. He was elected to the Sixty-second Congress, and reelected to the Sixty-third, Sixty-fourth, and Sixty-fifth Congresses. In looking over his biographical sketch in the Congressional Directory, I was impressed with the statement made therein:

Elected to the Sixty-second Congress, and reelected to the Sixty-third and Sixty-fourth Congresses without opposition.

He meant, and we all understand it, that he had no opposition in the general elections. He had opposition in the primary elections, and always won with splendid majorities, attesting his great popularity with his constituents; but SAM was too considerate and too modest, afraid he would wound some one, if he made reference to his battles in the primary elections, so he merely refers to the general elections and makes no reference whatever to the primary elections, in which he proved himself one of the best campaigners ever known to Georgians. This is so like the man—a brave fighter when fighting had to be done, but modest, considerate, and forgiving as a victor—never boastful, rather meek, until he was stirred to action, and then he was as brave as a lion and fought with the fury of a storm, but was always fair and honorable, regardless of who his antagonist was or what the cause of battle.

Mr. TRIBBLE was a self-made man, and did his task well in the making, for I have never heard anyone say other of him than that "he was a good man." The fact that the people, early in his young manhood, elevated him to important positions and promoted him to higher honors, indicated that he merited and held their confidence and esteem. As a Member of Congress, he was able, diligent, and faithful. He was a true American and as patriotic a man as I have ever known. He was tireless in his services for his country and carried, at all times, the welfare of his country on his heart and his mind, and never missed an opportunity to advance, as he saw it, the best interest of the whole country. He was an apostle of genuine Americanism.

I fear many public men are not appreciative of the suffrage of their fellow men. SAM TRIBBLE was. He loved the people of the Eighth District of Georgia, and they loved him, too, as was evidenced by the thousands who came from cities, villages, and farms, far and near, to pay a last tribute of respect to their dead Congressman and friend when the remains were carried home for burial. It was particularly noticeable and sad to me to see in the large crowd gathered to attend the funeral, men from every walk of life, a great number of farmers to whom SAM was always so faithful, who had come great distances to say a last farewell to SAM and to get a last sight of his honest face, who, with tear-dimmed eyes and bowed heads, had the appearance of soldiers who had lost their chieftain after many battles. I knew the love deep down in those noble hearts—I had been through political battles, just about like SAM had gone through with, and I knew that human hearts in order to love a man as Mr. TRIBBLE'S constituents loved him, were necessarily reflecting a deep and true affection which he had for them.

In political campaigns the strongest ties are formed between men, and that Congressman who does not love a constituency which has time and time again stood by and honored him with their votes and support is void of all the real tender human sensibilities and is unworthy of a place in the great National Congress. I did not know how deeply and truly I loved my friends and constituents, who have kept me here for 10 years, until I announced that I would not again be a candidate for the House; and my friends from all over the first Georgia district began to write me and express regret. It brought to my mind and my heart a more tender thought and affection for my constituency than I had ever had, for the trials in which they had proven true friendships came over me in a flood of memories, and I hope the fragrance of those sweet memories will abide with me until the end. When I saw men of all callings at SAM'S funeral, weeping, in many cases, like little children, I knew why SAM had been invincible as a campaigner in the eighth, for it brought home to me the memory of friends

who have stood so loyally by me in my battles, and I said in my own heart, here is the secret of his political successes—his hold on the people.

When the train, upon which Mr. TRIBBLE'S remains were carried, and on which was the funeral party, neared the boundary line of the eighth Georgia district on its sad mission, friends would board it to express sympathy and regret; and as we reached the eighth district large crowds, with sad faces, would stand about the depots and in their appearances could be read the unmistakable evidence of deep grief and great sorrow. His people, as I have said, were devoted to him and properly so, for he was a true friend, a good man, and a splendid Congressman and they hated to give him up. The grief of his constituents was so pronounced that along with the great sympathy I felt for his bereaved family and his close personal friends I found myself keenly sympathizing with the whole people of the district who seemed to realize what the loss meant to them. The people who congregated at the depots knew SAM was on that train and they seemed to long for a sight of him, for a warm clasp of his hand, and for the sound of his earnest voice, his usual friendly greetings, as on his former returns from Washington to the "red old hills of Georgia," but alas! his manly form was lifeless, his strong hand was cold, his voice which he had so often raised in defense of his people was forever silent; and his thousands of friends were broken-hearted and sad as it dawned upon them that Sam was returning for the last time to be buried in the dear "red old hills of Georgia," which had always been close to his heart and over which he had romped and played as a boy, where he had lived as a man, and where he wished to be buried.

In his death Georgia lost a noble and beloved son of whom the State was justly proud, and the Nation lost a true citizen and one of its ablest statesmen. His wife lost a devoted and splendid husband and his children a tender and affectionate father. His wife, one of the most charming and able ladies in Georgia, had been a great help to Mr. TRIBBLE in his career, and no tribute to his achievements can be paid this great man without carrying coupled with it also a deserved tribute to his devoted wife.

From the activities at the National Capitol, where he did his last and best work for his district, his State, and his country, his remains were taken back to Athens, the beautiful and classic city, where he had made his home for many years, and there, in the heart of his district, laid to rest.

If no marble shaft is ever erected to this distinguished Georgian to proclaim for all time his splendid qualities of heart and mind, there is builded to him a monument, larger, taller, and far more sublime than any piece of marble that will perpetuate and keep his memory ever fresh and green, a lasting monument of genuine love and admiration in the hearts and affections of noble and appreciative friends.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrowful hearts that we are on this occasion reminded of the passing away of one of our colleagues to whom we were all so closely attached, and one who had, during his active service here as a Member of the Sixty-second, Sixty-third, and Sixty-fourth Congresses, made many loyal and admiring friends. He was elected to the Sixty-fifth Congress by the people of his district by an overwhelming majority.

I was personally acquainted with Mr. TRIBBLE for more than 20 years, during which time he always convinced me of his earnestness and enthusiasm in matters of interest to those whom he represented. When I first knew our departed friend he was in the active practice of law, and afterwards was elected and served four years as solicitor general of his judicial circuit, which position he filled with credit and distinction. He received his first nomination to Congress over one of the ablest men our country has known for many years, and for this reason the public watched his career with interest. He was a hard worker, a very enthusiastic, wide-awake Representative and did much good for the district and the people he represented and for the country generally. He was a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which is one of the great committees of Congress. He was always at his post of duty and could be found at his seat at the opening of each session of Congress and was one of the last to remain upon the floor at the hour of adjournment. Truly he performed his duty well and we and the country may truthfully say that the Congress has lost one of its most valuable Members. One of the most inspiring characteristics of this man was his willingness to aid his friends and those worthy of recognition. He would go his full length for his colleagues and for any meritorious matter in which any of them were directly interested. He was positive in his declarations and ready at all times to defend

any position he might take and always stood firm in his convictions. He had a resolute will, a determination undaunted by fear, and was never satisfied unless he had accomplished that which in his heart he believed just and proper. Courage was the mainspring of his make-up, and nothing but positive proof of error would turn him from his course.

He was thoroughly convinced that to serve a constituency meant something to him, and no idle moments can be charged to him in the performance of his duty. A confidential statement made to him was absolutely safe and lingered in the deep recesses of his heart. He was proud of his wife and children and had the fullest measure of their love and esteem.

His sudden demise was a great shock to us all and his passing from among us is an irreparable loss to our body. We shall never forget his sojourn with us. We will oft remember the brightness of his face and the pleasant communications with him. He was indeed kind and generous, and the courtesy with which he responded to all his colleagues was commendatory and his desire for the success of his coworkers was unselfish. He has gone from among us, but we shall not forget him. We shall not forget his labors. We shall not forget the many hours he unrelentingly worked for his people and his country. He is now at rest.

Brother, thou art gone before us; and thy saintly soul is flown
Where tears are wiped from every eye and sorrow is unknown,
From the burden of the flesh and from care and fear released,
Where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest.

Sin can never taunt thee now, no doubt thy faith assails,
Nor thy meek trust in Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit fail:
And there thou'rt sure to meet the good, whom on earth thou lovedst
best,
Where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest.

And when the Lord shall summon us, whom thou hast left behind,
May we, untainted by the world, as sure a welcome find,
May each, like thee, depart in peace, to be a glorious guest,
Where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my tribute of respect, friendship, and admiration for our late colleague, the Hon. SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE, who served the people of the eighth congressional district of the State of Georgia with zeal, industry, and ability for six years as a Member of this House. He was a useful, faithful Member, always at his post of duty, and ever watchful of the interests of his constituents. He enjoyed the confidence and good will not only of every Member of the Democratic side of this House but every Republican who enjoyed his acquaintance or had knowledge of his many worthy qualities. We did not always agree with his position on public questions, which constantly divide the membership of this body, but it can be truthfully said that at all times he had the courage of his convictions. He was open, honest, and conscientious in the discharge of his duties. He was not a trimmer, not a dodger, not a demagogue. He was an honest, fearless, manly man. He fairly earned and deserved the love and admiration of his loyal constituents and the friendship and respect of his colleagues here in Congress.

I met Mr. TRIBBLE soon after his election to the Sixty-second Congress, and our friendship continued up to the time of his untimely death. In the passing of our colleague Georgia lost one of its true and devoted sons and his district a faithful, efficient, untiring public servant.

To live in hearts we leave behind
Is not to die.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, one of the most delightful conversations I ever had with the distinguished gentleman whose death we mourn to-day was here in this Chamber the day he was stricken. Apparently in the best of health, he was in a reflective mood, and those ties which bind true friends together, those tender feelings which ennoble friendly intercourse, seemed stronger that day between us than ever before, though we had always been the best of friends since our acquaintance began.

We talked of our pleasant and happy relations during our service in this House, and I am glad that I then had the opportunity to tell him how deeply I appreciated his friendship. It was one of those quiet hours when men are drawn close to each other and speak their feelings. Late that afternoon I learned of his sudden illness and hastened to the hospital, where were gathered many of his friends and colleagues, shocked, grieved, awaiting the fateful words they were so soon to hear. The call which we all must answer had come to him suddenly, almost in the twinkling of an eye, and he was soon to answer. Before his sun had reached its zenith and the shadows were falling to the east his day was ended. Always ready to meet the great emergencies of life, he was ready to answer the last call, for he had led a Christian life and heeded the mandate: "Be ye ready; the summons cometh quickly."

In the full glory of a brilliant young manhood, when success was crowning his efforts and the fine promise of goals yet untouched held their lure and hope, as he looked up the mountain whose paths he was climbing so surely and fast, his untimely death at least carried the blessing that goes to those whose ship goes down "when eager winds are kissing every sail."

Always enjoying the confidence and trust of those with whom he came in contact, he was early chosen a leader of his fellows. A lawyer by profession, he was made the prosecuting attorney for his county and for his judicial circuit before he came to Congress. His work in the discharge of his duties was always characterized by a fine sense of fairness, intelligent effort, and the utmost zeal.

I never knew a public man who labored more industriously for those whose commission he held than did SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE. No wish of a constituent was too small to receive his considerate personal attention, no task too great for him to undertake for them. He died in the service of his people, giving the very best that was in him to their cause. An incessant worker, he overtaxed his strength in the performance of his duties. He fell in battle. He was inspired in his fight for his people by the same intrepid feeling that moved Washington at the head of the noble Army of the Revolution from White Plains to Yorktown. Tingling in his blood when the Great Commander called him from the service of his people was the same patriotism which coursed through the veins of Jackson as he fell at Chancellorsville.

His service to his country was great. His life is worthy of emulation. He made an impress on the time in which he lived. But it is as SAM TRIBBLE, my friend, that I shall always think of him and mourn his loss. The Nation has lost a patriot, but I have lost a friend.

In his home he was happy, for his good wife always shared the fortunes of his life with a generous encouragement whether the days were dark or bright. She was ever willing to share his trials along with his successes, and there was a perfect sympathy between them. With his family the State and Nation share his loss.

Mr. TRIBBLE left to his family and his people a heritage far more priceless than gold—a life well lived and filled with service, and we are reminded that—

A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches,
And loving favor rather than silver or gold.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, there is not a great deal that I can say that has not already been said in the way of tribute to my late friend, the Hon. SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE, of Georgia, but what little I can say I want to say. In the matter of friendships among Members of this House there is no North, no South, no East, and no West. I suppose that Democrats perhaps more naturally form their friendships among Democrats than among Republicans, and Republicans more naturally form their friendships among Republicans than among Democrats, but the strongest friendships in this House often cross party lines, and there is, of course, no partisanship in friendships. It might be interesting to say a word or two as to how some of these friendships originate. Some come from living as neighbors in the same hotel perhaps, or in the same neighborhood of the city, or from belonging to the same church or fraternal organization; some come from service on committees; some of them come from the very antagonism which springs up across the aisle between Republicans and Democrats, as a man comes to love a worthy foe, and there are other ways doubtless in which they begin.

My friendship for Mr. TRIBBLE came from the fact that he had been my neighbor in the House Office Building and I have seen a great deal of him in a casual way as we passed each other in the corridors and went up and down on the same elevator and occasionally visited each other and did for each other the usual small favors, as Members of Congress, in the way of exchange of documents and information, and other little helps back and forth from one to the other. So I came to know him soon after my first service began in the Sixty-third Congress and it is a singular fact that when I came down here in December for the opening of this session Mr. TRIBBLE was the first Member of Congress whom I met. I took a car from somewhere up near the Treasury building and came down to the farther entrance of the House Office Building and as I started to get out I saw Mr. TRIBBLE in front of me. We got off the car together, walked up the corridors and took the elevator together for our respective offices, and talked over the coming events of the session. He looked well and told me that he was very well—yet only a day later he was stricken with his fatal illness. I was very much shocked. I felt I had lost a personal friend, and I can hardly say how much it affected me as I at

once recalled the fact that he had been the first Member of Congress whom I had seen after my arrival here for the session and the fact that he had been my neighbor over in the House Office Building for so long a time. Of course, I had not enjoyed the pleasure of the long friendship with Mr. TRIBBLE that his colleagues from the State of Georgia have enjoyed, but the friendship I have had with him is a very precious memory to me. This House has lost a most worthy Member and our country an able, valued representative.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, one of the strange things about life is, that we never fully appreciate our friends and our loved ones until they are called to the other world.

We see this man and that man occupying places of trust and honor, and those who have not attained such places of distinction never stop to consider the struggle, the deprivation, and the toll that made his goal possible.

Of all the men it has been my pleasure to know who now hold and have heretofore held a public office, none deserved the confidence and affection of his constituents more than did our dear departed friend, SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE. A more faithful, solicitous, or conscientious man never filled a public office. His paramount thought was of the betterment and happiness of his people. To lighten their burden, to be helpful to those who had the least of this world's blessing controlled his voice and vote.

He was the most indefatigable worker I have ever known. No task was too burdensome for his undertaking if it was for his people. He literally worked himself to death in serving those people he loved and who so sincerely loved him.

He loved the South. He was proud of his State. Whenever his section or his State was directly or indirectly in the balance, his voice was always heard in forceful and eloquent defense of his people.

He was a true friend—brave, courageous, honest, and humble. He said to me one day: "The longer I serve my people the more humble I am. To have the confidence of nearly 300,000 Georgians should make any man humble."

He was a most affectionate and thoughtful husband and father. I never knew a more miserable man when separated from his family. His last rational thought was of them.

He was held in the highest esteem by the membership of the House. No matter what difference of opinion may have existed about his position on public questions, all men knew he possessed an honest heart and intellect.

Mr. Speaker, as his friend I was a constant watcher at his bedside. I with thousands of friends hoped against hope. God in His infinite wisdom had laid the hand of death upon his brow. As I looked into his honest face for the last time I could not but think of how well it was with his soul. What childlike faith he had in God! How he had striven to serve Him! How clean and noble his life was! How charitable he was! How ready his hand to help the poor! What an example his life had been to his manly and devoted son just stepping into manhood.

As I clasped his palsied hand for the last time I thanked God that I had known him and loved him, and as I stepped into the chill of a winter's night I felt that I should return to his side and whisper one word to cheer him on his flight to God. I would have said:

O just and faithful knight of God:
Ride on, the prize is near.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, it was a tremendous shock to me to hear of the death of SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE. My heart went out to his devoted, helpful wife and children in their sad affliction. I realized, too, the Congress had suffered a great loss.

It was my good fortune and pleasure at the beginning of his congressional career to have become acquainted with Mr. TRIBBLE. We both came to this great body in the Sixty-second Congress. We occupied near-by offices and came in almost daily contact. Later we were associates on the Committee on Naval Affairs during the period of deepest interest in the great arm of the sea, when policies of tremendous importance were being inaugurated. Many differences prevailed, and feeling and tension at times were sharp and intense. With this association with SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE I had opportunities to know much about him. Happily, we here learn to know each other as men—not as partisans—and set our value on the qualities of mind and heart each other possess. That which first impressed me was his close, happy family relations, an index so expressive of that which is best in life and man. Always did his great sincerity impress me, and his high sense of right and nobility of character stamped themselves at every turn.

He was devoted to his official duties, industrious, studious; indeed, so strenuous in his earnestness and activity that he

seemed loath to lose a minute in his love of service. The outpouring of people at the funeral services at his home fully attested the great love of his neighbors. It was so sincere, so marked, so general, that, in itself, proved that a kind, strong, high-minded, thoroughly serviceable man had passed to his reward, and their grief and expressions showed how fully they appreciated the great loss they suffered. SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE earned this tribute by his deeds of love and service to mankind. After all he profits most who serves best.

There is a lesson in the sudden death of our dear departed colleague. The last day comes to all of us. We know not what moment the summons may come. Let duty be our constant watchword and faithful service our guide, ever remembering, no matter what the station in life, that "the charities that soothe, and heal, and bless, lie scattered at the feet of men like flowers."

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I came to add my presence in commemorating this occasion.

The death of the Hon. SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE gives remarkable accent to that sacred proverb which says, "In the midst of life there is death." In the heyday of a useful, intellectual, and vigorous life, the shadows of death were thrown athwart his path, and he lay down to rest in eternity and sweet communion with those who serve and obey God.

His life and example ought to be assimilated into the life of the young American everywhere. He stands in just fulfillment of that proposition that Christ gave to the twelve when He had just returned from the Mount of Transfiguration and found in the valley the twelve contending among themselves as to who should be the greatest in Heaven. He turned to them stating that "He who would be greatest of all must be servant of all." Mr. TRIBBLE's life fulfilled that proposition. His life was a life of service to his country, to humanity, and to God. And we ought to profit by his life and example, for we find:

There will be a place we know not where,
And time we know not when,
When God Divine in justice there,
Will judge the deeds of men.

And to be prepared for that judgment and get a decree in our favor in that eventful epoch in the universe ought to be the full hope and fruition of all human existence.

Mr. TRIBBLE in the very midst of life met death. He met death in the service of his country, and that service began in the vigor of his young manhood in the call of his State and his country, and in the midst of that service he was called to the Great Beyond.

I simply rose to add my presence and these few remarks in honor of a distinguished son of Georgia, and a splendid, typical American citizen.

Mr. LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a boy in north Georgia I looked with admiration upon the foothills that bordered my father's farm. When I first traveled the then seeming great distance of some 20 miles to the famous Lookout Mountain, from whose summit visitors looked over seven States, three battle fields, and numberless mountain peaks, I thought that here in the "heaven-kissing hills" is represented God's best illustration of the eternal, the everlasting. When some years later my mind became absorbed in the history of nations and the growth of governments, I felt that in the development of men, made in the image of their Maker, the purpose of the Almighty was shown—the continuing problem of the universe was outlined.

I now believe that the most everlasting thing in the contemplation of the human mind—the most fixed thing in men and in governments—is character. The soul, the spirit, the immortal part of him whom we memorialize to-day found its keynote, its essence, and its strength in his pure and splendid character.

No truer man ever breathed the breath of life than SAMUEL JOEL TRIBBLE. He died in the very flush of manhood—47 years of age when the summons came. He was a native of Franklin County, one of the so-called country counties of Georgia, on the northern tier, near the South Carolina border, where the mountain air is bracing, where thought is pure, where contamination by evil influences is unknown. As a boy he was an easy favorite in the county schools; as a student in the State University at Athens he soon ranked with the highest; choosing the law as a special course, he was speedily recognized as one of the leaders in the legal department.

His university and law courses completed, he "hung out his shingle" in this classical educational center of the South and began the practice of law. His adaptability to public service soon became evident, and he was elected solicitor of the city court, serving five years in that office, and was then called to a

further four years' service as solicitor general of the western circuit. The constituency of the eighth congressional district of Georgia were not slow to recognize the value of representation in Congress by such a man, and elected him to serve in the Sixty-second Congress. So fully did he meet all their expectations that they elected him to the Sixty-third and again to the Sixty-fourth Congresses.

From the very moment of his admission to the membership of this House Mr. TRIBBLE applied himself with singleness of purpose and unflagging assiduity to the work of legislation. Never losing sight of the interests of the people of his district, he never failed to keep before his mind's eye the larger interest of the country. The most important committee assignment given him when he took his seat here was to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and he continued there until the end. The chairman of that committee and his associates testify to the faithfulness, the industry, the high intelligence, and the intense patriotism with which Mr. TRIBBLE applied himself to the difficult work before that committee at every session, and which was particularly onerous when the momentous events of contemporaneous history enlarged its activities. He was unfailing in his attendance upon all sessions; any amount of labor assigned to him was borne cheerfully. Whatever the subject which he was called upon to investigate was exhausted by the minutest research.

With almost unerring instinct he knew how to separate the wheat from the chaff. With the acumen of the trained lawyer he distinguished between the true and the false; nothing that bore the faintest resemblance to wrong could escape his notice, and with like discernment he saw the good points of a proposition. In the great work accomplished by the Committee on Naval Affairs during the past few sessions of Congress Mr. TRIBBLE bore a share which will entitle him to honorable remembrance throughout the coming years.

The chief of the Confederate forces during the Civil War, Gen. Robert E. Lee, was fond of saying that "duty is the sublimest word in the English language." This thought found an echo in the heart of Mr. TRIBBLE and guided his course at all times and in all circumstances. His devotion to duty, his courage, his strong adherence to his convictions were salient characteristics, distinguishing him both in his public and private life.

With Mr. TRIBBLE conviction, the sense of duty, never yielded to expediency. Because a thing was popular, this did not commend it to his consideration or influence his action whenever his conviction ran counter. This policy of his was most strikingly illustrated in his course on private pensions. He was a consistent and persistent opponent of private pension legislation. He was firm in his belief that the general pension laws were liberal enough, both in their original frame and in the interpretation given them by the officials charged with their execution, to obviate the necessity of supplementing them with private pensions for persons who happened to be fortunate enough to have friends and advocates in Congress.

No doubt Mr. TRIBBLE at times aroused resentment among his colleagues by his opposition in this regard, but he never allowed this to deter him from the course which he had marked out for himself and of the correctness of which his conception of duty did not leave him in doubt. I am quite sure that the kindly feelings which he cultivated in his intercourse with his fellow Members must frequently have suffered a severe pang when they came in conflict with the stern dictates of conceived duty, but I am equally sure that his colleagues finally bore him no ill will because of his opposition, for they could not fail to recognize and appreciate the high sense of moral obligation which determined his action.

In a Republic like ours the conscientious man is the greatest asset of the State. The citizenry of a democracy must be animated by high ideals to be fruitful of the best service. Such a citizen was Mr. TRIBBLE. He had set his ideals high before him, and they were his guiding stars through life. Mr. TRIBBLE carried his idealism into every action of his life. It was not enough for him to do the thing which it was obviously his duty to do, but he constantly strove for something better and higher. If he ever had chosen a motto for himself it must have been "Excelsior." His thoughts were always lifted above the common; they were aimed at the best in life; they reached up to those higher realms where truth reigns supreme.

Those who live are those who struggle.

Measured by this, Mr. TRIBBLE may well be said to have lived a splendid life, for he never ceased to struggle for that which is good, that which is noble, that which elevates character. In his nature Mr. TRIBBLE partook of much of the mountains in whose vicinity he was born and had been reared. Firmness, rugged honesty, unyielding determination in the face of adverse influ-

ences, perseverance under difficulties, self-reliance were distinguishing traits in his moral make-up. Yet withal his was a kindly spirit. He was lovable to a degree, but not a spendthrift in his friendships. When he once had made a friend, however, he did "grapple him to his soul with hooks of steel," and was then as self-sacrificing as such a nature could prompt a man to be. No man was ever loved and respected more fully by his neighbors than was he. They knew that they could always rely upon him for friendly aid whenever aid was needed. They knew that if they came to him for advice it would come from the heart and would be given after patient consideration. He was a man whom children loved, and that is the best test of the kindness of a man's nature.

Mr. TRIBBLE was a model husband and father. In his home life he was governed by the same lofty ideals which animated his public career. To his wife he was the ever loving, considerate companion; to his children the ever faithful counselor and close friend. They received from him the best that his mind and heart could offer them. Praise was ever given in lavish measure and reproach was softened by gentle words.

Disraeli, in his speech on the death of the Duke of Wellington, in the House of Commons, said:

The Duke of Wellington has left to this country a great legacy, greater even than his fame—he has left to us the contemplation of his character.

No one will gainsay the declaration that the contemplation of a fine character is something whereby every man may profit. And thus we may to-day gather new inspiration for the work which we are appointed to do by pondering the character and the life of our departed colleague and friend. Surely, we can profit by the contemplation of his high sense of duty; by the consideration of his earnestness in his application to his work, of his conscientiousness in the discharge of every task that came to his hands. From such a study we may well gather new inspiration.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, we have assembled to-day to pay tribute to one of Nature's noblemen, to one who loved God and his fellow man, for such a man was Hon. S. J. TRIBBLE, our late colleague in this august Assembly.

Mr. TRIBBLE, in the very prime of life, vigorous, energetic, full of hope, and desirous of being of service to the people who had honored him, was suddenly called from his sphere of usefulness by the Great Architect of the Universe. Surely "God moves in a mysterious way, His wonders to perform."

On the opening day of this session of Congress, I sat in the House with Mr. TRIBBLE, and we discussed pending legislation, and he was full of ambition and determination to render splendid service to his district, State, and Nation. I never saw him in better spirits or seemingly in better health. On the following morning my heart was inexpressibly grieved and shocked to learn that my friend had had a stroke of apoplexy, and was at death's door, in a hospital. I hastened to his bedside, but human love and friendship and the best of medical skill availed not, and on the 8th day of December the soul of our friend returned to the God who gave it.

Mr. TRIBBLE held many positions of trust and honor and fully measured up to the requirements of each of them. He was a devoted husband, a loving father, a sincere and loyal friend, and the world is brighter and better for his having lived in it. He was my friend, true and tried. I loved him in life, and shall ever cherish his memory.

With a number of his colleagues, I accompanied his remains to the beautiful, classic city of Athens, Ga., his former home. On the following day, in the Presbyterian Church, his funeral was held. The church was filled with beautiful floral offerings, evidencing the love and esteem in which he was held, and a great concourse of sorrowing friends assembled to do him honor. The large edifice was inadequate to accommodate his many friends, and thousands could not gain admittance to the church. The funeral services were conducted by Dr. Lynch, of the Baptist, and Dr. Hill, of the Presbyterian Church, each delivering able and impressive orations which I incorporate in this, my simple tribute to my friend.

We believe in the immortality of the soul; therefore, let us hope, in the bright and better world, once again we shall know Mr. TRIBBLE and be with him forevermore.

There is no death,
The stars go down to rise upon a fairer shore
And bright in heaven's jeweled crown,
They shine forevermore.

And ever near us tho' unseen
The nearer immortal spirit treads,
For all the boundless universe is life,
There are no dead.

Discourse at the funeral service of Congressman S. J. TRIBBLE, by Rev. James William Lynch, D. D., pastor of the First Baptist Church, Athens, Ga.

ETERNITY IN THE HEART.

God has surprised us. We are shocked, pained, and grieved. For the moment the nightmare of oppressive mystery paralyzes us. We are as those who have frightful dreams in the night and wish for the light of the coming day.

THE TIMELINESS OF GOD.

In the dark and fell hour, so seemingly rude and ruthless, I come to lay upon your gashed hearts the comfort and hope of a beautiful scripture, "He hath made everything beautiful in its time; also He hath set eternity in their heart." In the eyes of God everything is beautiful in its time and place, for He sees it in the light of His all-revealing eternity. Though our hearts are stunned and paralyzed, God has put in them the ballast of a deathless hope.

THE DEATHLESS HOPE.

By the deathless hope I mean to designate the hope of immortality. The thirst for a future, personal, and conscious existence is the supreme passion of the soul. The moaning hunger of life is life—continued, personal, family-related, and consciously happy.

AGE AND EXPRESSION OF THE HOPE.

This hope is old as the soul and a part of it. The writer of Ecclesiastes—a book Voltaire read and Ingersoll praised—declares that God has set eternity in the heart. This eternal hope the Hebrews embalmed in their holy writings, the Egyptians bulid in their pyramids, prehistoric man symbolized on his rude implements of toil and weapons of war, and in all ages sculpture has given to its expression the finest stroke, painting the softest touch, poetry the gladdest note, and devotion the most sacred utterance.

THE RETICENCE OF MOSES.

The reticence of Moses on the question may be explained—the matter had been overdone in Egypt. In that land of pyramids, tombs, and mummies, immortality was only another word for superstitious idolatry. The nations' literature was called the "Book of the Dead." The enslaved Israelites needed to be organized and taught, not the masonry of sepulture and art of embalming, but the laws of hygiene and jurisprudence, not how to die and be buried, but how to be healthy and strong and long-lived. The great Prophet succeeded—the Jews are the healthiest people and most persistent race in the world.

NO LIE IN NATURE.

Though we may not affirm that the universality of the deathless hope proves the reality of an endless life, yet we do conclude that it constitutes a strong presumption in its favor. In the realm of nature there is no unsatisfied want—no emptiness without a corresponding fullness. The eye wants vision, and there is light; the ear wants sound, and there is music; the nose wants smell, and there is fragrance; the mouth wants taste, and there is food; the nerves want thrill, and there is touch; the mind wants thought, and there is truth, revealed and axiomatic; the heart wants love, and there is friendship; the soul wants life, and there is God. "My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God." If there be no future existence, this eternity in the heart is the only lie in nature.

THOUGHTS BEFORE THINGS.

Our faith in the doctrine will largely depend upon whether we assume the primacy and preeminence of mind or matter. For my part I find it easier to believe in the eternity of mind than to believe in the eternity of matter. Thoughts are greater than things. I believe they are older. All things were first thoughts. The modern loom is Arkwright's thought dressed up in iron; the locomotive is Stephenson's thought harnessed to steel; the ocean liner is Fulton's thought under steam; the stars are God's thoughts on fire; the Lord Christ was the Word made flesh. Our bodies decay and fall, but we pass away thinking.

THE GREAT ASSUMPTION.

Much of our practical knowledge is based upon assumptions. We can not prove anything in its genesis. Mathematics rests upon the assumption that one is one and twice one is two. We can not prove it. The great truths are axiomatic. God has put them in the mind as He has put eternity in the heart. They admit of no demonstration. Our use of them is an act of faith. God is the Great Assumption.

THE LAW OF CORRESPONDENCE.

To everything in the universe there has been given a sphere of existence corresponding to its nature. The planet Jupiter has an orbit of a thousand million miles. Some trees live a thousand years and more. The white elephant of India does service for a century. Now, man is greater than trees and elephants and planets. It is unreasonable to believe that they have larger spheres and longer lives. We are all greater than our dreams. "They that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars forever."

AN ETERNAL NECESSITY.

Moreover, the hope is an eternal necessity. Without it society would not hold together or civilization advance. The great apostle truly says, "If we have only hoped in Christ in this life, we are of all men most pitiable." Once let materialistic philosophy filter down into the common mind and selfishness would become dominant and regnant. Wheels would reverse and take us back to mere animalism. Epicures do not make missionaries or martyrs or soldiers. The world must have men who endure as seeing Him who is invisible. "We are saved by hope." God has put this telescope in our hearts and we look not upon things seen but unseen, for these are eternal. With John Fiske I believe in the "sweet reasonableness of God." This infinitude of space and these multitudinous worlds mean something. Nothing is wasted in God's hands. With Him there is a thing for every place and a place for everything. "In My Father's house are many mansions. I go to prepare a place for you."

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNIVERSE.

The inequalities of condition and miscarriages of justice in the social world at least hint a final settlement and adjudication of human affairs. Not many lawyers are infidels. They believe in laws and laws are made; they do not make themselves. Old Abraham asked, "Will not the Judge of all the earth do right?" It is the first moral

question raised in the Bible and the question can only finally and satisfactorily be answered in the Supreme Court of the Universe. Nothing is settled until it is settled right, but many decisions here will have to be appealed to the Great Assize. I have found the deathless hope weakest in physicists and surgeons, men who work in matter; and I have found it strongest in teachers, jurists, and statesmen, men who work in mind.

THE WORLD'S GREATEST REASONER.

The world's greatest intellect, for pure and unaided reason, reached the conviction of a life beyond. I refer to Plato of the Greeks. The words of his classic interpreter, Addison, have almost the immortality of their theme:

"It must be so—Plato, thou reasonest well!—
Else whence this pleasing hope, this fond desire,
This longing after immortality?
Or whence this secret dread, and inward horror,
Of falling into naught? Why shrinks the soul
Back on herself, and startles at destruction?
'Tis the divinity that stirs within us;
'Tis heaven itself that points out an hereafter,
And intimates eternity to man.
Eternity! thou pleasing, dreadful thought.
The stars shall fade away, the Sun himself
Grow dim with age, and nature sink in years,
But thou shalt flourish in immortal youth,
Unhurt amidst the war of elements,
The wrecks of matter, and the crush of worlds."

THE BEST AND FINAL WORD.

But after all has been said that can be said from the standpoint of science, philosophy, poetry, and reason, it remains, as revelation declares, that Christ brought life and immortality into light. The universal hope blossomed on His lips. He spoke words of familiarity, candor, and assurance. He called spirits back from the silence, and talked with heavenly visitants. He turned loose resurgent forces that still work upward. Out of His empty tomb came the great White Day, our Sabbath, witnessing every week and forever to His resurrection.

THE KEYS OF DEATH AND HADES.

John of Patmos saw Him in glory and heard Him say, "I am He that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive forevermore, Amen; and have the keys of hades and death." The "keys" are doubtless the symbols of experience and authority. Our Lord has tasted death for every man, and He has power to unlock all doors. He has the key to every experience in our life, every pain in our flesh, every wound in our heart, every perplexity in our mind—every condition, situation, state, and place through which the soul must pass. He will meet us in death with the keys; at the grave with the keys; at the gates of heaven with the keys. The compressed eternity in our hearts will expand into the eternity of ageless time, boundless space, endless life, infinite beauty, and all-perfect knowledge. We shall be with Him and like Him, and we shall know Him and ours and all, even as we are known. The deathless seed in the heart will flower forever in a deathless world.

"God does not send us strange flowers every year;
When the spring winds blow o'er pleasant places,
The same dear things lift up the same fair faces,
The violet is here.
It all comes back—the odor, grace, and hue,
Each sweet relation of its life repeated;
It is the thing we knew.
So after the death winter it will be;
God will not put strange sights in heavenly places;
The old love will look out from the old faces;
Veilchen, I shall have thee!"

Remarks at the funeral of Congressman S. J. TRIBBLE by his friend Dr. E. L. Hill.

"FRIENDSHIP."

The gifted and brilliant Goldsmith put in the mouth of one of his characters, who occupied the sacred office and lived the holy life, the disparaging words,

"And what is friendship but a name,
A charm to lull to sleep;
A shade to follow wealth and fame,
And leave the wretch to weep."

If this is a true conception of friendship, then better by far eliminate the thought from the human mind, and eradicate the sentiment from the human heart, and erase the word from the human language; but this is not a true interpretation of friendship. Friendship is the richest gift of one soul to another; and more precious than gold and silver. When Cyrus gave Artabazus, one of his courtiers, a gold cup, he gave Crysanthus, his favorite friend, a kiss. And Artabazus said to Cyrus, his great general, "The gold in my cup is not so precious as the sweetness in the kiss of friendship, which you have given Crysanthus." This was the ancient way of expressing the priceless value of friendship.

The life which has not been blessed with friendship's fragrant love is not worth living; and impoverished indeed is that life which has not been graced with true friends. We Americans can almost feel our hearts move with forgiveness and certainly with pity when we see that military genius, Benedict Arnold, who trifled with his honor and betrayed his country, lying upon his death bed in a garret in the metropolis of the world; and hear his physician ask him if there is anything he would have, and hear him reply, "Yes, only a friend." The essential worth of friendship was duly appreciated by the great Master Teacher who had nothing more valuable to give his disciples and nothing they coveted more, and hence he said to them, "Henceforth I call you not servants. I have called you friends."

Hon. S. J. TRIBBLE gave expression in life to no other virtue more strikingly than that of loyalty to his friends. Standing on yonder street corner engaged in conversation with him one day, he pointed to a man who passed by, and said, "That man is my friend, and I am waiting for an opportunity to show my appreciation of his friendship." Those of us who knew him well could appreciate fully the sincerity and solidity of his friendship. This large gathering, representing his entire district, bear full and rich witness to the esteem in which he was held by his friends.

I am honored to have been numbered among those who claimed him as a friend. Ten years ago I came to this city, a stranger in a strange land, and the third home into which I was invited was that of Mr. TRIBBLE. I well remember that ideal little cottage home on Prince Avenue, with the charms of a warm hospitality and the delights of magnetic personalities. From that evening my friend constantly expressed his genial interest in me and mine. His every effort was put forth to make me comfortable in that same little cottage, the few months that I occupied it as my home. When he was called into a larger sphere of usefulness, I thought perhaps his mind would be so engulfed in the larger interest of life he would drift away from local interests and persons, but from time to time he wrote me of his service and plans in Congress, and never failed to give me the warm hand grasp when I met him on our streets here.

But this friendship, like yonder mountain stream which springs from a pure fountain head and moves along its course for a time and then darts from sight underground, until farther down in the valley it appears again larger and richer and grander and more powerful, has been interrupted for a season by its passage through the grave, but soon will appear grander and larger and stronger in that world of endless and congenial associations. Until then I bid my friend, good-bye.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of personal bereavement that I appear to-day. When Mr. TRIBBLE came to Congress it was the good fortune of our committee that he should be assigned as a member thereof, and during the years of his service I had opportunity of close association with him, an association that, as the years continued and our work grew in volume and importance, became closer, and our friendship was cemented into a more hallowed compact. I esteemed him very highly, and I am justified in saying that he had the esteem, confidence, and admiration of every member of the committee. We esteemed him for his worth, we admired him for his ability, and we loved him for his friendship.

Mr. TRIBBLE was a man of positive convictions. It was not a question in his convictions, as commonly expressed, of "milk and cider." He believed something. He believed it in a positive way. He believed there were duties to be performed in life, and that belief was positive. He believed that there was work to be accomplished by a Member of Congress, and that was a positive belief with him, and he asserted it. He was a man who had the courage of his convictions. He was not afraid to express them, and he did express them when he felt that it was his duty so to do.

He was not only positive in his convictions, not only had the courage of them, but he was sincere in his beliefs. His beliefs and his convictions found lodgment in his heart and received the sanction of his judgment and the approval of his intelligence. No one can help but admire one who is positive in his character, who is courageous in his convictions, and who is sincere in his beliefs.

Again, Mr. Speaker, a thing that may be spoken to his credit and is worthy of emulation is that he was not too stubborn to learn. There is a great deal in that. Every Member who comes to Congress comes as a new man. There is a broad field here that before coming he has never explored. There are many subjects here which in their full phase and full view he has not attempted to survey. There are many questions here that he has not had either the time, the opportunity, or the privilege of fathoming. Sometimes we find a man so set in his ways, so prejudiced in his convictions, that he is too stubborn to learn. It is to be said to the credit of anyone, when he comes into a larger field of experience and observation, when he comes into a line of new duties, of untried labors, that he is not too stubborn to learn by experience and by enlarged opportunities and extended privileges. And I do not know of anyone in my association, in committee work, in private friendship, and in observation in the House that better illustrated that than our friend, Mr. TRIBBLE. He was frank, open, and sincere, and a man with feeling, with noble purpose, not too stubborn to learn, and developed year after year as he served in this House, and he was enlarging the sphere of his usefulness and improving all of his opportunities. It is something that can be spoken to his credit and is worthy of emulation.

Again, Mr. Speaker, he was polite and courteous. I think I might emphasize that especially. Politeness is one of the virtues of life that I sometimes think in the stir and bustle and the confusion of our present life is sometimes overlooked. I sometimes think that this generation does not give that attention and that consideration to the virtue of politeness that characterized our fathers and our forebears. It is a virtue, however, that yields the greatest dividends of any in life. It costs nothing, and yet it is the polish, it is the finish in character that marks the gentleman, that makes us close to our friends, that makes us congenial in company and in society. There may be a rough diamond and we esteem it as a diamond; but its beauty, its brilliancy, its value, is brought out and exemplified when it is polished. And politeness, courteous demeanor, courteous and polite character, is the finished-diamond quality of our lives.

Mr. TRIBBLE in his personal conduct and association illustrated these virtues. It is said:

Our lives are songs; God writes the words,
And we set them to music at pleasure;
The song grows sad, or sweet, or glad,
As we choose to fashion the measure.

The song of life for Mr. TRIBBLE was a glad song. He realized the true philosophy contained in that little verse, that he could fashion the song of his life and make it sad, sweet, or glad, and he chose to make it sweet and glad. Its harmony was pure, its melody was inspiring; and although we have laid him away to rest, the sweetness and the melody of that song are not hushed.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, we are glad to hear from the great chairman of the great committee on which our late friend, Mr. TRIBBLE, performed such excellent work, Mr. PADGETT of Tennessee, the words of praise and esteem and affection to which we have just listened. He is the best witness in this House as to the facts about which he talks, and his commendation is high praise indeed.

All important events and conspicuous men afford opportunity for instruction, and we can not make progress if we fail to observe and embrace the opportunities. Of course, we all hear though we neglect and do not often bear in mind, the great truth that "in the midst of life we are in death," and the importance of that injunction, "Be ye also ready," and the suddenness with which death comes and cuts off the most promising and useful in life. But there are other lessons that can be learned from the lives of such men as SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE. His life is an exemplification of the genius and value of our institutions, of the wide-open door which our institutions afford of opportunity for all to rise, to do well, to achieve usefulness, to make themselves illustrious, and to bless mankind.

Although we had a general knowledge of Mr. TRIBBLE as a lawyer in Georgia and as solicitor general of his circuit, there was very little general knowledge in Georgia of the real character of the man. But when suddenly and unexpectedly to us all at a distance from his district he defeated for Congress one we at that time thought the most brilliant man in Georgia or in Congress—at least many of us thought so—a man who had been most illustrious in his State, a man who by his wisdom and achievements in this House stood as the peer at the highest, and who would have been chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs if he had been reelected, we were led to wonder and inquire who was Mr. TRIBBLE. We were prompted to think there must be something in him, and something known to his constituents not known to the balance of the State; and so with much curiosity we observed his coming and his performance.

We found on nearer acquaintance that he had in him those elements of heart and mind and character that had endeared him to the people who knew him the best; that as solicitor general he had enforced justice with some discriminating degree of judgment and some element of tender mercy; that even as prosecuting officer, who had for four years enforced the law, he was yet popular, and that the people among whom he had lived, the people whom he had served, had elected him to Congress over the great and popular man whom he challenged in the battle for preference. We found that though he was not born to titles nor wealth nor influence, he had taken his chances among the poor boys in America; that he had used the few opportunities afforded him; that he had utilized every advantage; that he had learned to realize that—

The heights by great men reached and kept
Were not attained by sudden flight,
But they, while their companions slept,
Were toiling upward in the night.

And that with a resolute determination that would take no denial he proceeded step by step to inform his mind, to develop his character, until he had commanded that degree of confidence that elected him as solicitor general, in which office he made good and justified the confidence which afterwards secured his election to Congress.

He realized, even when he came to Congress, that he was not at the top, that he was only an humble beginner in the field of statesmanship, and he accordingly selected the men of experience and wisdom here and sought counsel of them, and sat at the feet of Gamaliel, and adopted for himself the strictest and most careful doctrines of statesmanship. He realized that—

Heaven is not gained by a sudden bound;
But we climb the ladder by which we rise
From the lowly earth to the vaulted skies
Round by round.

And he toiled without ceasing day and night, performing the routine duties the arduous nature of which unfortunately the people do not always understand and appreciate. Sometimes

they think a seat in Congress is a sinecure; that a man has nothing to do but come here and roll in luxury and have an easy time and a frolic all the time.

If they could take SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE as an exemplar and notice him, a poor man, with great demands for expenditure always upon him, his time so occupied by public duties that he could not give attention to private finances, always at work, always working for other people, they would realize that such a man is doing something for his fellow men in return for the great honors they are conferring upon him.

I do not want to forget to state another thing that we discovered upon nearer acquaintance. I may say we also realized the truth of the Scripture which says that "Whoso findeth a good wife findeth a good thing," and that in his wife he had secured a veritable helpmeet who in all his trials and in all his labors had labored and sympathized with him, and who in all his triumphs had rejoiced with him, and in most cases had been conspicuous in securing them. Their union was blessed with two delightful and splendid children, who blessed them by being good and intelligent children; and it seemed that all the elements of happiness and usefulness surrounded Mr. TRIBBLE when he saddened us all by unexpectedly taking his departure for the other world.

It is a pleasure to me, Mr. Speaker, in the midst of our sadness at his loss, to testify thus much to his usefulness to his people and his country, and the confidence his fellow Members reposed in him, and the pleasure his acquaintance afforded us all.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, within the brief period of six years four Georgia Senators, Steve Clay, Joe Terrell, A. O. Bacon, and William S. West have passed on their way, and three Members of this body, Jim Griggs, Anderson Roddenbery, and SAM TRIBBLE have answered the roll. The natural conclusion may reasonably be drawn that life in Washington is not conducive to longevity—seven Members of Congress in six years, or an average of over one a year. The last to die was SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE, of Athens, Ga., whose life and services we meet here to commemorate to-day.

His life and history are marked by strenuous effort. Above all he was a clean-cut, uncompromising, honest, and generous fighter who bore upon his political body many honorable scars, and I may add that in my opinion his strenuous exertion leading to a wonderful victory over a strong opponent in the last campaign was the direct proximate cause of his death. He had grown to be a skillful, watchful, and efficient legislator; he got results; he was ever ready either for service or for sacrifice; and the people of his district evidenced their great appreciation of his services by an overwhelming majority of some 12,000 in the last primary.

He would hardly have had opposition again in 10 years; and having reached this satisfactory state in public life when he could work for his district and State untrammelled by the dread of near opposition; when his efficiency was at its best an unaccountable thing happened as it often happens. The end of what appeared the beginning of a most useful public life came suddenly.

It was hard to die under such circumstances and conditions, yet when I first saw him after he was stricken I realized that he knew that the clock had struck twelve for him and he apparently had no deep regrets at leaving but for the parting with family and friends. He met and faced the common foe calmly and resignedly. With Dr. Davenport White and a trained nurse at Providence Hospital I was in a condition to know, if any one could, the state of his mind. I was the last person to whom he spoke. Right here I wish to remark in an aside of the wonderfully delicate structure of the human body. With every faculty at its best, mentally and physically, and the red blood coursing at full tide, there came a slight rupture of a minute capillary within the skull near the right temple, through which only one red blood corpuscle could pass at a time, and this little seeping leak formed a clot no bigger, perhaps, than a small pinhead and this caused the pressure which induced paralysis, and either the clot would not absorb or the little leak would not stop, and this little thing stopped the wonderful machinery which in action is life; and, then "the golden bowl was broken and the silver chord was loosed," and his spirit winged its way to the God who made it, and now we trust he is at perfect rest.

SAM TRIBBLE'S friendship was as pure and true as the "unchanging blue." He was such a friend as one could trust without fear of betrayal with the innermost secrets of his soul; and how rare is such friendship! Such unwavering loyalty! Among the most sacred words to me relating to the conduct of man to man is "friend," and "friendship." Friendship amidst one's difficulties, friendship that clings to one when others doubt his motives and misconstrue his conduct—

"friendship, the cordial drop that makes the bitter draught of life go down!"

He was great because he loved his country, his home, his district, his State, his section, and there was not a conscious moment when he would not, if he deemed it needful, have freely sacrificed his life on his country's altar.

His conscience was his guide through this life to another. He followed its dictates, true as the needle to the pole, and there rises before my mental vision the lines of Burns to his young friend, to heed his conscience:

Its slightest touches instant pause,
Debar all side pretences,
And resolutely keep her laws
Uncaring consequences.

He left a brilliant and devoted wife, one who was more helpmeet than most wives can be to their husbands. She was his daily consulting companion at all times and everywhere; he left a noble and manly son, who will surely follow in his footsteps along the pathways of duty; he left a beautiful and affectionate daughter who loved him devotedly; and he left many true and tried friends who mourn his death.

We all loved him, we love his memory, and trust that in the future we will meet and live together again. If for no reason given in the Inspired Writings, "by the same token that the death-devoted Greek knew that he would meet again his own Clemanthe" we know that we will meet again.

"As Ion begins his preparation for sacrifice at the command at Athens, Clemanthe his beloved fiancé exclaims, "And shall we never see each other?" and, after a pause, Ion answers, "Yes! I have asked that dreadful question of the hills that look eternal; of the flowing streams that lucid flow forever; of the stars, amid whose fields of azure my raised spirit hath trod in glory; all were dumb; but now, while I thus gaze upon thy living face, I feel the love that kindles through its beauty can never wholly perish; we shall meet again."

Some philosopher has wisely or unwisely said that death is man's best friend. And what is death to him who meets it with an upright heart?

A quiet haven where his shattered bark
Harbors secure 'til the rough storm is past,
Perhaps a passage overhung with clouds,
But at its entrance a few leagues beyond,
Opening to kinder skies and milder suns,
And seas pacific as the soul that seeks them.

A deserving and beautiful compliment was paid to him by the two able and Christian ministers who conducted his funeral exercises at the old Presbyterian Church at Athens, the seat of learning, the alma mater of so many distinguished Georgians. His pallbearers were among the wealthiest and most respected men of that center of learning; but higher than sermons and distinguished pallbearers was the simple and, to me, touching testimonial of the multitude of plain people who came from the edges of his district with increasing numbers as they came to view in solemn silence the last rites of the man they had loved and learned to love more and more as they knew him better and better.

SAM TRIBBLE was an independent character. "He walked a highway of his own and kept the company of his self-respect." He seldom sought advice, he worked out his own problems. He flared with righteous indignation at any slight assault made by Members on his State or his people, and he struck back like the reflex action of a nerve-pricked muscle. He was responsible for his acts because they were peculiarly his own. "Like Tennessee's pardner, he played a lone hand."

The close of such a life as his is in keeping with its general tenor—calm, peaceful, resigned, hopeful—leaving to his family and friends the inestimable heritage of a well-spent life in service of God and fellow man.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has set apart this hour to pay tribute to the work, life, and character of our departed colleague, the late lamented SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE.

I had known him for quite a number of years casually, but from the beginning of my term here we were thrown together almost daily until Congress adjourned, discussing our work, the different items of legislation, and the best and proper way to proceed. Being a new Member, I always felt free to discuss anything with him and obtain suggestions from him. In our constant association and work together I learned to know him, I believe, as he really was—a kind, courteous, lovable Christian gentleman.

He was dependable, always at his post, seeking the truth and right in everything, doing his duty to his people and to his country. His whole ambition here was that he might serve his people; to the trust reposed in him by them he was always faithful and true. He had a fine and delicate sense of justice

and the power to discriminate accurately, being able to separate the good from the evil, the true from the false; and, when convinced in his own mind of the right course to pursue, he possessed the moral courage to stand by his convictions. His mind and heart were always open to the cry of the distressed, the poor, the needy, the oppressed, wherever found; and, be it said to his everlasting credit and honor, he was always ready to help them.

I could not pay him higher tribute; nay, if he now knows—and who will say he does not—he would not have me say more, nor consider anything a higher honor or greater tribute than to say he was the servant, the friend of the poor, the needy, the friendless, the weak, the oppressed.

He was just finishing his third term here and had been reelected for another term, showing the faith and confidence his constituents had in him. He devoted his whole time and energy to their interests. His loyalty and majesty of character are shown in his life work. He was of a modest demeanor, and had no desire to appear other than he really was. He avoided show and ostentatious display.

SAM TRIBBLE was a man, great, not in the large accumulation of wealth, not in his own estimation, though holding high positions of honor and trust, but great in humility of life and of that moral character which enables one to withstand and overcome all obstacles, and do right under all circumstances, as he saw it.

His early training and life were such as to bring him in contact with that class of his fellow citizens which made him familiar with the wants, needs, hopes, ambitions, and desires of the great mass of toilers of his district and of the Nation, and his sympathy always went out to them, and he labored tirelessly for their welfare. A striking illustration of their appreciation and esteem was shown at his funeral, when men from all walks of life, and especially such as I have referred to, from all over his district in large numbers attended and showed their grief for him who had always kept them in mind and was faithful to their every interest and trust.

We need more such men in public life, in high positions, in legislative halls especially. He was a very useful Member here, and we will continue to miss him.

He is not dead; he has only passed through the gates into that unknown land, into a newer and larger life, waiting and watching for those he loved, free from all pain and sorrow. But our friend and colleague is with us no more. He has preceded us, but we are reminded that we too must travel the same road; whether at some early date or in the distant future, may we have so lived that it may be said of us, as it can truly be said of him, that he was a noble, true, and honest man; that the world is better on account of his life; that he contributed some to the sum total of human goodness and made many happier.

Earth seems more sweet to live upon, more full of love, because of him.

It was a sad privilege to attend his funeral. The sorrowful crowd which gathered long before the hour of the funeral, the procession which accompanied his remains to its last resting place, the large floral offerings laid by friends upon his bier, and the look of sadness and grief upon the faces of all who gathered to pay last tribute of love and respect to his memory, showed the real esteem in which our colleague was held by his colleagues, his fellow townsmen, and the people of his State.

Now, as we meet in this hall where he labored and spent much time so pleasantly, and realizing that he is to meet with us no more, our hearts are filled with grief and we feel deeply the loss we have sustained. When we remember how he was so suddenly stricken, his sufferings, how we watched by his side, hoping against hope, and then how he slipped away, we are overwhelmed in our sorrow. We have reached that place where earthly help is of no avail in our suffering; yet we can look beyond the clouds that overshadow us and through faith see the star of hope, and remember the assuring promise of Him who said,

I am the resurrection and the life; whosoever believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live again. And whosoever liveth and believeth in me, he shall never die.

His death was a distinct loss, not only to his district and State, but to the Nation. People, out of gratitude for service rendered throughout the past, in all ages, have built imposing monuments in memory of the lives, characters, deeds, and virtues of their dead; they remind us and generations following of their many lovable traits and accomplishments, inspiring us to nobler deeds and better lives; but greater than monuments of marble, than fame, and wealth is the rich heritage left to his family and friends. A life that amid all of its temptations, it worries, and disappointments "had kept the whiteness

of his soul." Had lived the true life, worthy, and well spent in the service of his people.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be allowed 10 or 15 days to revise and extend remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WALKER] requests unanimous consent that general leave to print for all Members be given for 15 days. Is there objection? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, from the time when God said, "Let there be light," and there was light, the evidence He gave us of His power and purpose was discoverable in three things, and they are, that He implanted in the human heart the sentiment of love, inspired respect for life, and reverence for death.

Centuries before the cross was erected on Calvary, where was consummated the sublimest of all sacrifices, the ancients worshipped their mythical gods under the belief that they were children of earth and that by their wisdom and power they had transmuted themselves into gods and were instrumental and capable, from their homes afar off, of controlling the destinies of earth; that all changes of season, climate, thunderstorms, and tempests, all ills of mankind, his sorrows, his misfortunes, blessings, and comforts, came either from the wrath, whim, or pleasure of these beings.

It is related by the historians that it was no uncommon custom among the ancients to offer up human sacrifice to the gods and to the spirits of departed friends.

The progress and enlightenment of mankind has changed even the appearance of the bloody sacrifice, and we have gathered here to-day to perform a sad but most appropriate duty, under a beautiful custom of this great lawmaking body, for the purpose of speaking in kindness and sorrow of a departed Member; to refresh our memories with copious drafts from the fountain of love and charity made by our departed colleague while living among us; to revive sweet thoughts and pleasant recollections; to place upon the altar of friendship a sprig of evergreen—a little forget-me-not.

When we met early in December for the last session of the Sixty-fourth Congress, knowing the frailty and uncertainty of life, we knew that ere this Congress expired by limitation on March 4 of the coming year there would be some of us whose voice would become silent, who would sink into that dreamless sleep which kisses down the eyelids still; whose form would be absent from this chamber; whose seat would be vacant; some who, at the beckoning of the pale messenger that never tires and never pities, would lay aside forever the burden and cares of this life and be piloted to the "misty dim regions of Weir," where hope is the creator and faith the defender, and within one week of the day we convened the soul of Hon. SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE had appeared before its Maker.

On the 4th of December, Mr. TRIBBLE was in his seat, well and happy, and joined his fellow Members in extending congratulations to those who had won reelection in November and genuine sympathy to the unfortunate ones whose terms must terminate March next. There was then no indication that the angel of death hovered so closely about our beloved colleague who had just been reelected to the Sixty-fifth Congress and during his sojourn in Washington as a Member of the House had become so popular with all of those with whom he came in contact.

Death is always sad, but it is peculiarly so when it strikes at a shining mark and cuts down and terminates a life but half spent at the moment the zenith of success and happiness has been attained, as it did in this instance. It is such cases which cause us to realize how mysterious life itself is, and how uncertain.

Death has since then again visited our body and summoned to his eternal home another able, valued, and popular Member, Hon. David E. Finley, of South Carolina. Georgia, with sorrow's pain still fresh in her breast and tears not yet dry from her own loss, extends loving sympathy to her sister Commonwealth across the Savannah in the sudden and sad bereavement which has come upon her.

Perhaps in all Georgia no man's life furnishes greater inspiration and incentive to hope for the young man of that State than does that of Mr. TRIBBLE. Born in a small hamlet, SAMUEL J. TRIBBLE, by hard work in the open air during his early boyhood days, laid the foundation for a strong constitution, which was strengthened in after life by freedom from any evil habits. He possessed three predominating and cardinal virtues—fidelity, sobriety, and industry—to which were added a

fund of great common sense and a wonderful knowledge of human nature. Without influence and starting without means in early life, by hard work he overcame one obstacle after another and made for himself a pathway through life marked at every milestone by singular success, in each instance due almost entirely to his wonderful industry, strong integrity, absolute sobriety, and constant faithfulness and fidelity to trusts confided to him.

He laid hold of his opportunities, and nobly and grandly he rounded out a magnificent character. It is, after all, the character that we work out of our opportunities, whatever our ability, that marks the measure and the fullness and the grandeur of the man. He was true to his fellow men, true to his duties, true to his associates, true and loyal to his friends, a devoted husband and father. We are better for our association with him, and the world is better that he lived and labored.

To those who knew him best it seemed as if he had placed and constantly kept before him that great motto:

To thine own self be true,
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man.

And by closely and constantly adhering to this simple but hard rule of life he steadily moved on from a country boy without influence to honorable membership in the greatest body of lawmakers for the greatest Nation in the world, and there made for himself a reputation for character, industry, ability, and courage that commanded and gave to him at all times the esteem and respect of his fellow Members, who are gathered to-day to pay tribute to him and his life's work, unfortunately terminated before he was 48 years of age and just in fullest prime.

Surely no man could hope to do more. He is sincerely mourned and sadly missed by the wide circle of friends and acquaintances he had made.

He, the young and strong, who cherished
Noble longings for the strife,
By the roadside fell and perished,
Wearily with the march of life.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, again the death angel has invaded the ranks of our membership, and he has taken away one of the bravest and best Members of this body.

SAM TRIBBLE was my friend, and I was deeply grieved when I heard that he was dead. Here he labored earnestly and faithfully.

He was an able and industrious Member of Congress, cheerful and enthusiastic in all his labors.

Just a little while ago, Mr. Speaker, we saw him engaging in the debates in this House and we heard him answering the roll-calls. But we can hear him speak no more—and he has answered his last roll-call here. In the midst of a busy and a useful life death touched him and he fell asleep. In the providence of God I believe that his name has been added to the list of the faithful over yonder, and that his splendid spirit is at rest forevermore. God bless and comfort his loved ones.

Mr. RUCKER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, when Mr. TRIBBLE left Athens on Friday preceding the meeting of Congress in December he seemed full of health, happiness, and brilliancy, and there was nothing to indicate that we would have the services of to-day commemorative of his services in this House, and yet God in His providence has so ordered and he is profoundly mourned by the people of the eighth congressional district, into whose confidence and affection he had dug himself deeply. They loved him in life, they deplore him in death, and in him they knew they had a friend in whom there was no shadow of turning.

He went directly to the people and made himself known to them, learned their wants, was interested in what they desired, and served them faithfully. The eighth district of Georgia has had many illustrious Representatives. It has had upon this floor as its Representatives Howell Cobb, Benjamin H. Hill, Parks Bell, Emory Speer, William M. Howard, and many an illustrious person. It never had a Representative more true to the people, more watchful of their interests, more solicitous of their good than our lamented friend.

I first knew Mr. TRIBBLE when he came as a student to the University of Georgia at Athens from the county of Franklin—a good old rock-ribbed Democratic county. He was graduated from the university with distinguished honors, succeeding here as everywhere else and commencing the practice of law at Athens with the Hon. Edward T. Brown, a great lawyer and a man enjoying an excellent practice.

Mr. TRIBBLE made good from the beginning because he brought into the practice of his profession high intelligence, sterling integrity, untiring energy, and a faithfulness that characterized his every act.

After a few years he became a candidate for the office of solicitor general in the western circuit, and was elected. He gave equal rights to all and special privileges to none, the high and the low, the rich and the poor alike. There was no bitterness in his prosecutions but fairness and justice, and he left no wounds, because everyone recognized that fair play was the order of the day. He won the office by a tremendous vote over a strong field, for even this early the people had become to know him and to love him. After he retired from the office of solicitor general he continued the practice of law for a year or two and then announced his candidacy for Congress, in opposition to the Hon. William M. Howard, a long-time Member of this House who was known for his intelligence and high character and deemed invincible.

This race was in 1910 and one of the hottest that we ever had in the eighth congressional district—a district in which there has been many a hard fight, and as much fine campaigning as in any district in this great country. He faced every shape of power and influence and conquered all. He made good in Congress from the beginning. He never got a letter he did not answer promptly. He attended to every request made of him and got favorable action, and the people soon came to know that they had one at Washington who could be relied upon in all contingencies.

In the two succeeding elections he had no opposition but in 1916 he was opposed by Hon. Thomas J. Brown, of Elbert County, a gentleman of high standing and character, and he triumphed by a large majority, and at the time he was taken away it seemed that he had silenced opposition, that he had gotten out over the rough waters and out in the open sea where every prospect pleased.

In all his public career he had the support and help of his wife, possessed of every grace of mind and heart, of his lovely daughter and his noble son.

In his first campaign I believe he visited every home and every citizen in the eighth congressional district and he knew every voter personally. His style of campaigning was novel.

His services here have been beautifully portrayed by his fellow Members. They knew him, loved him, and are aware of the excellence of his service, of his interest in his constituents, and his unswerving integrity.

I never knew a man who had more of the elements that commend one to the love of those he comes in contact with than SAM TRIBBLE. It was not hard for him to make friends with the people. He loved them and they loved him. I observe, Mr. Speaker, that whenever you love anybody you will find them loving you, and when they love you you may know you love them.

He had a kind heart and a generous disposition and he sought to find good in every person, and he found it.

Speaking of kindness I desire here to produce some words spoken by Senator Benj. H. Hill, years ago in the United States Senate:

Mr. President, we are told that when God created the heavens and the earth on the third day He said, "Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth; and it was so." From that day to this it has been so. Yet all these seeds must be sown in their season and in a climate adapted to their nature, else they will perish. But, sir, there is seed which will bear fruit in all seasons and in every clime under the heavens. Plant it in the cold where the snows never melt, or in the heat where the frosts never come; scatter it on the naked rocks or in the most fertile soil; drop it in the water or on the land and everywhere, every seed will germinate and grow and reward the sower. It is tilled by a hand that never tires; it is watched by an eye that never sleeps; it is trained by a power that tempers all the elements to its healthiest maturity. That seed, sir, is kindness, and I have garnered its fruits when and where they were least expected.

I was standing at Heardmont, in Elbert County, Ga., near the banks of the Savannah River, when the train bearing the body home came upon the long bridge that spans the mighty river into Elbert County, Ga., and as the train crossed that mighty stream there was a low mournful shriek of the whistle, and I felt that the engineer driving the train was thinking of the dear dead he was carrying home, and he evidenced it by that mournful blast, and it came home to me, SAM TRIBBLE is coming home, coming into Elbert County, which was the storm center of his first race—coming home to be laid away in the beautiful cemetery at Athens, which overlooks the Oconee River, his last resting place. There never was a more beautiful cemetery. There never was interred in its soil a nobler Georgian. Home—a place dear in life, precious in death—more genuine pleasure therein to be found than can be found in all the splendors and glories of the earth. Those at home are the father, mother, the wife, the children, the grandchildren, dear relatives. They never go back on us and love us to the end. They will never turn their backs on us.

And, Mr. Speaker, I remember with so much pleasure this fact, that Mr. TRIBLE not only professed the Christian religion but he practiced it, which is a far better thing.

I see him now, when on Sabbath evenings when at home, he would go into East Athens, a part of the city lived in by God-fearing men and women, and he visited the Sunday schools and singing schools. Nothing interested him more than this work, and he brought sunshine and happiness whenever he entered the door. What a sweet reflection this is.

"I am the resurrection and the life, saith the Lord; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live," and whosoever liveth and believeth shall never die.

Life's fitful fever ended, he sleeps well, and may he renew his wasted strength and refresh his fatigued faculties in the balmy breezes of Heaven's happy home. May a kind Providence rest his mighty soul in eternal peace.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the resolution already adopted the House stands adjourned until Monday, February 5, 1917, at 12 o'clock noon.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Monday, February 5, 1917, at 12 o'clock noon.

SENATE.

MONDAY, February 5, 1917.

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

Rev. J. L. Kibler, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father in heaven, we feel deeply our dependence upon Thee and upon Thy kind providence. We know not what a day may bring forth. In the midst of life we are in death. Guide us, we pray Thee, and guide all the affairs of our great country, that we may have life, and that we may have it more abundantly. Bless Thy servant, the President of the United States, his Cabinet, the Members of Congress, and all who are in positions of authority that they may have wisdom and grace to guide us through these perilous times in a safe way, and that the blessings of peace may speedily come to all the world. We ask it all in Jesus' name. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday, February 2, 1917, when, on request of Mr. JAMES and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

SUBMARINE WARFARE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 3d instant, a translation of the note addressed to him on January 31, 1917, by the German ambassador at Washington, together with translations of the two memoranda which accompanied it. The communication and accompanying papers will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The matter referred to is as follows:

To the Senate:

In compliance with the resolution adopted by the Senate on February 3, 1917, requesting the Secretary of State, if not incompatible with the public interest, to transmit to the Senate a correct copy of the message and accompanying memoranda from the Imperial German Government advising of the resumption of submarine warfare against neutral and other countries, of date February, 1917, the undersigned the Secretary of State has the honor to transmit to the Senate herewith a translation of the note addressed to him on January 31, 1917, by the German ambassador at Washington, together with translations of the two memoranda which accompanied it.

These appear to be the documents called for by the Senate resolution.
ROBERT LANSING.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 3, 1917.

(File No. 763.72/3179.)

THE GERMAN AMBASSADOR TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE.
[Translation.]

GERMAN EMBASSY,
Washington, January 31, 1917.

MR. SECRETARY OF STATE: Your Excellency were good enough to transmit to the Imperial Government a copy of the message which the President of the United States of America addressed to the Senate on the 22d instant. The Imperial Government has given it the earnest consideration which the President's statements deserve, inspired as they are by a deep sentiment of responsibility. It is highly gratifying to the Imperial Government to ascertain that the main tendencies of this important statement correspond largely to the desires and principles professed by Germany. These principles especially include self-government and equality of rights for all nations. Germany would be sincerely glad if in recognition of this principle countries like Ireland and India, which do not enjoy the benefits of political independence, should now obtain their freedom. The German people also repudiate all alliances which serve to force the countries into a competition for might and to involve them in a net of selfish intrigues. On the other hand, Germany will gladly cooperate in all efforts to prevent future wars. The freedom of the seas, being a preliminary condition of the free existence of nations

and the peaceful intercourse between them as well as the open door for the commerce of all nations, has always formed part of the leading principles of Germany's political program. All the more the Imperial Government regrets that the attitude of her enemies who are so entirely opposed to peace makes it impossible for the world at present to bring about the realization of these lofty ideals. Germany and her allies were ready to enter now into a discussion of peace and had set down as basis the guaranty of existence, honor, and free development of their peoples. Their aims, as has been expressly stated in the note of December 12, 1916, were not directed toward the destruction or annihilation of their enemies and were, according to their conviction, perfectly compatible with the rights of the other nations. As to Belgium, for which such warm and cordial sympathy is felt in the United States, the chancellor had declared only a few weeks previously that its annexation had never formed part of Germany's intentions. The peace to be signed with Belgium was to provide for such conditions in that country, with which Germany desires to maintain friendly neighborly relations, that Belgium should not be used again by Germany's enemies for the purpose of instigating continuous hostile intrigues. Such precautionary measures are all the more necessary as Germany's enemies have repeatedly stated not only in speeches delivered by their leading men but also in the statutes of the economical conference in Paris that it is their intention not to treat Germany as an equal even after peace has been restored but to continue their hostile attitude and especially to wage a systematical economical war against her.

The attempt of the four allied powers to bring about peace has failed, owing to the lust of conquest of their enemies, who desired to dictate the conditions of peace. Under the pretense of following the principle of nationality, our enemies have disclosed their real aims in this war, viz, to dismember and dishonor Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria. To the wish of reconciliation they oppose the will of destruction. They desire a fight to the bitter end.

A new situation has thus been created which forces Germany to new decisions. Since two years and a half England is using her naval power for a criminal attempt to force Germany into submission by starvation. In brutal contempt of international law the group of powers led by England does not only curtail the legitimate trade of their opponents but they also by ruthless pressure compel neutral countries either to altogether forego every trade not agreeable to the entente powers or to limit it according to their arbitrary decrees. The American Government knows the steps which have been taken to cause England and her allies to return to the rules of international law and to respect the freedom of the seas. The English Government, however, insists upon continuing its war of starvation, which does not at all affect the military power of its opponents but compels women and children, the sick and the aged, to suffer for their country pains and privations which endanger the vitality of the nation. Thus British tyranny mercilessly increases the sufferings of the world indifferent to the laws of humanity, indifferent to the protests of the neutrals whom they severely harm, indifferent even to the silent longing for peace among England's own allies. Each day of the terrible struggle causes new destruction, new sufferings. Each day shortening the war will on both sides preserve the life of thousands of brave soldiers and be a benefit to mankind.

The Imperial Government could not justify before its own conscience, before the German people, and before history the neglect of any means destined to bring about the end of the war. Like the President of the United States, the Imperial Government had hoped to reach this goal by negotiations. After the attempts to come to an understanding with the entente powers have been answered by the latter with the announcement of an intensified continuation of the war the Imperial Government—in order to serve the welfare of mankind in a higher sense and not to wrong its own people—is now compelled to continue the fight for existence, again forced upon it, with the full employment of all the weapons which are at its disposal.

Sincerely trusting that the people and Government of the United States will understand the motives for this decision and its necessity, the Imperial Government hopes that the United States may view the new situation from the lofty heights of impartiality and assist on their part to prevent further misery and avoidable sacrifice of human life.

In closing two memoranda regarding the details of the contemplated military measures at sea, I remain, etc.

(Signed) J. BEENSTORFF.

[Inclosure 1.]

MEMORANDUM.

After bluntly refusing Germany's peace offer the entente powers, stated in their note addressed to the American Government, that they are determined to continue the war in order to deprive Germany of German Provinces in the west and the east, to destroy Austria-Hungary, and to annihilate Turkey. In waging war with such aims, the entente allies are violating all rules of international law, as they prevent the legitimate trade of neutrals with the central powers, and of the neutrals among themselves. Germany has, so far, not made unrestricted use of the weapon which she possesses in her submarines. Since the entente powers, however, have made it impossible to come to an understanding based upon equality of rights of all nations, as proposed by the central powers and have instead declared only such a peace to be possible, which shall be dictated by the entente allies and shall result in the destruction and humiliation of the central powers, Germany is unable further to forego the full use of her submarines. The Imperial Government, therefore does not doubt that the Government of the United States will understand the situation thus forced upon Germany by the entente allies' brutal methods of war and by their determination to destroy the central powers, and that the Government of the United States will further realize that the now openly disclosed intentions of the entente allies give back to Germany the freedom of the action which she reserved in her note addressed to the Government of the United States on May 4, 1916.

Under these circumstances Germany will meet the illegal measures of her enemies by forcibly preventing after February 1, 1917, in a zone around Great Britain, France, Italy, and in the eastern Mediterranean all navigation, that of neutrals included, from and to England and from and to France, etc. All ships met within that zone will be sunk.

The Imperial Government is confident that this measure will result in a speedy termination of the war and in the restoration of peace which the Government of the United States has so much at heart. Like the Government of the United States, Germany and her allies had hoped to reach this goal by negotiations. Now that the war, through the fault of Germany's enemies, has to be continued, the Imperial Government feels sure that the Government of the United States will understand the necessity of adopting such measures as are destined to bring about a speedy end of the horrible and useless bloodshed. The