

Also, petition of the Providence (R. I.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring larger salaries for members of the Tariff Commission; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of Woman's Club of Exeter, N. H., favoring the migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of citizens of New Castle, Pa., favoring an antipolygamy amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 62 citizens of Beaver County, Pa., favoring Christian amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of Philadelphia Produce Exchange, against change in oleomargarine tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WARD: Petition of residents of Chatham Center, Columbia County, N. Y., favoring the submission to the States of a national prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of residents of Hensonville, Warnersville, and Cobleskill, N. Y., in favor of a national constitutional amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WASON: Memorial of Baker Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church, of Concord, N. H., representing 500 people, favoring national constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions adopted by the New Hampshire Conference of Charities and Corrections, favoring the prohibition of the liquor traffic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Concord (N. H.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, representing 100 people, favoring national constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. Harriet G. Burlingame and 91 other members of the Exeter (N. H.) Woman's Club, favoring the bill to carry into effect the terms of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain relating to migratory birds; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 23, 1917.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, February 20, 1917.)

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

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there are but few Senators in the Chamber. 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	Hughes	Overman	Smoot
Bankhead	Husting	Page	Sterling
Brandegge	James	Pittman	Stone
Bryan	Johnson, S. Dak.	Polindexter	Swanson
Chamberlain	Jones	Pomerene	Thomas
Chilton	Kirby	Ransdell	Thompson
Clapp	Lane	Reed	Tillman
Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Robinson	Vardaman
Culberson	McLean	Sheppard	Walsh
Curtis	Martin, Va.	Sherman	Williams
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	
Hitchcock	Myers	Smith, Ga.	
Hollis	Norris	Smith, S. C.	

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

PUBLIC BUILDING AT PITTSBURGH, PA.

Mr. SWANSON. From the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 18894) to amend the public-building act approved March 4, 1913, authorizing the acquisition of a suitable site for a public building at Pittsburgh, Pa. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to know something about the bill.

Mr. SWANSON. The Secretary of the Treasury has recommended that the right to acquire the building at Pittsburgh, Pa., reserving mineral rights, be granted. Under the general public-buildings act the Government gets title in fee, but in portions of Pennsylvania and even in Pittsburgh where land has been sold they reserve the mineral rights as though there were mineral rights, and it is impossible to get land there with an absolute right to obtain minerals. Consequently, they have been unable to construct a public building at Pittsburgh. The bill simply proposes to waive that right and amend the statute which pro-

hibits the acquisition of any land for public buildings with this reservation.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision of the public-building act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stats., 876), which authorizes the acquisition of a suitable site, etc., at Pittston, Pa., be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to add the following proviso, namely:

"Provided, That the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, accept a title which reserves or excepts all ores or minerals on the lands with the right of mining the same."

Mr. SMOOT. There is no appropriation involved?

Mr. SWANSON. None whatever. We have passed a great many bills of this kind relative to sites in Pennsylvania and other mineral States where it is impossible to get a title, unless the mineral rights are waived by the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. All right.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. HUGHES. I desire to call up the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19937) 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 report has heretofore been submitted and appears in to-day's RECORD.

The conference report was read and agreed to.

Mr. HUGHES. I call up the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 18181) 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.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report, and it was read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

RIVERSIDE MILITARY ACADEMY.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There is a little bill on the calendar passed by the House relieving a military institute which was burned down in Georgia from a claim for Government equipment. It is recommended by the department. It has passed the House. They are about to reorganize and recommence work. It is essential that the bill should be passed. It will take but a moment. There is no objection to it. It is unanimously recommended by the Committee on Claims. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (H. R. 16855) for the relief of Riverside Military Academy.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want to object to the consideration of the bill, but I should like to ask the Senator having the unfinished business in charge, if he will not agree to unanimous consent to take up the calendar under Rule VIII for an hour and consider only bills to which there is no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. In view—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Will the Senator defer taking up the calendar until I may present a bill?

Mr. SIMMONS. Just one word, please. Last night we took a recess until 11 o'clock instead of half past 10, as has been our custom lately, because the minority were to hold a conference this morning. I am advised that that conference has not yet adjourned. I am perfectly willing under these conditions to take up the calendar, laying temporarily aside the unfinished business until the conference has been finished. I do not desire to call up the revenue bill while the minority Members are absent from the Chamber.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator know how long that will be?

Mr. SIMMONS. A reasonable time.

Mr. SMOOT. It will be understood that only bills unobjected to will be considered.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask, for that purpose, that the revenue bill be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. FLETCHER and Mr. NEWLANDS. The conference has adjourned.

Mr. SIMMONS. I withdraw the request, as I see the minority Members are coming in. I presume the conference has terminated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 16855) for the relief of Riverside Military Academy.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Riverside Military Academy, at Gainesville, Ga., and its bondsmen be relieved of all responsibility on bond given to the United States by the Riverside Military Academy for the loss of two cutters and their outfits, valued at \$1,608.77, which property was destroyed by a storm on the night of December 31, 1915.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to have read a telegram similar to a number that I have received.

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

The telegram was read, as follows:

ANDREWS, FLA., February 22, 1917.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
1627 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.:

Your letter reached me some time ago, with copy of rivers and harbors bill, which I am sure the great majority of people in our country approve, as it provides for projects already neglected too long, in many instances where delay is not to the credit of our Government or in the interest of economy. Please urge to the utmost passage of this bill, as failure to pass this bill for some other provision providing a lump sum inadequate for needs of the country would be a public calamity.

J. H. DRUMMOND.

PROPOSED EMBARGO ON FOOD PRODUCTS.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I desire unanimous consent to introduce a bill and to have it properly referred. If I may be permitted, I should like to say just a word in reference to it. It is a bill to conserve the food supply of the United States, and to protect the people from extortionate prices by temporarily prohibiting the export of farm products, and so forth.

The bill (S. 8302) to conserve the food supply of the United States and to protect the people from extortionate prices by temporarily prohibiting the export of farm products, fish, game, and manufactured foodstuffs was read twice by its title.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I feel that the hour has arrived when, in behalf of cheaper food, the Congress of the United States should act. We read in the newspapers of women engaged in rioting in the city of New York, crying: "We want bread; we are hungry"; in Philadelphia we read of there being one dead and nine injured as the result of the riot, women calling: "We want bread; we are starving." The women were led by Mrs. Florence Shadle, 32 years of age. She carried a baby. In this land of prosperity, wealth, and plenty such a condition should be impossible. I believe there is food enough in this country for every mortal in it, but we are shipping to the warring nations of Europe millions of bushels of wheat, rye, corn, and potatoes, and tons of meat, while our own people starve. Think of it!

While Germany and the allies are battling with their great problems on the field, their citizens are clamoring for food. That they suffer great privation there is no question. But what excuse is there for us, with an abundant supply of every article of food, and when we are at peace with the world, for the existence of such conditions? I say there is none. I hold that it is unpardonable; indeed, Mr. President, it is little, if any, short of a crime.

The loaf of bread is squeezed in size almost to the vanishing point. Potatoes, which in 1916 were sold at \$3.30 per barrel, to-day are selling for \$9.75 per barrel. Onions, which were selling in 1916 at 75 cents per hundred pounds, to-day are selling for \$15 per hundred. Cabbages, which were selling in 1916 for \$9 per ton, are selling in 1917 for \$160 per ton. All other staple commodities are advancing in proportion.

Mr. President, I insist that willful waste is a wrong to the verge of a crime. One may go this very night to the princely restaurants in New York, to the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria, to the Imperial Hotel, or to a hundred others, and he will find revelry and waste going on to an extent and on a scale of extravagance that is alarming. There is no interference or molestation from the police as to them, but in another part of the city at the same time there is being made a demand for bread; there is a bread riot. Two women, Miss Ganz and Mrs. Harris, were pleading with the mayor of New York for food—for bread. I read as follows:

Then came back the old wail that was the dominant note of the curious demonstration: "But these people are starving and want bread." It was Miss Ganz who spoke.

As soon as the committee left the city hall Miss Ganz took up a position on the steps and started to harangue the crowd. She told them the mayor was not in, and cries of displeasure were raised. Then she became more eloquent and was getting down to an old-fashioned "Sweet Marie" address when Inspector O'Brien gave orders that she be arrested.

Miss Ganz was hustled back into the city hall through the rear door and around to the traffic station in the basement. She was charged with disorderly conduct. She was arraigned later before Magistrate

Wyllie in the Tombs police court. She was found guilty, but sentence was suspended. The magistrate advised her to take only small delegations to the city hall when she tries to see the mayor in the future.

In such a situation shall Congress sit mute and be blind to the sufferings of our fellow citizens? I understand that the Government of Great Britain has placed an embargo on our vessels coaling in their ports. Clearly we have a right to retaliate. Mr. President, an embargo on the staple food products will lower the price of these commodities and necessities instantaneously. I have here another list showing the marked advance in the price of food products, which I ask may be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

TO ASK AID OF CONGRESS.

At a meeting of 2,000 men and women in the New Plaza Hall, Williamsburg, last night, it was decided to join with all peddlers, retail grocers, and other dealers in foodstuffs in a movement to urge upon Members of Congress the necessity of doing something to reduce the cost of foodstuffs. An overflow meeting attended by 1,000 was held outside the hall. Speakers said protest demonstrations are taking place in many eastern cities.

Joseph Hartigan, commissioner of weights and measures, said wholesale fish prices in Fulton Market, as reported by his inspectors, show increases over 1914 as follows:

Fish.	Price yesterday.	Price 1914.	Increase.
Bass.....	\$0.23	\$0.14	\$0.09
Bluefish.....	.25	.08	.17
Cod (market).....	.08	.03	.05
Cod (steak).....	.16	.06½	.09½
Flounders.....	.09	.08	.01
Halibut.....	.20	.06	.14
Haddock.....	.08	.06	.02
Mackerel (Spanish).....	.16	.06½	.09½
Sea trout.....	.18	.11	.07
Salmon.....	.15	.10	.05
Sturgeon (lake).....	.32	.30	.02

John J. Dillon, State commissioner of foods and markets, said people are now in revolt against a system that he has been fighting. Last year, he said, he tried to sell cabbage in this city for up-State farmers and all he could get was (?) a carload, or just about enough to pay the freight. Farmers became discouraged, he said, and permitted cabbage to rot on the ground. All this emphasizes the necessity of terminal markets where, he said, produce could be sent and sold according to the law and demand.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I earnestly plead for such disposition of the bill which I have introduced as will ultimately make it the law of the land and relieve this horrid situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

NATIONAL MCKINLEY BIRTHPLACE MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent of the Senate—

Mr. SIMMONS. I recall that I said to the Senator from Ohio a while ago that I would consent to laying aside the unfinished business long enough to allow him to dispose of the matter he has in mind.

Mr. HARDING. I thank the Senator from North Carolina. I desire to ask that the bill (S. 8222) to amend an act to incorporate the National McKinley Birthplace Memorial Association may be taken up and passed. The bill does no more than to add four names to the original board of trustees. I should like very much to have the bill passed, so as to obtain the sanction of Congress for it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 8222) to amend an act to incorporate the National McKinley Birthplace Memorial Association, approved March 4, 1911.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, to insert, after the enacting clause, the words "That the act entitled 'An act to incorporate the National McKinley Birthplace Memorial Association,' approved March 4, 1911, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:"; and, on page 2, line 18, before the word "section," to strike out the words "the amended," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National McKinley Birthplace Memorial Association," approved March 4, 1911, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

That the following-named persons, namely, J. G. Butler, jr., of Ohio; Myron T. Herrick, of Ohio; J. G. Schmidlapp, of Ohio; John G. Milburn, of New York; W. A. Thomas, of Ohio; Elbert H. Gary, of New York; Charles M. Schwab, of Pennsylvania; George W. Perkins, of New York; and Henry Clay McEldowney, of Pennsylvania, and their associates and successors, duly chosen, are hereby incorporated and declared to be a body corporate of the District of Columbia by the name of the National McKinley Birthplace Memorial Association, and by such

name shall be known and have perpetual succession, with the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

SEC. 2. That the object of the corporation shall be to perpetuate the name and achievements of William McKinley, late President of the United States of America, by erecting and maintaining in the city of Niles, in the State of Ohio, the place of his birth, a monument and memorial building.

SEC. 3. That the management and direction of the affairs of the corporation and the control and disposition of its property and funds shall be vested in a board of trustees, nine in number, to be composed of the individuals named in section 1 of this act, who shall constitute the authorized board of trustees, on the approval of this act. Vacancies caused by death, resignation, or otherwise shall be filled by the remaining trustees in such manner as shall be prescribed from time to time by the by-laws of the corporation. The persons so elected shall thereupon become trustees and also members of the corporation.

SEC. 4. That said corporation shall hold its meetings in such place as the incorporators or their successors shall determine.

SEC. 5. That the board of trustees shall be entitled to take, hold, and administer any securities, funds, or property, real or personal, which may at any time be given, devised, or bequeathed to them or to the corporation for the purposes herein defined, and to purchase necessary lands for site and to sell and convey by good and sufficient deed any other lands that may be given, devised, or bequeathed to the corporation, and to convert the same into money; with full power from time to time to adopt a common seal, to appoint such officers and agents, whether members of the board of trustees or otherwise, as may be deemed necessary for carrying out the objects of the corporation; with full power to adopt by-laws and such rules or regulations as shall be deemed necessary to secure the safe and convenient transaction of the business of the corporation; and with full power and discretion to invest any principal and deal with and expend the income of the corporation in such manner as in the judgment of the trustees will best promote the objects hereinbefore set forth; and, in general, to have and use all the powers and authority necessary and proper to promote such objects and carry out the purposes of the corporation. The trustees shall have power to hold as investments any securities given, assigned, or transferred to them or to the corporation by any person, persons, or corporation, and to retain such investments, and to invest any sums or amounts from time to time in such securities and in such form and manner as may be permitted to trustees or to charitable or literary corporations for investment, according to the laws of the State of Ohio, or in such securities as may be authorized for investment by any deed of trust or by any act or deed of gift or last will and testament.

SEC. 6. That all personal property and funds of the corporation held or used for the purposes hereof pursuant to the provisions of this act, whether of principal or income, shall, so long as the same shall be so used, be exempt from taxation by the United States or any Territory or District thereof: *Provided*, That said corporation shall not accept, own, or hold, directly or indirectly, any property, real or personal, except such as may be reasonably necessary to carry out the purposes of its creation as defined in this act.

SEC. 7. That the services of the trustees, when acting as such, shall be gratuitous, but the corporation may provide for the reasonable expenses incurred by the trustees in attending meetings or otherwise in the performance of their duties.

SEC. 8. That this charter shall take effect upon its being accepted by a majority vote of the incorporators named herein who shall be present at the first meeting of the corporation, due notice of which meeting shall be given to each of the incorporators named herein, and a notice of such acceptance shall be given by said corporation causing a certificate to that effect, signed by its president and secretary, to be filed in the office of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 9. That Congress may from time to time alter, repeal, or modify this act of incorporation, but no contract or individual right made or acquired shall thereby be divested or impaired.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend an act entitled 'An act to incorporate the National McKinley Birthplace Memorial Association,' approved March 4, 1911."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 8252) to authorize the change of name of the steamer *Charles L. Hutchinson* to *Fayette Brown*.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1878) making appropriation for payment of certain claims in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims, reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts, and under the provisions of section No. 151 of the act approved March 3, 1911, commonly known as the judicial code.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 20496) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KEY of Ohio, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. SELLS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 20827) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors

of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KEY of Ohio, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. SELLS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 20783) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 20451) 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.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

H. R. 12195. An act to amend section 17 of the United States bankruptcy law of July 1, 1898, and amendments thereto of February 5, 1903;

H. R. 14426. An act to amend section 6 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American National Red Cross," approved January 5, 1905;

H. R. 18534. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the St. Francis River at or near Parkin, Ark.;

H. R. 18720. An act permitting the building of a railroad bridge across the Mississippi River at Bemidji, in the State of Minnesota; and

H. R. 19239. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Pearl River, Miss., and the fourth ward of the parish of Washington, La., to construct a bridge across Pearl River, between Pearl River County, Miss., and Washington Parish, La.

SENATOR FROM VERMONT.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I present the credentials of my colleague, Hon. CARROLL S. PAGE, chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Vermont a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1917.

The credentials were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF VERMONT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1916, CARROLL S. PAGE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Vermont 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, Horace F. Graham, and our seal hereto affixed at Montpelier, this 21st day of February, in the year of our Lord 1917

HORACE F. GRAHAM,
Governor.

By the governor:
[SEAL.]

GUY W. BAILEY,
Secretary of State.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE. I present resolutions adopted by the Men's Club of the Church of Our Saviour, of Brookline, Mass., indorsing the action of the President, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Men's Club of the Church of Our Saviour, of the town of Brookline, Mass., in meeting assembled, unanimously adopts the following minute:

"After exhausting the resources of diplomacy in an effort to avert war, the President has now taken the only course consistent with national self-respect.

"War with Germany will not ensue unless the Imperial German Government knowingly violates well-settled principles of international law, and violates them with intent definitely hostile to the United States. In that event, war will inevitably follow, not by our own act but through the deliberate choice of a self-confessed disturber of the peace of the western world.

"If any honest doubt exists respecting the cause of war in Europe, the awful responsibility for extending it to this hemisphere will rest upon Germany and upon Germany alone.

"It may be that the Imperial German Government is misinformed respecting the temper of the people of the United States, just as that Government is supposed to have misconceived the sentiment of the British Empire at the outbreak of the European war. If so, and before fatal action based upon so grave a mistake is taken, Germany should be made aware of the essential unity of our people and of their loyal determination to make all sacrifices necessary to protect our liberty and to maintain our honor. To this end we call upon all bodies similar to ours throughout the country and upon all groups of citizens organized for whatever purpose, to meet without delay and express themselves with no uncertain voice respecting the course that they will be prepared to follow.

"We urge all such groups of citizens, secular and religious, large and small, societies, clubs, and institutions of every sort to unite with us in giving immediate public expression to such convictions as those which we now solemnly record:

"First. That the act of the Executive in severing diplomatic relations with Germany is one to be approved and commended by all who have the best interests of the United States at heart.

"Second. That the German declaration of January 31, 1917, represents an unjustified and unjustifiable attempt to destroy the freedom of the sea and to abridge the commercial liberty guaranteed to us by established law and custom, and that if the Government of the United States were to acquiesce therein such action would be resented by all good citizens as in the highest degree pusillanimous and as altogether inconsistent with the spirit and traditions of a free people.

"Third. That the President will be justified in recommending to Congress the most extreme measures that may be deemed necessary to protect life, liberty, and property; and that it is our duty and that of all loyal citizens to tender immediately to the Government all the service of which we severally and collectively are capable.

"Fourth. That while all should stand ready to volunteer, if voluntary service is called for, yet Congress, in providing for our common safety, should not adopt emergency measures merely, but should definitely recognize the principle that the duty of defending the Nation rests equally upon all citizens capable of service. To the end therefore that the burden of safeguarding the country should no longer be cast exclusively upon the loyal National Guard and upon other patriotic military and naval volunteers Congress should be urged to exercise its constitutional power "to raise and support armies" by establishing immediately a permanent and democratic system of defense based upon universal service and training under direct and exclusive Federal control.

"A copy of this minute is ordered to be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of War and other members of the Cabinet, to the members of both congressional Committees on Military Affairs, and to every chamber of commerce in the United States."

GEO. S. PARKER, *President.*

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the city council of Malden, Mass., indorsing the President's action in severing diplomatic relations with Germany, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Northeastern Association of Fish and Game Commissioners of New York and New England, of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to place under Federal control anadromous fishes on the Atlantic coast, which was referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from sundry citizens of Texas, praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee presented petitions of sundry citizens of Tennessee, praying for national prohibition, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of the Burroughs Nature Club, of Naugatuck, Conn., favoring the migratory-bird treaty with Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Socialist Party of East Hartford, Conn., praying that the United States remain at peace, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of South Norwalk, Stafford, New Britain, Greenwich, New Haven, Falls Village, and Unionville, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for national prohibition, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OLIVER presented memorials of sundry granges, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the proposed reduction of the tax on oleomargarine, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Clarion, Beaver, Boliver, and New Castle, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Jeannette, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation for the protection of migratory birds, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of District No. 5, United Mine Workers of America, of Pittsburgh, Pa., praying for an investigation into the high cost of living, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Beaver County and Butler County, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to found the Government on Christianity, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the United People's Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., praying that the question of war be submitted to a referendum of the people, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, praying for national prohibition, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PHELAN presented a memorial of Mailers' Union No. 9, of Los Angeles, Cal., remonstrating against any change in second-class postal rates, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COLT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Rhode Island, praying for national prohibition, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Medford, Oreg., praying for national prohibition, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Portland, Oreg., praying that the United States remain at peace, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Vale, Oreg., remonstrating against the so-called "draft" provision for compulsory military service in the Hay-Chamberlain Act, which was ordered to lie on the table.

ALFRED B. ANDREWS.

Mr. CLAPP. For the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], I report from the Committee on Claims, without amendment, the bill (S. 8297) for the relief of Alfred B. Andrews, and I submit a report (No. 1105) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 8303) granting an increase of pension to James R. Rundlett; and

A bill (S. 8304) granting an increase of pension to Nathan H. Ellis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIS:

A bill (S. 8305) for the relief of Laurin W. Rolfe; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 8306) excepting certain classes of manufacturers and dealers from the operation of the provisions of section 5 of the bill (H. R. 19410) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. STONE submitted an amendment authorizing the commissioner of the Freedman's Savings & Trust Co. to pay to all depositors of said company a sum equal to the verified balances due said depositors at the time of its failure, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 20783), which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment providing for the erection of a medium-power radio station at Galveston, Tex., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 20632), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. WORKS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$80,158.73 to pay the Yosemite Valley Railroad Co. for amounts actually expended by it in building El Portal Wagon Road, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. R. 20967), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. PHELAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 20079), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

CLAIM OF MISSISSIPPI CHOCTAWS.

Mr. CLAPP submitted the following resolution, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed:

Senate resolution 372.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make careful inquiry into and report all the facts to the Senate, at the beginning of the next regular session of Congress, as to the services rendered and expenses incurred, if any, from 1896 to 1906, inclusive, by Charles F. Winton and his associates and by Walter S. Field and Chester Howe in the matter of the claim of the "Mississippi Choctaws" to citizenship in the Choctaw Nation west of the Mississippi River, and the fair value of the estate obtained by said "Mississippi Choctaws."

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. OVERMAN submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19300) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8 and 9.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, and 11, and agree to the same.

LEE S. OVERMAN,
LUKE LEA,
W. L. JONES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

H. D. FLOOD,
CYRUS CLINE,
HENRY ALLEN COOPER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 20783. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on the 23d instant, approved and signed the following acts:

S. 703. An act to provide for the promotion of vocational education; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture and the trades and industries; to provide for cooperation with the States in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure;

S. 2222. An act for the relief of the heirs of Antoine Bayard;

S. 5899. An act to punish persons who make false representations to settlers and others pertaining to the public lands of the United States;

S. 6850. An act authorizing transfer of certain retired Army officers to the active list; and

S. 7757. An act authorizing a further extension of time to purchasers of land in the former Cheyenne and Arapahoe Indian Reservation, Okla., within which to make payment.

THE LATE GEN. FUNSTON.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce that at the conclusion of the routine business to-day I shall offer a few remarks concerning the life and distinguished services of that brave soldier and great general, Frederick Funston, of Kansas, who recently died in the service of his country at San Antonio, Tex.

I wish to say in this connection, Mr. President, that I have desired to do this ever since the death of this great American citizen, but on account of the revenue bill being constantly before the Senate there has been no proper time afforded to do so. Therefore I shall take advantage of the first favorable opportunity to-day to deliver the address to the Senate.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Regular order!

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana.

NEUTRALITY PROCLAMATION OF 1793.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in the patriotic Farewell Address of President Washington, read in accordance with the custom of the Senate on yesterday, Thursday, the 22d instant, reference is made to his proclamation of the 22d day of April, 1793, in the following brief paragraph:

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both Houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

The proclamation is a very brief one, Mr. President, and I ask that it may be read from the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read the proclamation, as follows:

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas it appears that a state of war exists between Austria, Prussia, Sardinia, Great Britain, and the United Netherlands of the one part and France on the other, and the duty and interest of the United States require that they should with sincerity and good faith adopt and pursue a conduct friendly and impartial toward the belligerent powers.

I have therefore thought fit by these presents to declare the disposition of the United States to observe the conduct aforesaid toward those powers respectively, and to exhort and warn the citizens of the United States carefully to avoid all acts and proceedings whatsoever which may in any manner tend to contravene such disposition.

And I do hereby also make known that whosoever of the citizens of the United States shall render himself liable to punishment or forfeiture under the law of nations by committing, aiding, or abetting hostilities against any of the said powers, or by carrying to any of them those articles which are deemed contraband by the modern usage

of nations, will not receive the protection of the United States against such punishment or forfeiture; and further, that I have given instructions to those officers to whom it belongs to cause prosecutions to be instituted against all persons who shall, within the cognizance of the courts of the United States, violate the law of nations with respect to the powers at war, or any of them.

In testimony whereof I have caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed to these presents, and signed the same with my hand.

Done at the city of Philadelphia, the 22d day of April, 1793, and of the independence of the United States of America the seventeenth.

[SEAL.]

By the President:

Go: WASHINGTON.

TH: JEFFERSON.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by E. T. Taylor, jr., one of its clerks, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18181) 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 House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19937) 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 further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 18566) for the relief of Mrs. Nancy E. Mullins, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 18566. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nancy E. Mullins was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

THE REVENUE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business is now before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20573) to provide increased revenue to defray the expenses of the increased appropriations for the Army and Navy and the extensions of fortifications, and for other purposes.

The SECRETARY. The pending amendment is on page 7, in the amendment of the committee, lines 15, 16, and 17, where the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] proposes to strike out, on line 16 of the amendment, the words "July first" and in lieu thereof to insert "December thirty-first"; and on line 17 to strike out "twenty-one" and insert "nineteen," so that, if amended, it will read:

Sec. 208. Titles I and II of this act shall cease to be of effect on and after December 31, 1919.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment of the Senator from Indiana by striking out "nineteen" and inserting in lieu thereof "eighteen."

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. CURTIS. This is an amendment to an amendment, is it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Indiana to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not know that I quite understood the Senator from Kansas; but if I caught his amendment, it was that this tax should not be levied except for the fiscal year 1918. That is the effect of it?

Mr. CURTIS. That was the effect of the amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. And the tax would cease to be operative after that time?

Mr. CURTIS. But the Vice President tells me that it is an amendment in the third degree; so I will bring the matter up in another way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Indiana to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. WATSON and Mr. SMOOT called for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, this amendment was offered for the purpose of limiting the time of the appropriations provided by Titles I and II of this act. The amendment offered by the committee provides that Titles I and II of the act shall cease to be of effect on and after July 1, 1921. I have offered an amendment that those titles shall cease to be of effect on and after December 31, 1919.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. WATSON. I yield; yes.

Mr. CURTIS. As I understand, the Senator from Indiana has a right to modify his amendment. I will ask the Senator if he will not modify his amendment so as to fix the date at December 31, 1918? I am satisfied that the amendment offered by the Senator carries this part of the bill for a longer time than he intended.

Mr. WATSON. Which I was about to state. In other words, because of the confusion existing between the fiscal year and the calendar year, this appropriation is being carried for three years under my amendment instead of two, as I originally designed to have it. Therefore I modify my amendment so as to read "December 31, 1918," instead of "July 1, 1921." In other words, it carries these appropriations for two full years.

This bill is designed for special preparedness, and it is simply a question about what "special preparedness" means. It is a question as to whether or not, under the plea of special preparedness, we desire to carry these appropriations for four years. My own thought is that if we have an abundance of revenue—which nobody seeks to deny—to take care of the exigencies that confront us, succeeding Congresses will perform their duty and their function; and I know of no reason why at this time we should add to the huge appropriations that are asked here for the purpose of preparedness when we shall have an abundance of revenue to carry this program forward for the ensuing two years. Therefore it occurs to me that there is no demand made upon us at this time to appropriate for four years to come, when we can carry forward our program for two years and thus meet the exigencies that confront us.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. CLAPP. And when developments may prove the unwisdom of a program adopted and provided for carrying forward four years at this time.

Mr. WATSON. I will say to the Senator that that point was made last night—

Mr. CLAPP. I know it was.

Mr. WATSON. And that I did not care to go over the entire argument again to-day. It may be that we shall not want this large naval appropriation at the end of two years. On the contrary, if the worst comes to the worst, larger appropriations may be necessary, or the emergency may become all the greater; and it is not fair for us to assume that succeeding Congresses will not discharge their patriotic duties and fulfill their patriotic functions. Therefore it seems to me that all that can be demanded of us at this time is to meet the emergency that confronts us by a limitation of two years, which is amply sufficient for present purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, in the first place the amendment of the Senator from Indiana would limit the collection of this tax to one year, because the tax is only payable the year following, and the machinery for collection follows the year of the tax.

Mr. WATSON. If the Senator will permit me, that matter was argued out here last night, and the contrary view was established, I thought, to the satisfaction of everybody.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not think it was. It certainly was not to the satisfaction of the members of the committee or the Treasury Department.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I dissented positively from that statement last night.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; the chairman of the committee dissented positively from it. There is no doubt about the fact that, under the terms of the statute, the tax is returned the year following the year that the tax accrues. Your tax for 1917 is returned in 1918 by the 1st of March. Then it is payable by the 1st of June, I believe, or the 1st of July. So that the terms of the statute, as amended, limit the tax to four years. The addition of six months, carrying it to July 1, 1921, was intended to leave the machinery in force for the collection of the tax; that was all. It was not intended that the tax itself should last more than four years. It may be that a little further explanation should be added to that provision declaring that the continuation beyond January 1, 1921, is only for the machinery of collection.

One word more, Mr. President, about the necessity for this tax. We have already made the appropriations that go through these four years. The Senator from Indiana suggests that we will not have to continue this line of preparedness, this line of construction. Well, we can stop those appropriations the very moment it is determined wise to stop them; and whenever that is done I am sure Congress at the same time will repeal this tax.

I hope we may, by the end of two years, be able to slacken up on military construction. I hope so. I long that that may be true; and if it is true, then I should be perfectly delighted to stop this tax. But at present we have made the appropriations running through the four years.

Mr. SMOOT. Not four years.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; we have not made the appropriations for four years, because we could not.

Mr. SMOOT. No; we could not.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We have outlined a class of work that is to run through that period, however.

Mr. SMOOT. You have a building program.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We have authorized contracts; we have made a program that would involve the four years; and we are seeking through this proposed revenue bill to meet that line. If we can stop that program, and do, pending these years, we certainly will be glad at the same time to stop this tax.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken when he says that there have been appropriations made for four years. He is also mistaken when he states that there has been an authorization for a program to be carried out in the next four years. All that there has been done is this—a tentative program has been agreed to. Congress can appropriate for it if it wants to, or Congress may not appropriate, as it decides.

The amendment offered to the bill by the Finance Committee of the Senate reads as follows:

Titles I and II of this act shall cease to be of effect on and after July 1, 1921.

Under this bill the tax will be levied upon the incomes and the profits for the year 1917. Of course it will not be collected until June 1, 1918, but it will be imposed for 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920, and 1921 if the amendment is agreed to in the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia says that they can repeal the law in two years if it becomes unnecessary to collect the additional taxes. The best way to do that would be to provide only that they should be collected for two years, and then, if conditions were such at the end of two years as to justify it, pass a resolution or put this same provision for another two years in a naval appropriation bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on that point the naval bill is the heaviest bill we have, so far as appropriations are concerned.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. I have just been taking part in making up that bill. The appropriations are all made as usual for the year.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. The only difference that exists is that we have made extra appropriations in order to expedite the work, and have made larger appropriations than usual for the authorizations, with the view, of course, of getting the ships as rapidly as possible; but that means that the money will be spent more rapidly than usual. It is not delayed for four years. On the contrary, the expenditure is hastened.

Mr. SMOOT. I am speaking of the imposition and collection of the tax.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly. Something was said about appropriations running four years. We are reducing the time as much as we possibly can in the Navy.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I stated last night, when this same question was up, that the appropriations for this year exceeded even the program that was mapped out, for the reason that it is desired to hasten the completion of the program, and the Navy appropriation bill carries \$531,000,000 this year. Next year it does not necessarily follow that that same amount will be appropriated.

Mr. LODGE. Unless there is war, next year's bill will not carry anything like it.

Mr. SMOOT. As the Senator says, unless there is war it will carry nothing like it. If there is not war, and it is not necessary to appropriate \$531,000,000 next year, this tax will be imposed and collected, however, if this amendment is adopted.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think that the modified amendment of the Senator from Indiana making it December 31, 1918, the end of the calendar year, is long enough to have the law in force. Then if war should happen by the end of the year 1918 a similar provision could be included in the Navy bill at that time.

Not only that, if war does come the \$531,000,000 will not be sufficient. I take it for granted, if war comes, a bill will be passed through Congress, in my opinion, quickly as possible authorizing the expenditure of a billion of dollars for the early purchase and forced construction of battleships and auxiliaries.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course what the Senator suggests would be physically impossible, the immediate construction of battleships.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not say—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just a moment, if the Senator please; I am not going to detain him. Even the immediate construction of the smaller sort of war vessels, cruisers or submarines or submarine catchers, could not be provided in the manner the Senator suggests in the case of a war. We must have time to build these instrumentalities of national defense. The construction of the smallest of them would require at least one year. Hence the importance of the adoption of that provision in time of peace, because of the impossibility of securing them in time of war and of sufficient speed to adequately provide for national defense.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator would be perfectly right if I had said the construction, though perhaps it would be possible for the Government of the United States to purchase colliers and other auxiliaries of our Navy. That is what I had in mind. Of course the Senator is correct as to the time it takes to construct the smallest ship for national defense. In fact, the Senator said one year, but under conditions to-day I have not a doubt but that it would take two years.

The amendment spoken of by the Senator providing for additional submarines I am in hearty sympathy with. Two years ago I offered an amendment to the naval appropriation bill authorizing the building of 75 submarines. I have every reason to believe that if a point of order had not been made against the amendment to the naval appropriation bill at that time the Senate of the United States would have voted the authorization of the construction two years ago of 75 submarines. So I want to say to the Senator that it will give me great pleasure to vote for the authorization of the construction of the additional submarines provided in the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I sincerely trust the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana will be adopted. There is no reason to have the imposition and collection of the tax unless it becomes necessary, and we will know by the end of the calendar year 1918 whether it is necessary to extend it beyond that time or not.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I trust that the chairman of the Finance Committee will accept the amendment of the Senator from Indiana. It is offered in a sincere desire to improve the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me, I do not want to take time. I stated my position very fully last night on this subject. I can not accept the amendment. I do not think it ought to be adopted.

Mr. PENROSE. I did not know but that the Senator might have changed his mind overnight, as frequently happens, and be prepared this morning to accept it.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have not. I am as strong in the belief that the amendment ought to be adopted as reported by the committee to-day as I was last night.

Mr. PENROSE. So my hopes are shattered.

Mr. SIMMONS. They frequently are.

Mr. PENROSE. As the Senator says, they frequently have been.

Mr. President, I entirely agree with what the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] has said about the fact that this amendment will not in any way interfere with these expenditures. I do not agree with him when he says that the money may not be needed. I do feel quite confident that if the money is not needed for preparations to enlarge the Army and the Navy and in fortifications for defense in war some alluring product of Government ownership or some socialistic governmental activity will be discovered by the Democratic majority to exhaust any funds that may be left remaining to maintain the ever-recurring deficit in all its flourishing prosperity.

Mr. SMOOT. I apologize to the Senator for even suggesting that the amount of money would not be needed.

Mr. PENROSE. Not only would this amendment not interfere with the legitimate expenditures for defense, but it is desirable, in my opinion, for another reason. The most superficial examination of this measure will convince any person that it is crudely drawn and its purposes are not altogether stated in a candid way. The title reads: "An act to provide increased revenue to defray the expenses of the increased appropriations for the Army and Navy and the extensions of fortifications, and for other purposes."

We were told last summer, Mr. President, when a previous burdensome bill imposing direct taxes was pending with a similar title that the estimated revenue to be raised thereunder would be amply sufficient to meet these military and naval expenditures and to provide for any deficit which might be expected in the future.

Mr. President, I think I should like to have order in the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT rapped with his gavel.

Mr. PENROSE. I said at the time and other Members of the minority said that the bill would fail as a revenue producer. I will continue my remarks when order is restored.

The VICE PRESIDENT rapped with his gavel.

Mr. PENROSE. I believe I have stated that the title of the bill is misleading. As predicted last summer, the then pending measure has failed to raise revenue, and the deficit still exists. The title of this measure, in my opinion, should be "to defray the expenses of increased appropriations for the Army and Navy and to meet the deficit and the bankrupt condition of the Treasury of the United States due to wasteful extravagance and unnecessary expenditures." Not only is this measure expected to raise—Mr. President, I recognize that this bill has been fully considered by the Democratic caucus, and that public discussion before the American people does not interest the Democratic majority; but I think at least courtesy should be extended to minority Members when they are discussing the measure in good faith, and those Members of the Democratic majority who desire to indulge in noisy conference should adjourn to some other part of the Capitol than the Senate Chamber.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. PENROSE. For an inquiry? For what purpose does the Senator rise?

Mr. THOMAS. I merely wish to say that I think the remark made by the Senator is very timely. I have noticed several times when we have been speaking on this side of the Chamber that the Senator from Pennsylvania has been a conspicuous offender in the same direction.

Mr. PENROSE. Well, Mr. President, I have no doubt that I have not been entirely free from this offense. Sometimes the gentlemen on the other side address the Senate in such an inaudible tone that it is difficult to tell whether they are addressing the Senate or talking to themselves.

Mr. THOMAS. When the Senator whispers he is never inaudible.

Mr. PENROSE. Many of the speeches which have been delivered with great vociferousness have not yet appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD even for examination by the minority.

This measure, Mr. President, goes out of its way to lead to the impression that it is for preparedness. Section 1 says:

That the receipts from the tax imposed by title 2—

That is, the receipts under this peculiar taxation in the pending bill—

And one-third of the receipts from the tax imposed by title 3 of this act shall constitute a separate fund in the Treasury to be used only for the expenditures incurred under—

And then the acts of this Congress and the last Congress are recited providing for expenditures for the Army and Navy and for fortifications. In addition the paragraph goes on to say:

In addition to such receipts from the taxes imposed under Titles II and III of this act, there shall be credited annually, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, to such separate fund, the sum of \$175,000,000, such sum being the estimated additional revenue to be derived under the act entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes," approved September 8, 1916, in excess of the revenue to be derived under then existing laws.

Here is a deliberate attempt, Mr. President, to convey to the people of the country and to the legislators the thought that this oppressive and burdensome tax measure is primarily intended to be for the purposes of military and naval development. But mark the caution which follows this effort on the part of the majority lawmakers. Read the proviso:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Treasury may use such fund for other purposes, but such fund shall be reimbursed for any portion thereof so used.

Is there, Mr. President, from here to China and from to-day back 500 years a more childish, a more grotesque, a more inane, a more ridiculous provision than this proviso herein contained? A whole paragraph solemnly setting forth that a fund should be consecrated to a certain purpose, and then a proviso saying the Secretary can use it for some other purpose, but if it is used for some other purpose the fund shall be reimbursed. How? By another bill? Heaven help the reimbursement, if the majority can pass appropriation bills encroaching upon this fund so ostentatiously proclaimed to be for the purpose of national defense. It is humiliating to feel that a tax bill of this magnitude, calculated to paralyze thrift and industry and precipitate bad times, should be made ridiculous and childish by a provision of this kind.

I for one think that two years is ample time to permit legislation of this character to remain upon the statute books. I look fondly forward to the hope that sanity will return to the American people, and that a House and Senate of a different complexion will exist at the end of that period to restore legislation by the two Houses of Congress to the high standards of statesmanship, which have usually prevailed in the history of the Government.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the Senator mean to intimate that the people of the United States are now insane?

Mr. PENROSE. I do not, Mr. President; but I doubt the sanity of some of the representatives of the people.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator hopes for a return of sanity to the people. I wonder if—

Mr. PENROSE. I am unwilling to be further interrupted. I am about to conclude.

That is about all I have to say at this time, Mr. President, on the pending amendment. As the discussion progresses I shall call attention to other inconsistencies in the measure; but as we read the subsequent pages we will come to no more ridiculous provision, no more inane provision, unworthy of the authors of this measure, than that which loudly proclaims the setting aside of a fund for a noble and patriotic purpose and then taking the precaution to say it has a string to it; we will take the money back whenever we feel like it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in addition to what has been said by the Senator from Indiana, the Senator from Utah, and the Senator from Pennsylvania, I desire to say that Congress will be in session in December again; that should there be no extra session it is bound to meet for the long session in December. So there will be plenty of opportunity to extend the time if it is necessary. Then, again, Congress will meet a year from December, which will give some thirty-odd days in which to act upon this matter and extend the time if it should be necessary. I hope the modified amendment of the Senator from Indiana will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to the amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been requested on the amendment of the Senator from Indiana to the amendment. Is there a second to the demand?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. The understanding is that the amendment has been modified to read "December 31, 1918."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], who is compelled to be absent to-day. If present, I do not know how the Senator from Maryland might vote on this question. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK], who is absent, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when Mr. TOWNSEND's name was called). My colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] has been called away from the Chamber by sickness in his family. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CURTIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], who, I understand, is detained from the Chamber on account of sickness. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] and will permit my vote to stand.

Mr. TILLMAN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. BANKHEAD. I desire to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] on account of sickness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. GRONNA (after having voted in the affirmative). I have voted, but I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. LODGE. I desire to announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. COLT. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY], who is absent. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I desire to be excused from voting, Mr. President.

Mr. CLARK (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, for fear there may be some misapprehension, I desire to state that I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. I have voted, but the Senator from Missouri, although afterwards in the Chamber, did not vote, and stated that he withheld his vote because of his pair. Believing that the Senator, had he voted, would have voted with his party, I shall withdraw my vote under the circumstances.

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

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE]; and

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

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—34.

Borah	Fernald	McCumber	Smoot
Brady	Gronna	McLean	Sterling
Brandegee	Harding	Norris	Wadsworth
Catron	Jones	Oliver	Warren
Clapp	Kenyon	Page	Watson
Cummins	La Follette	Penrose	Weeks
Curtis	Lane	Poindexter	Works
du Pont	Lippitt	Sherman	
Fall	Lodge	Smith, Mich.	

NAYS—41.

Ashurst	James	Phelan	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Swanson
Beckham	Kern	Pomerene	Thomas
Bryan	Kirby	Ransdell	Thompson
Chamberlain	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Tillman
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Underwood
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shafroth	Walsh
Fitchcock	Myers	Sheppard	Williams
Hollis	Newlands	Shields	
Hughes	Overman	Simmons	
Husting	Owen	Smith, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—21.

Broussard	Goff	Nelson	Sutherland
Clark	Gore	O'Gorman	Townsend
Colt	Hardwick	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Cuberson	Johnson, Me.	Smith, Ariz.	
Dillingham	Lewis	Smith, Md.	
Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Stone	

So Mr. WATSON's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. I move to strike out from the pending bill, beginning in section 1, down to and including line 21, on page 2. I offer that amendment, unless there are some other committee amendments still to be considered.

Mr. SIMMONS. What section of the bill is it the Senator from Wyoming moves to strike out?

Mr. CLARK. I am told that my motion is not at present in order.

Mr. LODGE. I understood that the committee amendments were to be disposed of before individual amendments were offered.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. I will say, for the information of the Senator from North Carolina, that my proposed amendment is to strike out section 1 down to and including line 21, on page 2. I will offer the amendment at the proper time.

Mr. SIMMONS. That amendment, I think, would not be in order at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 7, inserting lines 15, 16, and 17.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to hear what the amendment is.

Mr. SIMMONS. We have just rejected an amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to modify the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The committee proposes, on page 7, beginning in line 15, to insert:

SEC. 208. Titles I and II of this act shall cease to be of effect on and after July 1, 1921.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. On that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment of the committee is found on page 10, line 7, after the word "opportunity," to insert the words "to subscribe."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, wherever there is a section in which an amendment occurs I should like to ask that the section

be read, so that we can really know what the amendment means.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, it was distinctly understood last night that the paragraph which contains an amendment should be read in full.

Mr. SIMMONS. Do I understand the Senator wants the whole of that title read?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. There is only one amendment in section 400 of Title IV, and that section covers nearly two pages. The Senator wants the whole thing read?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the entire paragraph or section in which amendments occur.

The Secretary proceeded to read Title IV, section 400, as follows:

SEC. 400. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to borrow on the credit of the United States from time to time such sums as in his judgment may be required to meet public expenditures on account of the Mexican situation, the construction of the armor-plate plant, the construction of the Alaskan Railway, and the purchase of the Danish West Indies, or to reimburse the Treasury for such expenditures, and to prepare and issue therefor bonds of the United States not exceeding in the aggregate \$100,000,000, in such form as he may prescribe, bearing interest payable quarterly at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum; and such bonds shall be payable, principal and interest, in United States gold coin of the present standard of value, and both principal and interest shall be exempt from all taxes or duties of the United States as well as from taxation in any form by or under State, municipal, or local authority, and shall not be receivable by the Treasurer of the United States as security for the issue of circulating notes to national banks: *Provided*, That such bonds may be disposed of by the Secretary of the Treasury at not less than par, under such regulations as he may prescribe, giving all citizens of the United States an equal opportunity.

The SECRETARY. At that point, on page 10, line 7, after the word "opportunity," it is proposed to insert the words "to subscribe."

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that this amendment extends an equal opportunity to all the citizens of the United States to subscribe to a loan for certain purposes. I note that one of the purposes for which the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to borrow on the credit of the United States is "to meet public expenditures on account of the Mexican 'situation.'" The word "situation" is rather an extraordinary one to occur in legislation of this character, and particularly in connection with a loan. I do not recall that the history of financial legislation in several hundred years of parliamentary government in any free country gives an instance of a loan of some \$200,000,000 or any other amount borrowed for a "situation." I have know of loans to be incurred for a war, or an epidemic, or a flood, or for starvation, or for an invasion, but here it is proposed to make a loan of \$200,000,000 for a "situation."

Mr. BRANDEGEE. A chronic situation.

Mr. PENROSE. Yes; "a chronic situation." What is the nature of the "situation," Mr. President? When did it begin? When will it end? What is it? Where is it located? Who produced it? Is any one in this broad land willing to acknowledge the parentage of this "situation"?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Is there one?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes; is there one? Is it left unclaimed, a foundling on the doorstep, humiliating to the householder on whose doorstep it is found, because it invites suspicion regarding the daily circle of his routine life?

I am curious to know, Mr. President, why this radical innovation in the phraseology and terminology of fiscal legislation finds a place here, so that in the future the legislator and the historian may have an accurate definition of what a "situation" is. I invite the attention of the chairman of the Finance Committee to the propriety of adding a proviso defining a "situation." Is this a good "situation," Mr. President, or a bad "situation"? Is it a critical "situation," or is it some other kind of situation? When these American citizens are invited to subscribe to this loan and march up to the desk to put down their hard-earned wages to raise this \$200,000,000, they will inquire what is the "situation" for which they are putting up their money; and I ask, in all seriousness from the chairman of the committee, or from any other Member of the majority, whether they can give the Senate any information as to this "situation." I have known of loans to be incurred for a war,

Has any estimate been made as to this "situation"? Will the pending revenue bill be ample and sufficient to meet the requirements of the "situation" as long as it may continue? Is it likely to continue indefinitely, or is there a fixed time ahead which we may all contemplate when this "situation" may end? Is this "situation" serious, or in the nature of a vaudeville performance?

These are inquiries which will naturally arise in the breast of the prospective investor. I think the country is entitled to have a little more definite information as to why this very large sum of money is to be asked from the savings of the American people. I think they are entitled to know a little about what the "situation" is.

One question which will naturally occur is, whether any part of this money is to defend the lives of American citizens or the honor of American women or the property of our people wherever it may be located, or whether we shall continue to march up the hill and march down again? It is an expensive proceeding, Mr. President, apparently without any definite result. We recall one situation where we were "too proud to fight," and then another situation, later on, where we were ready to fight anything in sight. We recall a situation where we marched into Vera Cruz to compel a salute to the American flag, and where we subsequently withdrew without any flag or any individual being saluted, at considerable expense to the country. We recall a still later situation when we marched very boldly across the border in pursuit of Villa and his associates, who had had the presumption to cross over into the domain of the United States; and as far as any observer can ascertain at this distance, Villa and his forces have continued to be as active up to the present time as they were when this "situation" arose, after an expenditure of some lives and many million dollars.

I think that this is one point on which I am really entitled to have information from the chairman. He has not seen fit to explain this measure in any considerable detail; but as this proposition involves taking money from the pockets of the taxpayers, I think he ought to enlighten us on it. Is this Mexican situation in the nature of a "get-rich-quick" concern, Mr. President, for which money is taken from the taxpayers upon some plausible and rainbow-chasing prospectus? In that case, let it be branded with the proper term, "Get poor quick" and "get dishonored quick."

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, what has transpired during the last 10 or 15 minutes makes very clear, I think, the purpose of the minority with reference to this bill. We are now considering an amendment adding one word to section 400.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, we can not hear the Senator. Will he speak a little louder?

Mr. SIMMONS. I am speaking loud enough, I think, for the Senator to hear me. That section covers nearly two pages. The only amendment made to it—

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I do not suppose it makes any difference to the chairman of the Finance Committee—

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not yield.

Mr. PENROSE (continuing). But no one can hear the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEA of Tennessee in the chair). The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. PENROSE. I did not know I was interrupting the Senator. I could not hear him.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is one of the tricks of the Senator from Pennsylvania—to profess not to hear anybody on this side of the Chamber. It has become quite stale.

The only amendment made to that section is to add the words "to subscribe" in line 7 of the tenth page. This amendment proposes to insert in that section two words that evidently were inadvertently left out. That is apparent from a reading of the context. In considering this purely formal amendment the time of the Senate is taken up to read two pages of printed matter.

Of course, Mr. President, if the minority desire to take advantage of the situation that now exists, there being left only about seven days, excluding Sundays, between now and the time this session of the Congress will automatically expire, they can, by the unnecessary consumption of time, defeat this bill, and they can defeat the appropriation bills to provide money to pay the necessary expenses of preparedness which have had the sanction of their party.

I do not know why the minority apparently have reached the conclusion that there shall not be such legislation at this session as will be necessary to avoid the necessity of an extra session; but I feel quite confident that their attitude with reference to this little perfunctory amendment can mean nothing but a deliberate purpose to prevent the passage of this necessary legislation. The Senator from Pennsylvania consumes the time of the Senate about another matter which is so clear, which, looking at it even from his standpoint, is so irrelevant to the amendment, that the impression gained from their action with reference to the addition of the words "to subscribe" is further enforced.

Of course, Mr. President, the purpose for which these bonds are issued is well understood. On account of the Mexican situation—and the words are sufficiently descriptive to indicate what is meant—it will be necessary to raise \$162,000,000, the estimated expense of that situation, in order to reimburse the Treasury for money expended from the general fund to meet this indebtedness which was not provided for at the last session. At the last session of Congress it was stated and understood that no definite estimate was made or could be made as to the expenses of the Mexican situation. It was impossible to make a satisfactory estimate. It is always impossible, when you have a situation of that sort, until after the situation has developed itself more fully than it had at that time, to estimate closely what will be the cost. It was thought then by the department that the cost to December 31, 1916, of that situation would amount to about \$130,000,000. It has since been ascertained that it will amount to \$162,000,000 by June 30, 1917.

Because of the inability of the department to make a proper estimate, it was stated that there would be no provision in the revenue bill passed at the last session from which to pay the expenses of the Mexican situation, but that under the general law giving authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to issue Panama bonds the expense of that situation would be met by an issue of those bonds in whatever amount was necessary.

The Secretary did not issue those bonds, but from day to day has paid the expenses out of the general fund in the Treasury. That brought about a deficit of \$157,000,000. This bill proposes now to reimburse the Treasury of the United States, not an indefinite amount, but an amount estimated to be \$162,000,000. So that the bonds proposed to be issued in this title are to cover, first, the expenses incident to that situation up to June 30, 1917, estimated at \$162,000,000; the construction of the Alaskan Railroad, \$35,000,000; the armor plant, \$11,000,000; and the Danish West Indies, \$25,000,000, making \$233,000,000. We have authorized heretofore an issue of \$50,000,000 of Panama bonds to meet the expenses under the shipping act and \$20,000,000 for the cost of the nitrate plant, making \$70,000,000 of these bonds already authorized. That will make a total of bonds to be issued of \$303,000,000.

There are only \$222,000,000 of Panama bonds in the Treasury which can now be issued. That will make it necessary, in order to meet these expenses, to issue \$81,000,000 in new bonds; and this title authorizes the issuance of as much as \$100,000,000, not more—only as much as may be necessary, but not more than \$100,000,000 of bonds—to defray these expenses.

I do not think it is necessary to say anything further in reply to the questions and the argument of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, of course I assume that the bill is now being considered for committee amendments only.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is right. The amendment is found on page 10, line 7, and proposes to insert the words "to subscribe."

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understand where the committee amendment comes in; but it seems to me the Senator from Pennsylvania was quite within his rights and quite justified in asking for information upon the language of this paragraph.

Section 400 provides:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to borrow on the credit of the United States from time to time such sums as in his judgment may be required to meet public expenditures on account of the Mexican situation—

For one item. Mr. President, whatever may have been in the minds of the committee, I do not know, but that language, if it is left to stand as it is written, would allow the Secretary of the Treasury at any time in the future to issue bonds in such sums as in his judgment may be required to meet public expenditures, if they were only made on account of the Mexican situation.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does not the Senator lose sight of the fact that the issue is limited to \$100,000,000?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not lose sight of that fact, and of course I do not mean that he could issue bonds in a greater amount than the act authorizes him to issue. So far as anything in the act is concerned, however, not one penny of expenditures made in the past in the conduct of military operations on our part in Mexico need be paid by these bonds, but if somebody should decide that the troops should be sent back into Mexico, and if it were necessary to provide additional money, these expenditures made in the past could be left unpaid, and the entire amount authorized by this act could be used for future expenditures.

I call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to the fact that I think there ought to be an amendment. If it is

designed to pay expenditures already made, the bill should so state; and at the proper time, if nobody else does it, I shall offer an amendment, after the word "expenditures," in line 12 of page 9, to insert the words "heretofore made."

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator understands that this \$160,000,000 estimated for the Mexican situation includes the money that has already been spent on account of that situation and that which it is estimated will be spent during the remainder of this fiscal year.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Of course, I had no understanding about it except the language of the bill, Mr. President.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is an estimate.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is the reason I was asking information of the chairman, as to whether I understood the chairman of the committee correctly.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know whether the Senator knows what I mean or not.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. The bill authorizes the issue of \$100,000,000 of bonds. Upon the basis of \$162,000,000 expenditure it would require only \$81,000,000 of bonds to meet these different items; but we can not say with absolute definiteness what may be the increased expenditure on account of the Mexican situation between now and the end of the fiscal year. This, however, is to meet an estimate of \$162,000,000 for the Mexican situation up to the 30th day of June of the present fiscal year.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, that is simply to say, when anybody asks what this Mexican situation is, that Congress is asked to appropriate not to exceed \$100,000,000 to provide for it, a part of which the Senator says is to be spent away up until the end of this fiscal year. What is the Mexican situation now, that Congress is asked to appropriate it blindly without knowing anything about what it is to be used for?

On the admission of the Senator from North Carolina, if I understood the Senator from North Carolina correctly, I am not sure that I did, the Secretary of the Treasury already had authority to issue Panama Canal bonds to pay for this expenditure. If he had, I suppose he still has that authority, and if he has he can pay all the past expenditures made on account of the so-called Mexican situation out of the issue of Panama Canal bonds, and then he will have this fund for future operations in Mexico.

I do not know what to do about it. Of course, if the bill comes to a vote a majority will pass it in any language they have a mind to, and they seem to resent anybody asking for information or calling attention to the loose wording of the bill. But that shall not deter me from making such comments as I choose to make upon it from time to time, and I leave it there.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I only desire to call the attention of the Senate to what I consider a grossly inelegant, untechnical, unstatutory phrase which never has appeared, to my knowledge, in connection with financial legislation or bond issues. I challenge any precedent for the issuance of bonds for a "situation." It makes us ridiculous before the exchequers and treasuries of civilized nations to use such language. Certainly we ought to defer somewhat to the laws of grammar, and the elegancies of diction, to the phraseology which bankers and borrowers and creditors are accustomed to use. I have never heard of a customer going into a bank to float a note for a "situation," commendable as the situation might be, or to ask for a personal loan from an old friend upon the street for a "situation."

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I call my colleague's attention to the fact that two months ago a very eminent lawyer testified that he was "attorney for the situation."

Mr. PENROSE. Yes. If we are going to use the vulgar parlance of the street in connection with fiscal phraseology, I would suggest the propriety of striking out the word "situation" and let it read "the Mexican mess." That would be a little more descriptive anyhow in its accuracy and equally technical. I have sufficient patriotism in my bringing up and in my education to want to preserve the high standards of statutory language, and I intend when the opportunity is offered and this paragraph again appears upon the floor of the Senate open to amendment to offer an amendment changing the phraseology of the Mexican "situation" or Mexican "mess" into more elegant and illuminating and definite and legal language, so that the vast army of citizens who will put the savings of their thrift into this \$20,000,000 of expenditure may know a little more clearly for what purpose it has been spent or is being spent. They may well feel puzzled as to how it has been spent or how it will be spent, for up to the present time the Mexican mess or the Mexican "situation" has hardly advanced an inch. It is just the same as it was when the famous phrases of "watchful waiting" and "too proud to fight" were submitted to the

patriotic consideration of the American people. We have been in and we have been out. I do not know whether we will go in and go out again or not, but certainly while we are committing these wanton acts let us observe the proprieties at least of appearance and clothe our performances in technical language.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the psychological "situation" or "mess," whichever it may be, of the Senator from Pennsylvania is supreme, it is almost sublime, but with it all it is quite amusing. Everybody who listens to the Senator from Pennsylvania knows that he is distressed neither in mind nor body in the argument which he has just been making. He wants to strike out the word "situation" and wants to substitute for it the word "mess." He tells us that by his bringing up he is better prepared to vote for the word "mess" than for the word "situation."

Now, what is the "situation" in Mexico? Let us be serious about it a while and talk about it earnestly, not merely in a partisan spirit, a spirit which concludes that any rack pin to hang a hat on to hurt the Democratic Party is a good rack pin.

What is the "situation"? Who knows what it is? How can we make a definite appropriation for a definite "situation"? Carranza has lately come out and given us notice that he stands among the three Americas—Central, South, and North American—in opposition to the President of the United States, and asking him to knuckle down quietly upon four fingers on the floor and submit to being kicked once more.

The universal opinion of the party to which the Senator from Pennsylvania belongs is that the President has been kicked enough already. If there is any criticism of him at all, it is not that he has not gone far enough, but that he ought to have gone further; not that he has not acted quickly enough, but that he ought to have acted more quickly. I am not agreeing with those criticisms, because they are your criticisms floating in the circumambient political atmosphere from Massachusetts clear on through wherever there is a Republican who is bent upon attacking the President of the United States.

Mr. President, it does not make any difference whether you call the Mexican "situation" the Mexican "mess"; it is a messed-up situation. There is no doubt about that. It is a mess because there was nothing that we could do that would have kept it from being an uncontrollable sort of a bad situation, unless we had been willing to put the American people in for a worse mess than the Mexican people were already in.

What are you going to do with those people? Suppose you stop "the watchful waiting" of which you make so much fun, and suppose that 35,000 American troops headed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] go down to reduce Mexico to order—perhaps the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] acting as his lieutenant—what are you going to do with them?

Mr. PENROSE. Will the Senator permit me?

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield most gladly to hear the answer to that question.

Mr. PENROSE. In all my criticism of the Mexican situation I never offered to go down there myself. I early became convinced that I exposed too much surface to the enemy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am the last man in the world to doubt the physical courage of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I know he is just as brave as I am or anybody else. I did not mean to infer that he was not going with the idea of saving his own hide. Of course I knew he was not going. I knew that by my knowledge of myself and by my knowledge of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I knew neither one of us was going, but I also knew that a good many American boys would have to go if we are going to have that trouble. I also know that the Senator from Pennsylvania knows that there is no way of defining the Mexican situation. The fingers of a great European power have already been playing with the Mexican pulse. We have already received from Carranza an intimation of what might happen. We have also received an intimation of the same great foreign nation playing with the pulse in Cuba. The Senator from Pennsylvania knows those facts as well as I do. He knows that if we make a provision for bonds to meet the Mexican situation, that situation must remain indefinite, because we can not define it. We can not define it because its definition remains with Mexico and with the European pulse finding and feeling power in Mexico.

Of course the Senator from Pennsylvania knows all that. There is no man in this body with better sense than he. Whatever else may have been said about him at any time or whatever else may be said about him now, his intellectual acumen is almost perfect. He knows the situation in Mexico as well as I do, and he knows that neither he nor I know that it is a definite

situation and that it is "a mess," as he calls it, and that calling it "a mess" does not help "the situation."

The American people somehow or other right now have got to stand shoulder to shoulder against foreign aggression. It would not be becoming to be too specific in saying what that foreign aggression is, but the Senator knows it as well as I do. He perhaps knows it better because he has a better individual intellect than I have.

Now, Mr. President, after you are through with it all, the Senator tells us that here is a bond put upon the market to meet "a situation"; that he never heard of anybody being economically armed with sufficient business penetration to subscribe for bonds "to meet a situation." What a man subscribes to is the bond and it is not the situation. Whenever the United States Government puts out a bond to meet its possible expenses for the purpose of meeting a situation announced to them, the United States therefore necessarily becomes sponsor. The situation is elastic; the bond is a definite thing.

Speaking for myself, and I think speaking for the Senator from Pennsylvania, if we had a few hundred dollars to spend we would not have the slightest hesitation about the security. The Senator, of course, knows he has been playing with the galleries and has been playing with the public and has been playing with the Senate. He does not mean one word that he says. He knows as well as I do that the business value of that bond issued by the United States is not in the slightest degree embarrassed by the use of the word "situation."

By the way, the word situation is not a very indefinite word. It means the sitting place of the nation at that time as well as the nation can discover a sitting place. If the Senator knows what our situation in Mexico is he knows a lot more than I do. It is a thing apt to be developed in any minute to mean something totally unexpected. As Disraeli says, "It is the unexpected that always happens."

Now, why does the Senator from Pennsylvania come in here about once a month to break my pair in order to produce a case of discord and lack of harmony in the national defense?

Mr. PENROSE. I protected the Senator from Mississippi for nearly two weeks in January.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He did. There is no doubt about that, and he protected me most nobly. That does not discount the fact that I have protected him for about two years. But let that go.

Why should he come here and try to create discord about nothing, about a word, a difference between "a situation" and "a mess"?

By the way, I do not know what the word "mess" means. The word "mess," if anything at all, means a nasty situation and a bad situation, something worse than a sweet situation. The worse the situation is the more money we will need to meet it. The more unexpected the situation will be the more we will need to be prepared for it.

My friend from Pennsylvania is one of the most genial men who ever lived. He is all right in every respect except when his partisanship is aroused. It makes a man like me, who is really patriotic, sigh with grief when I view his partisanship. Whether it is some old Federalist doctrine or whether it is a new plutocratic doctrine makes no difference, the Senator from Pennsylvania is equally strenuous in his support of both. I remember only a few years ago when the Senator went back to Pennsylvania to be an uplifter, when he made up his mind that this modern party that calls itself "progressive" could not "outprogress" him upon any question in the world. But just as soon as he got himself safely seated in the Senate his progressivism and his upliftism expired by their mutual consent and by his consent, too.

I hope the Senator will not insist upon introducing the word "mess" upon an American statute in order to cure the indefiniteness of the word "situation," which he knows to express a real and practical indefiniteness and not merely an indefiniteness of language.

Mr. President, the time will come some day when the biographies of statesmen will be written, and the biography of the Senator from Pennsylvania will be written, too. I promise not to eulogize him during his lifetime for fear I might do him harm, but after he is dead, if he shall die before I do, I shall pronounce a eulogy upon him for some good for which he is entitled to be remembered. I do not want the Senator to present himself to the American people as offering an amendment to substitute the word "mess," which is very indefinite, if not of doubtful construction, for the word "situation," which is about as definite as we can make it, especially when he remembers, as I remember, that the bond is for this specific thing, and he will be mighty

glad to have a few of them if he has money enough to buy them, and so will I.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I do not intend to pursue this matter any further. I am anxious to facilitate the passage of this measure and to help to perfect it. So far it is the fact that I have been completely ignored with my colleagues in the minority in our patriotic efforts to prune out some of the inconsistencies in the measure. I rose in good faith to call attention to the impropriety of the word "situation" in connection with a bond issue, and tried to accentuate my objections by saying the word "mess" might just as well have been used. When the paragraph appears in the Senate I shall offer proper technical language in connection with the issue of the bonds.

I know that the credit of the Government is the bond, but the knowledge of the purpose of the loan is a test of the popularity of the loan. If the loan is for a purpose offensive to the American people or unpopular among them, there will not be that ready contribution that there would be where universal approval is voiced for the bond issue from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. I can easily imagine how an aroused public sentiment perhaps might ridicule this performance of borrowing money for a "situation" so that men might well hesitate to subscribe with any great zeal, and the bonds, perchance, might not be floated upon as favorable conditions as might have prevailed had a little more decorum been preserved in issuing them. So I will not pursue the matter further at the present time.

As to the Mexican situation I shall say briefly that I am one of those who look on it as constituting the most deplorable chapters in the history of our foreign relations. Vacillation, infirmity of purpose, ignorance of conditions, and inexperience with the rules and amenities of international intercourse have brought us to a condition in Mexico where we incur nothing but contempt. Had the situation been taken up firmly in the beginning, upon the lines of definite and recognized diplomatic procedure, with the recognition of the de facto government in conjunction with the other nations of the world, we would not have had this condition. A few thousand men, had the necessity arisen, could have gone into Mexico then when the American citizen was respected and feared and American rights were respected and honored, just as they went 70 years ago under Scott and Taylor and marched into Mexico with five or eight thousand men and conquered the country. But having once sunk to the lowest level, as a people branded with cowardice, and with a Government prompted only by infirmity of purpose, 150,000 men on the border and far into the interior were unable to hunt to cover a bandit with a few hundred followers. It is a lamentable situation and it is a complicated one, but all the trouble has arisen from the ignorance and incapacity of those whose duty it was to have taken hold of the matter early and firmly, until the situation as described in this bill has cost several hundred million dollars and may cost several hundred million dollars more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, do I understand we are still on the bond question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment was agreed to without objection.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the Chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. OWEN. May I ask the indulgence of the Senator for just a moment?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. OWEN. I wanted to ask if we might not agree that on Monday we might take the first hour after meeting to dispose of the amendments to the Federal reserve act? It is quite an important matter, and I have been trying for weeks to get it concluded. I do not think it will take over a half or three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope the Senator will not make that request in the absence of the chairman of the Finance Committee.

Mr. SIMMONS entered the Chamber.

Mr. THOMAS. I see, however, that the Senator from North Carolina has come in.

Mr. SHERMAN. May I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if this is the bill that authorizes the member banks of the Federal Reserve System to charge exchange rates?

Mr. OWEN. The members of the system have a right to charge whatever rates they please, and they have always had it since the act passed. This bill does not deal with that.

Mr. SHERMAN. As it is now, though, if I understand correctly, the exchange is limited to the cost of transacting the exchange business.

Mr. OWEN. No; there is no statute about it. They are at liberty to charge what they please. They seem to have gotten the impression that this bill proposes to deal with the matter of exchange, and forbids them to charge exchange. The bill does not do that. The report has been printed and is before the Senate.

Mr. SHERMAN. The bill, if I have read it correctly, would put it in the power of the Federal Reserve Board to authorize the national banks to charge a reasonable rate of exchange, and the board would fix the rate.

Mr. OWEN. I do not so interpret it. The report speaks for itself; but that matter could be considered if we could arrive at some agreement.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am opposed to the bill in its present form, Mr. President, and could not yield for that purpose, because it occurs to me—

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SHERMAN. For a question.

Mr. WEEKS. I wanted to say that there are several features in this proposed legislation. One of them, at least, is as important as any matter with which the Senate has to deal. It has to do with getting into the Federal reserve banks as much of the floating surplus gold as can be done within a reasonable time; and I hope an effort will be made to get action on this bill. There may be features of the bill which Senators will want to oppose, but I am confident that they will not oppose that particular proposition.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SHERMAN. For a question.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, in the present situation, at this particular time, I can not consent to laying aside the revenue bill either to-day or to-morrow for the bill presented by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. OWEN. I suggested Monday, not to-day or to-morrow.

Mr. SIMMONS. A little later I may be able to consent to that; but I hope, for the present, that the Senator will not press that request.

Mr. OWEN. I withdraw the request, under the circumstances.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator desire to lay the revenue bill aside?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I do not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; no such proposition as that is before the Senate.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will proceed with my comments, then.

[Mr. SHERMAN resumed and concluded his speech on February 24.]

GEN. FUNSTON.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, the sudden and untimely death of Maj. Gen. Funston, who had served his country so bravely and brilliantly for many years, came as a great shock to the Nation. By his death Kansas lost the greatest soldier she ever produced.

It was my privilege to know Gen. Funston personally when I lived in Allen County, Kans., where he made his home from the time he was about 2 years old. After reaching manhood he was not at his old home much of the time, but I saw him occasionally when he returned on visits. One of my first official acts was to call the attention of President Wilson to this worthy officer of the Army and to the fact that justice demanded he be made a major general at the first opportunity; and it was indeed pleasing to me and to the people of Kansas when the President finally gave him his deserved recognition by advancing him to the high rank of major general November 18, 1914.

Gen. Funston's death is not only a great loss to Kansas but is a greater loss to the entire Nation. This is especially true at this particular time when military genius means so much to the Nation. Gen. Funston was a natural-born soldier. He was a military genius with no superiors and with few equals. He never had military schooling or special military training, but the instincts of a soldier and the peculiar characteristics of a commanding officer were born in him. Without military training he went to Cuba and cast his lot with that brave and courageous people who were fighting for liberty, and while thus engaged he attained distinction as an officer. After his last battle in which he was wounded, he was captured by the Spanish, and it was only by his quick natural wit that he was

able to gain freedom, claiming to be an American newspaper reporter and in sympathy with the Spaniards. His achievements as an officer in the Cuban Army in over 20 battles favorably commended him to the Army of the United States. When the Spanish War began he was appointed colonel of the Twentieth Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and he made that regiment famous. His personally planned capture of Aguinaldo, the Philippine rebel chief, on March 23, 1901, which terminated the rebellion, was such as to give him prominence throughout the world for daring, courage, and successful execution of difficult military plans.

With only four American officers and 78 native Macabebe scouts and three Spaniards, Gen. Funston undertook this difficult task by marching from Manila to Palanan, in the interior of Luzon, where Aguinaldo had his headquarters. The general, with the other Americans, pretended to be prisoners of the Philippine scouts. Letters were sent to Aguinaldo purporting to come from Gen. Lacuna, who was associated with Aguinaldo in the rebellion against the United States, stating he was sending a number of fine troops for the personal use of the Philippine president, who had captured and made prisoners a number of American members of a surveying party, and also requested that Aguinaldo send them an escort and supplies. Aguinaldo complied with their request, and implored the Macabebes, who pretended to be rank insurgents, to treat the white prisoners kindly. As they approached the headquarters they were greeted by Aguinaldo personally, with a fine bodyguard of troops, who received them with great pomp and ceremony. The troops of Gen. Funston, by prearrangement, surrounded the headquarters and marched in front of Aguinaldo's troops. Aguinaldo retired to the house, and Gen. Funston immediately assumed command, and an order was given, "Now, Macabebes, go for them!" This command was followed by a brisk firing of guns and a general scattering of Aguinaldo's troops. Aguinaldo, hearing the shots and mistaking them for signs of festivities and being short of gunpowder, rushed to the window and shouted, "Stop that foolishness! Don't waste ammunition!" He was immediately seized by one of the officers throwing his arms around him, and was then rushed to the coast and taken to Manila, which put an end to the rebellion.

Gen. McArthur said of this victory at the time:

The transaction was brilliant in conception and faultless in execution.

President McKinley, in an autograph letter, wrote the following concerning Gen. Funston's regiment:

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, September 30, 1899.

The American Nation appreciates the devotion and valor of its soldiers and sailors. Among its hosts of brave defenders, "the Twentieth Kansas" was fortunate in opportunity and heroic in action, and has won a permanent place in the hearts of a grateful people.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

On October 10, 1899, the Twentieth Kansas Regiment entered Golden Gate, San Francisco, on its return home, where it was greeted by the governor of Kansas and other distinguished Kansans and given a triumphant welcome all the way from San Francisco to the capital of Kansas. On November 3, 1899, a grand reception was tendered the members of the regiment by the people of Kansas at Topeka, where men, women, and children came in great crowds from all sections of the State to welcome and to honor the brave "Twentieth Kansas boys," who had accomplished so much for the Nation and added so many pages of glory to the history of the State. Gen. Funston was presented with a gold sword set in diamonds purchased by popular subscription.

Promotions came to Gen. Funston rapidly until he became brigadier general of the Army April 1, 1901, when his youth and the fact that he rose from the volunteer service interfered with his further advancement for over 13 years. Both President Roosevelt and President Taft promoted other Regular Army officers over him who were his senior in years but had performed no special distinguished service. Gen. Funston almost despaired of promotion, but with characteristic tenacity he stuck to the Army until he received his coveted reward. He accepted his fate philosophically and in good spirits, as is shown in a letter to me of October 17, 1914, in acknowledgment of his appreciation of my interest in his behalf, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,
Vera Cruz, Mexico, October 17, 1914.

HON. WILLIAM H. THOMPSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMPSON: I can not tell you how much I appreciate your action in writing the President and Secretary of War in my behalf, I being especially grateful for what you did because it was an entirely voluntary act.

I hear that I am again to be passed over in the matter of promotion. I suppose that my principal crime is still my "youth." God save the mark. I used to be young, but have been getting over it at the rate of 365 days per year. I have marked time for 13 long years, not

counting my two years as a brigadier general of Volunteers. But what is the use of being unhappy about it? Really, I am lucky to be alive and to have such a good and beautiful wife and such adorable children. Under such treatment nine out of ten men would find it hard to be loyal and to do their duty, but somehow I do not. It will not make any difference.

Again thanking you for your interest in me, I am,
Yours, very sincerely,

FREDERICK FUNSTON.

As he advanced in rank in the Army, he immediately assumed and mastered all the higher responsibilities devolved upon him. He discharged with fidelity every trust and duty placed upon him in the most satisfactory manner. There was no military commander since the Civil War whose fighting qualities and brave exploits so endeared him to the people as the little hero who fought with Gomez and Garcia for 18 months as commander of the Cuban artillery, and with the Twentieth Kansas Volunteers against the Spaniards and ladrones in the Philippines. While his dashing and picturesque capture of Aguinaldo gave Gen. Funston his greatest prominence, and made him a brigadier general, yet he performed services to his country far more difficult and of much greater value.

When San Francisco was falling into charred ruins and its terrified inhabitants fled to the hills in disorder and uncontrolled lawlessness prevailed, it was Gen. Funston at the head of the Regulars who brought order out of chaos. He met every requirement of that awful situation and won the confidence and esteem of not only the citizens of California but of the entire Nation, who all greatly sympathized with the people of that unfortunate city.

He played well his part in the Vera Cruz campaign, and has received praise from everywhere for his successful management of military affairs on the Mexican border. The American troops had only been in Vera Cruz a short time when a Mexican general sent him a message stating that he was unable to longer restrain his troops which were about to advance and drive the Americans into the sea. Gen. Funston sent back one of his characteristic replies, saying, "If you can not hold your troops back, I can." This was in line with his famous reply to Gen. Otis when he asked him, "How long can you hold your position, Funston?" and he replied, "Until my regiment is mustered out."

Concerning his death, and services in Mexico, the Secretary of War, Mr. Baker, made this statement:

Gen. Funston's death is a loss to the Army and a loss to the country. During the trouble on the Mexican border his work has been difficult, exacting, and delicate. His conduct has been that of a soldier, and he has exemplified the high tradition of the American Army by his quick, intelligent, and effective action. Throughout it all the sympathy between Gen. Funston and the department has been complete and no shadow of disagreement has arisen.

Gen. Funston's life was a career of continual adventure and reads like a novel, and is one that appeals to every patriotic young man of the country.

While still a student at the Kansas University he went on an exploring expedition to Colorado in places in the Rocky Mountains which were difficult of access, and worked as guide to earn money to pay his expenses. A few years later his father, Hon. E. H. Funston, who was a Member of Congress from the second Kansas congressional district from 1884 to 1894, secured his appointment as a botanist to accompany a party of Government surveyors to explore Death Valley, where he spent seven months. He next went on a daring adventure to Alaska, and on his return trip went down the Yukon River in a small canoe which he built himself and made the perilous trip of over 1,500 miles down the river alone. As he neared the end of his journey the boat capsized and he struggled for his life in the icy water. He succeeded in saving himself only to be threatened with death from cold and starvation, but fortunately came across a missionary post where he took refuge, but he became sick and nearly died from pneumonia.

While in Cuba, leading a cavalry charge, he was wounded in both lungs, his horse was shot from under him, falling upon and crushing his right leg, and while he was endeavoring to crawl to the Cubans he was captured by the Spaniards, making a hairbreadth escape. His skill and daring at Rio Grande de la Pampanga, Luzon, for which he was awarded a medal of honor; his bravery, exemplified by the execution of his plan for the capture of Aguinaldo; his executive power in peace, shown as department commander in San Francisco, Portland, Denver, St. Louis, Chicago, and Manila, and his long experience as a commanding general, and particularly his recent valuable services rendered at Vera Cruz and on the Mexican border, all mark a life of activity and usefulness worthy of the highest commendation of every American citizen.

Gen. Funston was born at Newcastle, Clark County, Ohio, November 9, 1865, and died at San Antonio, Tex., February 19, 1917, leaving a wife and three children, who now reside at San Francisco, Cal. He was particularly devoted to his mother, who

still survives him, and whom he visited at the old home on every possible occasion. He was a lover of children and music, and it is an interesting coincidence that he was playing with a little child and listening to the hotel orchestra playing The Blue Danube waltz, of which he had just remarked "How beautiful it is," when the death summons suddenly came.

After his mastery of the Vera Cruz and border situation it was not difficult to conceive a second "Chapultepec" of Mexico as peaceful as the campaigns in the Philippines, and I have often thought that had Gen. Funston been given a free hand at the border and placed personally in charge of an expedition into Mexico he could have returned with Gen. Villa to answer to this country for the murders which he and his men had committed in the Columbus massacre. He knew no fear. He was venturesome and resourceful beyond measure. While, like Napoleon, he was only a small man in stature, barely 5 feet 5 inches in height, yet he was a great fighter and may well be called the "little hero of Manila and Mexico." His great achievements prove him one of the most skillful, hard-working, and successful soldiers of our country, and he has brought to Kansas a fame unsurpassed by any of her greatest sons. He wore the uniform of the United States with the greatest honor and distinction, and at the age of only 51 he died, the youngest of our major generals. In the present impending crisis it will be difficult to fill his place. Kansas and the Nation sadly mourn their great loss.

THE REVENUE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20573) to provide increased revenue to defray the expenses of the increased appropriations for the Army and Navy and the extensions of fortifications, and for other purposes.

Mr. PAGE obtained the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. 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	Fernald	Martin, Va.	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Harding	Martine, N. J.	Smoot
Borah	Hollis	Newlands	Swanson
Bryan	Hughes	Norris	Thomas
Catron	James	Overman	Thompson
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Underwood
Clapp	Kenyon	Penrose	Wadsworth
Clark	Kirby	Pittman	Warren
Colt	La Follette	Poindexter	Watson
Culberson	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Weeks
Cummins	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Works
Curtis	Lewis	Sherman	
Dillingham	McCumber	Shields	
Fall	McLean	Simmons	

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] is detained in committee on work of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me for a minute?

Mr. PAGE. I have been asked by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] to yield to him for a moment.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I desire, with the Senator's consent, appreciating his courtesy, to submit an amendment to the pending bill. I ask to have the amendment read and lie on the table.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator desire to have the amendment read? Would it not be agreeable to him to have the amendment printed in the RECORD?

Mr. LEWIS. If the Senator thinks it will take too much time to have the amendment read, I shall be glad to adopt his suggestion.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think it would be better to have the amendment printed in the RECORD without reading.

Mr. LEWIS. As I do not wish to consume time unnecessarily, I shall be glad to avail myself of the Senator's suggestion. It is an amendment conferring power upon the President of the United States to seize foodstuffs held in violation of public policy. I ask, then, that the amendment be printed in the RECORD. I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. LEWIS to the bill (H. R. 20573) to provide increased revenue to defray the expenses of the increased appropriations for the Army and Navy and the extensions of fortifications, and for other purposes, viz: Insert the following:

"SEC. —. That whenever to the knowledge or information of the President of the United States there are circumstances sufficient to justify him, in his judgment, to proclaim that the food and necessities of life of the citizen of the United States is being monopolized and wrongfully held by persons in the United States for the purpose of

unjust increase in price, and whenever such increase of price, to the judgment of the President of the United States, upon facts to his knowledge, is in pursuance of the violation of existing laws of the United States forbidding monopolies and conspiracies to monopolize the necessities of life, the President of the United States may, by proclamation, proclaim the fact so established. That then and there, in any court of the United States, process may be filed by any United States attorney for the seizure of such foods as held in violation of law and which are necessary to the maintenance and life of a citizen of the United States.

"SEC. —. That such seizures provided for in section 1 of this act may be made by any officer of the law of the United States or by any officer of any State who may be authorized to serve as an officer of the United States in conjunction with any officer of the United States or by authority or order of the President of the United States through Executive order.

"SEC. —. That the said foods, when seized, may be at once disposed of at public sale in such manner as shall be judged as proper by the officers of the law to whom judgment in condemnation is now authorized by law in matters of condemnation now provided for the United States Government, the goods so condemned to be disposed of to those whose necessities are first to be relieved. The price to be obtained from such products shall be no higher than such rates as shall be prescribed by such department of the Federal Government as may be designated at the time of the President's proclamation by the President of the United States. Said sale shall be in a public place and upon limit in such quantity to each purchaser as shall be prescribed as a minimum to the due and proper necessity of those whose necessities are the object of this act.

"SEC. —. That when any goods or foods are so seized same shall be paid for by the United States upon the basis of the fair market value; that whenever the said market value is declined said goods or foods shall be the subject of condemnation, and the fair market value arrived at by the said condemnation proceedings submitted to a jury in such courts as have jurisdiction in condemnation proceedings at the instance of the United States; that the seizures herein prescribed may be had peremptorily; that the sales and disposition to those whose necessities justify shall be had promptly, without delay, to the object of preventing a monopoly of foods inflicting upon the citizens the penalty of hunger and the vicissitudes of need.

"SEC. —. That all acts or parts of acts in conflict with this act are hereby repealed."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, would the Senator from Vermont be willing to permit the next amendment to be read before he proceeds? I have an amendment that I want to offer, and I would like to discuss it briefly. Would it discommode the Senator to defer his remarks until the conclusion of that?

Mr. PAGE. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment of the committee is on page 11—

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, was the amendment on page 10 agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary informs the Chair that it was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 11, after line 4, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 401. That the Secretary of the Treasury in his discretion is hereby authorized to borrow on the credit of the United States a sum not exceeding \$63,945,460 and to prepare and issue therefor bonds of the United States, the proceeds of such bonds to be applied to the redemption on August 1, 1918, of the bonds of the 3 per cent loan of 1908 to 1918 authorized by the act approved June 13, 1898, and then maturing, such proceeds to be applied to no other purpose: *Provided*, That in his discretion the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to receive at the Treasury prior to August 1, 1918, any of the bonds of the 3 per cent loan of 1908 to 1918 maturing on such date and to issue in exchange therefor an equal amount of bonds of the United States herein authorized: *Provided further*, That the bonds herein authorized shall be in such form as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, redeemable and payable at such times within 50 years from date of issue as the Secretary may direct, bearing interest payable quarterly at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, and the bonds herein authorized shall be payable, principal and interest, in United States gold coin of the present standard of value, and both principal and interest shall be exempt from all taxes or duties of the United States as well as from taxation in any form by or under State, municipal, or local authority, and said bonds shall not be receivable by the Treasurer of the United States as security for the issue of circulating notes to national banks: *Provided further*, That said bonds may be disposed of by sale or exchange by the Secretary of the Treasury at not less than par, under such regulations as he may prescribe, and in case of sale all citizens of the United States shall be given an equal opportunity to subscribe therefor, but no commissions shall be allowed or paid thereon, and a sum not exceeding one-fifth of 1 per cent of the amount of bonds herein authorized to be issued is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to pay the expenses of preparing, advertising, and issuing the same and the expenses of refunding the bonds of the 3 per cent loan of 1908 to 1918: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed as modifying section 11 of the act approved March 14, 1900, authorizing the refunding of the bonds of the 3 per cent loan of 1908 to 1918 into 2 per cent consols of the United States bearing the circulation privilege.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

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

The SECRETARY. It is proposed, at the end of the amendment, to insert the following:

Provided further, That in lieu of any of the bonds provided for in this act the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to issue serial bonds of the United States, maturing in equal amounts from 1 year from date of issue to 25 years from date of issue at a rate of interest not exceeding one-fourth of 1 per cent in excess of the rates provided for in this act.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to explain the amendment briefly, and I should like to have the attention of the Senator from North Carolina particularly.

This amendment, in substance, gives to the Secretary of the Treasury the right to issue serial bonds instead of the bonds provided for in this act. I listened with a great deal of interest the other day to the address of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] on this subject, and I am satisfied that all of those who listened to that address on the question of a comparison of serial bonds with the bonds provided for in this act were impressed with the idea that a great deal of money could be saved by issuing serial bonds, even though the rate of interest were higher.

I have provided in the amendment that if the Secretary issues serial bonds he can increase the rate of interest one-quarter of 1 per cent. I have made it discretionary with the Secretary whether he shall issue such bonds or the bonds provided for in the act as it stands at present.

Taking the figures given me by the Senator from North Carolina as to the amount of bonds provided for in this act, and making a rough computation at my desk here in the last few minutes, I have found that if the Secretary availed himself of the right given him here in this amendment, and it was necessary for him to increase the rate of interest one-quarter of 1 per cent, and then issue serial bonds instead of those provided for in the act, he would save in interest the sum of \$279,000,000. That saving would be spread out over 50 years of time; but, Mr. President, if we can save that much money, it seems to me that, even though it takes 50 years to save it, we ought to avail ourselves of the opportunity.

There is another point in it. If we issue the bonds that are provided for in this bill they will be like bonds that have been issued in the past; no provision will be made for their payment. They will mature, and we probably will be issuing refunding bonds instead of paying them off at the expiration of the time they are to run. If serial bonds are issued, however, one twenty-fifth of them will be paid off each year, and at the end of 25 years they will all be paid, with a saving of more than the face of the bonds in the end. If you will compute the matter just briefly with a pencil you will find that we are paying more in interest than the principal of the bonds will amount to, and at the end of the 50 years the principal will still remain to be paid. If we provide for a sinking fund, as was so well demonstrated by the Senator from Massachusetts the other day, even though we invest the sinking fund, there is always danger of that large amount of money being misappropriated, mishandled, or honestly lost. If it is not invested, we have kept it out of circulation; and there would have to be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$300,000,000, in round numbers, in the sinking fund to pay these bonds at the time they matured.

I earnestly hope that the Senator from North Carolina will not object to this amendment. I have not made it compulsory upon the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds of this kind. The Government of the United States, as I understand, has never issued bonds of this kind. The Secretary never has been authorized to issue bonds of this kind. It is the modern method resorted to now by most of the municipalities issuing bonds at the present time; and it seems to me there could be no possible objection to at least giving to the Secretary of the Treasury the discretion of issuing these bonds instead of the others provided for.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, in behalf of the committee, I am inclined to make no objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

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

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I doubt if there is any State in this Union that is so vitally affected by the so-called Underwood amendment as the State of Vermont. I dislike to take the time of the Senate in discussing a proposition which has been already so well discussed by the Senate; but it seems to me that the duty is incumbent upon me to say a few words, because the State I in part represent is so vitally interested.

Something like 30 years ago the agricultural interests of Vermont were very materially depressed. Our farms were selling for a very low price. Our boys, as they became young men, thought they saw, and they probably did see, in the West a greater opportunity for success; and they left the farms where they had been brought up and went off to help build up the other States. Even to-day Vermont suffers immensely because of this tendency of our young men; and when I say "our young men" I may specify, perhaps, by saying that it is the more progressive and enterprising of our young men who go away from the State. The last census shows that we have

407,000 natives of Vermont in this country, and yet, sir, only 250,000 of them live within the borders of the State.

The result was that our farms reached a very unfortunate condition as to the quality of the land. The quality of the soil was depreciating from year to year. Our sheep industry, which in the early seventies and eighties was a most important industry, had gone backward until in 1890 we had very little of that industry left in our State. We formerly raised some wheat. We raised a goodly amount of cereals. We raised a good many hops. But along in the latter part of the nineteenth century, say about 1890, our farmers became more interested in dairying, and from that time until the present our State has been improving, our farmers have been more prosperous, our young men in larger numbers are staying at home, and to-day the dairying interest is the one great industry of our State.

Perhaps I ought to qualify that statement. It is true that we produce more than 50 per cent more marble than all the other States of the Union combined; and, barring Pennsylvania, which is the great slate State, we produce more slate than all the rest of the Union. In 1907 we stood third, I think, among the granite-producing States; in 1909 we were second; in 1911 we were first. I think I am right about these dates. It is not material about the exact years; but from 1912 forward we have been the great granite State of the Union, producing by far more granite than any other State, and of a better quality. We produce more scales than any other State, and I do not know but that we produce more than all the other States of the Union. As I came down from my home last month I picked up one of the menus in the dining car, and there I found this sentence:

Vermont produces more maple sugar than all the rest of the Union combined.

With all of these industries standing out so prominently, perhaps I ought not to say that the dairying industry is the one great, leading industry of our State; and yet that comes very near being the truth, because our farmers to-day are devoting their energies largely to the dairy and to poultry.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], in his debate upon the butter industry, told us the other day that butter was made without any Federal inspection. I do not know but he is right about that; but he might have said that the butter industry of Vermont, of Maine, and, I think, of most of the other States, is inspected very, very closely; and to-day there is no industry that in my judgment is conducted with greater reference to purity and to health than the butter industry.

As I said in my remarks the other day, our farmers take their milk in the early morning and put it in closed containers, cans that are absolutely clean and that are thoroughly scalded every day in order that there may be nothing septic about them. It is then taken to the creameries; and I want to say to any Senator here that if he wishes to see the best possible evidence of cleanliness and of purity he may go to our Vermont creameries, and he will there find it.

Mr. President, it seems to me that a gross wrong is done to my State when a Senator will stand up and say that the butter product of the country is 61 per cent impure. I do not know where the figures come from. I remember that they were taken several years ago; but any one who is conversant with the butter industry knows that such a statement is an absolute insult to the intelligence of the people. The people of the dairying States know that it can not be true, I care not where the statement comes from.

I want to read, if I may be permitted, the statement made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] in which he speaks of the unwholesomeness of our butter product. I thought I had it before me so that I could turn to it in a moment, but I do not seem to find it. I know he made charges against this great industry that ought not to have been made in the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to follow a little further the conditions in my own State. In 1890 we began to improve upon the methods of butter making. We began to improve the breeds of our cattle. The old native cow, with very few exceptions, is no longer found in Vermont. We have some known as "grades," but the great majority of our farmers to-day have the Jersey, the Guernsey, the Ayrshire, and a few of the Holsteins. I want to say that Vermont expends annually each year thousands upon thousands of dollars to eradicate tuberculosis. To-day, as was well said by my colleague yesterday, we regard any farmer who will permit tubercular cattle in his herd as almost a public enemy. We have great pride in our dairying industry; and any one who wishes to ascertain this truth has only to go to Vermont to see that every effort that can possibly be made is made to give Vermont a pure dairy product.

The same is true in regard to our sugar. A few years ago it was the custom rather than otherwise for a farmer to mix granulated sugar with his maple product. But the State has taken it upon itself to remedy this matter, and to-day there is a heavy fine imposed upon any man who adulterates his maple sugar. The fact is, Mr. President, we have learned that to be successful in any business we must do that business well, and we are doing it well in sugar, in poultry, and in butter. Turn to your menus, and you will find that they are very apt to feature the Vermont turkey. We produce the best of their kind in all these lines.

Now, what has been the result? Every good farmer understands—and I see there are some farmers here—that if you do not take back to the soil the ingredients taken from it you will deplete that soil.

The State of Massachusetts to-day is suffering because its milk is sold to go to the cities—to Boston, to Worcester, to Providence, and to other large cities. That milk goes out of the State and nothing comes back from it, and the result is a deterioration of the soil. I fear that within a short time Vermont is likely to suffer in the same way, because we are now sending some—and I fear increasing quantities—of our milk to New York and other cities. But where the milk is taken to the creamery, the cream extracted, and the milk sent back to the farm and fed to the hogs the result is that we improve from year to year the quality of our soils. If those of you who have not been through the State of Vermont during the past 30 years would ride through our State to-day, you would hardly know it, so materially has it been improved.

We might go further and say the same as to our highways. Vermont to-day has perhaps the best highways, or among the very best, of the Union, and those highways, I want to say further, are paid for. Vermont has no bonded debt. We do not build roads and bond our State to pay for them. Every year the State pays its bills as it goes along, and the only debt we owe, I believe, is a few thousand dollars taken by the State from the school fund, and upon which the State returns 6 per cent interest each year.

This dairy interest has built up Vermont, and I have no doubt it has built up other dairying States as it has Vermont, and we feel, and I think we feel rightfully, that any public legislation that makes a direct attack upon this the greatest industry of our State is but little less than criminal. Vermont will take its medicine. Make all the oleomargarine you please, make it as good as you please, sell it where and when you please, but sell it for what it is.

I read in the Senate the other day the ingredients of oleomargarine. I want to read them again because I want you to see the kind of competition that we are up against. I do not know that this book entitled "Food Inspection and Analysis" is a standard work, but I sent to the Congressional Library and got it, believing it to be such, and in the book I find this language:

The composition of oleomargarine varies between the following limits:

Oleo oil, 20 to 25 per cent.
Neutral lard, 40 to 45 per cent.

Mr. President, consider for a moment what it means to pass the legislation provided for in the Underwood amendment. It means that you take from the hog from 40 to 45 per cent of the entire ingredients which go into oleomargarine. You take of tallow, which is by a process made into oleo oil, 20 to 25 per cent. How do you suppose the dairying industry can be successfully carried on if it must compete with an article made of these cheap ingredients and sold fraudulently as butter? Let me state for the edification of the Senate that the other ingredients are butter, 10 to 25 per cent, and milk, 5 to 30 per cent. What is butter mixed with these other ingredients for? For any honest purpose? Everyone understands that it is solely that that margarine when it is produced may look and taste like and have the flavor of butter. It is churned in milk. Why? Because by churning it in milk they get from the milk a little of the yellow color which gives to the oleomargarine a little nearer approach to butter.

There is no need of debating this question of fraud. The whole purpose of this measure is to permit a fraudulent article to be sold in competition with a legitimate industry. That is all there is to it. We talk about it as being put up in marked packages so that the purchaser may understand what he is buying. That amounts to absolutely nothing. The facts are that when the butter is placed before the guests of the hotel, the boarding house, and the restaurant it bears no marks indicating that it is not butter.

The State of New York by law provides that in all its hotels, its boarding houses, and its restaurants where oleomargarine is

offered to the consumer as butter a placard stating that fact shall be plainly posted in the dining hall where it is so offered.

The suggestion that by being placed in packages, the package being marked "Oleomargarine," fraud is thereby prevented, is all wrong. If it would serve that purpose I would not object. I do not mean to confess that oleomargarine, made as it is, largely of lard and tallow, is the equivalent of butter, but if anybody wants to use oleo, I certainly do not object. I do object to having it sold as butter and in that way reducing the price of butter by this unfair, dishonorable, and unjust competition.

I think it was the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] who said that no one was opposing this measure except the Butter Trust, and that the opposition was coming from the Butter Trust. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] recently placed in the RECORD several telegrams he had received from different States of the Union. I remember there was one from my own State. There was not a single instance in which the butter makers of those States did not protest against the unfair competition which would result from this fraud. I remember that, in the case of my own State, the Holstein-Fresian Association of America, representing 100,000 owners and breeders of dairy cattle, entered its vigorous protest, asserting that it would work irreparable injury to the dairy interest. I fear there are good grounds for the fears expressed by this great association.

I understand that my good friend from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] says that if he thought this measure would injure the dairy interests he would not press it. On whose judgment, I would ask the Senator in all candor, may we the more safely rely touching the effect of this legislation upon the welfare of the great dairy interest of the country? Should we rely on the views of those who are vitally interested in dairying or those whose interests are largely—perhaps exclusively—bound up in the beef industry?

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator intend to indict me as being interested in the manufacture of oleomargarine?

Mr. PAGE. No; farthest from that. I only say you were kind enough to say if you thought this proposed legislation would injure the butter industry you would not support it. That is the language of your speech, as I read it.

Mr. WARREN. Exactly. I may be quite satisfied with my own judgment about this matter, as is the Senator with his judgment. I suppose I have been more continuously and longer engaged in butter making in some extent than almost any of the great butter makers of Vermont, both as to the number of years and the quantity, though they live to be somewhat older up there than I am; and I have seen something of the operation.

I know, as the Senator does, how unpopular it is to tackle a prejudice, especially among the rural people, of whom I have been one a great part of my life. I believe exactly as I said, that under the present law where a quarter of 1 cent per pound is taken upon white oleomargarine and where there is a fine or tax of 10 cents upon colored, it allows those wretched manipulators, who are neither farmers nor straight business men, to operate in taking the same kind of coloring that they put in butter and undertaking to imitate and sell it as butter.

I believe it would be better to mark on oleomargarine just what it is, and tax it accordingly and sell it for what it is, putting it in small packages duly marked so that it would be impossible to have it go to retailers and consumers except under its own name and brand.

Mr. PAGE. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. PENROSE. If the Senator from Vermont will permit me, I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming whether he calls a 10-pound package a small package?

Mr. WARREN. Those matters could be very easily reached by an amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, myself, or others, and it may be done.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask the Senator if, in all fairness, we ought not to let the butter men, the men who are vitally interested in this matter, the men who get up at 4 o'clock in the morning to milk cows, say what ought to be done rather than those whose interests are opposed to them?

Mr. WARREN. I go the Senator one better, for I spent three years in getting up at 3 o'clock in the morning and milking as many cows, I presume, as he ever did; and I have been confined to the house making butter and cheese for months at a time in the State of Massachusetts, which, I am proud to say, lies very near the rugged State of Vermont. As to dairymen, Vermont is not the only dairy State in the Union. We had the very able remarks of an honored Senator here [Mr. WADSWORTH] from the great Empire State of New York, the richest State in the Union and the greatest dairy State. He takes the ground

that it is a benefit, and would be in the long run, rather than a damage to those interests, to adopt the amendment now before us. He is a Senator, as the Senator from Vermont knows, who has had a good deal of experience in the cow business.

Mr. PAGE. I want to say to the Senator that in the State of New York there is a special law, as I have remarked, that no hotel keeper, no boarding-house keeper, can use oleomargarine—at least, it can not be placed upon the table—unless there is a placard plainly marked saying that the boarding house or hotel uses oleomargarine for butter. If we could bring in some way to the attention of the men who eat the butter at the hotel and eat it at the boarding house and eat it on the railroad cars the fact that they are eating oleomargarine, we would destroy all the energy that is being put into this measure in the aid of oleomargarine.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator as to the language used. Does the placard state "Oleomargarine used in place of butter"?

Mr. PAGE. I only heard the Senator from New York in a single sentence speak of that, and I got the idea rather than the language. I am sorry I can not tell the Senator.

Mr. CLAPP. Will the Senator pardon me?

Mr. PAGE. With pleasure.

Mr. CLAPP. The only place I ever saw the notice, and I think that was out West, it did not say "in place of butter." That would have been a warning; but it said "Oleomargarine used here." You were offered your choice of butter or oleomargarine. Of course you ordered butter and you were left to guess what you got. It was so with the dealer down here on the street the Senator's colleague spoke of yesterday. The place pretended to have butter and oleomargarine, and, of course, the customer always got, from the dealer's standpoint, butter; the oleomargarine sign simply served to pacify the law, and the fraud went on. The trouble is we are trying here to reverse and avoid the truthfulness of the old saying that it is useless to lock the stable after the horse is stolen; and we let this article go out in imitation of butter and neglect what should be done, which is to prohibit the making of the article in imitation of butter.

Mr. PAGE. I agree with the Senator fully. Let me illustrate. For years you have been taking the wheat at the flour mills at Minneapolis and working out everything so as to make that flour white. Is not that correct?

Mr. CLAPP. Yes, sir.

Mr. PAGE. We try to make flour white, and we try to make bread white. In Vermont, at considerable expense and trouble, we try to make our maple sugar white. White is the color that most people prefer in much of their food. But in margarine, instead of allowing its natural color, white, to dominate, the margarine manufacturers are seeking all manner of subterfuges to give it the yellow color. Is this for any honest purpose? Certainly not. It is simply to defraud the people by selling oleomargarine for butter.

Mr. President, I am interested, and I have been interested very much in times past, in hearing what the Senator from Wyoming has said in regard to his early life on the farm. I want to say to the Senator that the man who runs a dairy earns his money.

To be a good dairy farmer requires a great deal of energy, a great deal of hard work; and it is an industry that is entitled to be sustained, encouraged, and supported by Congress rather than to be made to suffer by legislation which can not be otherwise than detrimental.

I think I should refer for a moment to what the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] said in regard to the facts in this case, as he thought them to be; and that was that but for the Butter Trust there would be no energy manifested here in opposition to this bill. Mr. President, if it were not for the Swifts and the Armour's and the Cudahy's, who are making money by the hundreds of millions every year, we should not find very much energy, in my judgment, put into the effort to secure the passage of this measure.

I remember that only a very few years ago the Swifts had a capitalization of but \$25,000,000. The capital stock was worth from 100 to 102. A little later, however, that capitalization was increased to \$50,000,000, while to-day it is, I believe, \$75,000,000, and the price of the stock has gone up and up, until, I think, to-day it is quoted around 150.

I have not observed the quotations of late, but it must be somewhere in that vicinity. They are piling up millions of dollars absolutely beyond the dreams of avarice, and now they come here and ask to have this measure passed, that they may further add to their untold millions.

Mr. CLAPP. Would the Senator describe the moral attitude of an honest man who is pushing a manifestly dishonest meas-

ure? It just occurred to me that it is a sort of an anomalous situation that is presented here.

Mr. PAGE. I certainly do not want to accuse my brother Senators of being actuated by any but the most honorable motives. I simply say what we all know—it does not require argument to prove it—that it is the Armour's and the Cudahy's and the Swifts who make oleomargarine and who are making money by the millions by doing so. They are selling oleomargarine to-day for around 20 or 22 cents a pound. If this legislation prevails, they will, in my judgment, sell it for 25 cents a pound, and I do not know but for more. Still, this bill is being urged because it is claimed that it is going to be in the interest of the poor man.

Mr. President, I predict that within a year from the time this amendment is adopted—if it is adopted; I do not believe it will be—you will see the poor man paying from 2 to 5 and, perhaps, 10 cents higher for his oleomargarine than he is paying to-day.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, when I interrupted the Senator from Vermont, it was not with reference to Senators. The Senator from Vermont, as I understood him, was talking about the Swifts and the Armour's who were manufacturing this product; and I had reference to men who put out a product which they must know in the very manufacture of it was intended to be an imitation.

Mr. PAGE. I understood what the Senator from Minnesota meant. I desire to say in regard to this whole matter that its influence is going to be very much wider than appears upon the surface here. We are to-day producing thousands upon thousands of calves in the dairy sections, and in that way are giving the country its beef; whereas if you destroy the dairy interests you at the same time very materially injure the beef industry. There is no question about this. It is not a matter that is narrowed down to the profit and loss of Armour and Swift on the one side or the dairying interests on the other; it is something that affects the whole country, and it affects it seriously and materially.

I observed in the pamphlet placed upon the desk of Senators—the pamphlet issued by the cottonseed-oil industry of the South, and by the beef industry—that some one is charged with materially overestimating the number of men engaged in dairying. The number given in the estimate of some one friendly to the dairy industry was, I think, some four and one-half millions. I do not remember the exact figures, perhaps some Senator can tell me. I think Senator UNDERWOOD placed the number at about one and one-half millions. Anyone conversant with the dairy industry of this country understands that it is impossible that it should be conducted by as few as one and one-half or even two million people. The men who own the farms may not number more than one and one-half million, but the men who work on the farms and who are connected with the industry swell that number three or fourfold. I do not know but we might properly count the mothers and daughters who in many cases contribute to the work of this industry, but the number who do this is small, as compared with 25 years ago. I can remember when nearly all the milk was converted into either butter or cheese in the homes; but to-day the instances are rare where either butter or cheese is made except in the creameries and cheese factories.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Vermont that if the estimated number of farmers is too large and the number is really smaller than the estimate, does it not furnish an additional reason why we ought to encourage rather than discourage the farming interests and industry?

Mr. PAGE. That would certainly seem to be fair; but the advocates of this measure are trying to minimize the importance of the industry, while the Senator from Alabama has literally filled several pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the names of labor organizations that favor his measure.

Mr. CLAPP. No; but the question of numbers favoring or opposing a measure might have some effect upon the psychology of the situation. What I was getting at, however, was that the foundation of a nation's wealth and stability depends largely upon the agricultural development of the country; and aside from any question of numbers with reference to favoring or being opposed to this measure, if we have got our number of farmers estimated too largely, it is a deplorable fact; and, instead of being a reason for discouraging farming, it ought to be a reason for encouraging it.

Mr. PAGE. I agree with the Senator; but it seems to me that in this debate we are getting away from the fundamental principles which ought to govern us, namely, that a legitimate industry is sought to be ruined by legalizing a fraud. If that is true, who can stand up and defend this amendment? If it is not true, I want to be shown wherein.

I have yet to find any candid man who will say that he believes that, if this bill passes, we shall not see, all through the country, in every boarding house, in every hotel, in every restaurant, on every railroad train, oleomargarine placed upon the table as butter.

If any industry can not live in this country except by the practice of fraud, I think it ought to die. I do not believe we should permit the great beef monopolies of Chicago to take lard, tallow, and cottonseed oil and doctor them with a mixture of butter and palm them off upon the consuming public for what they are not. That, it seems to me, is really the crucial test which should be applied in every man's mind when he comes to decide upon this bill. Is it an honest measure? Is it designed to treat fairly a legitimate industry? If it does not, if the oleomargarine industry seeks to gain its prestige and its advantage by dishonesty, by selling its product to be used for what it is not, then, Mr. President, it seems to me, by all means, that we ought to defeat any legislation tending to encourage such a scheme.

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it is not my purpose at this time to discuss the oleomargarine amendment, but I desire to submit a few remarks on the bill itself. Later on I may say a few words on that amendment and also on one other amendment.

The revenue bill now before the Senate, being House bill 20573, proposes to tax corporations at the rate of 8 per cent of the amount of net income left after deducting \$5,000, plus 8 per cent of the actual capital invested. The net income for the purpose of this tax is to be the net income shown by the income-tax returns. I call particular attention to the words "the net income shown by the income-tax returns," for this definition of net income is one of the great iniquities of the bill, and I shall refer to it again later.

First, let us see how many corporations will be subject to this tax: (1) The law expressly exempts those corporations which are now expressly exempt from the income tax. As these exempt corporations are ones which are created for the public good or cooperative purposes and not for profit to the stockholders they may be dismissed without further consideration. (2) Income derived from the business of life, health, and accident insurance combined in one policy issued on the weekly premium plan is exempted in the House bill, but included in the bill reported to the Senate. (3) Every corporation having a net income of only \$5,000 or less will escape the tax. In 1912, the last year of the corporation tax, 305,336 corporations filed returns, and of this number 61,116 had an income of more than \$5,000. If the same proportion is maintained for the last fiscal year of the Government—July 1, 1915, to June 30, 1916—of the 350,000 corporations, approximately, that filed returns approximately 70,000 will be shown to have \$5,000 or more of net income. From this number we must deduct those corporations which do not earn more than 8 per cent on their capital, many railroads, public utilities, and other corporations, perhaps 20,000 in all. The tax will therefore fall on about 50,000 corporations, a small minority of those doing business, creating only a small part of the annual income of the country. Many of these taxable corporations will have small amounts of income exceeding the 8 per cent allowed as deduction. As the margin over 8 per cent increases, the number of corporations will decrease, so that it is probable that of the \$170,000,000 expected to be raised by this tax 30,000 corporations will pay one half and the remaining 20,000 corporations the other half.

Partnerships and corporations, which are also made subject to this tax, are exempt on income derived from personal service. No end of difficulty will be experienced in defining for practical purposes the loose expression "personal service." I think this was thoroughly demonstrated in the discussion here last night, when Senators on the other side and Senators on this side were really unable to agree as to whom this tax would apply, and it is not now settled in the mind of any Senator, in my judgment, just whom this tax will reach.

The method of fixing the amount of capital by which the 8 per cent deduction is to be measured is open to grave criticism. Actual capital invested is defined by the law to be (1) the actual cash paid in, (2) the actual cash value of assets other than cash at the time such assets were transferred, and (3) paid-in or earned surplus and undivided profits used or employed in the business, but not to include borrowed money or property.

The actual cash paid in may perhaps be ascertained without difficulty, but how is the actual value of assets for which stock has been issued to be determined? Patent rights, mines, plants, and going businesses are often taken over at a valuation which, in the judgment of the directors, justifies the issue of stock. Good will, that most intangible of assets, often forms the basis

for the issue of stock, as do also prospective earnings under efficient management. A more difficult thing to determine than the actual cash value of these assets could hardly have been required. It will cause endless controversy between the taxpayer and the tax collector.

"Paid-in or earned surplus and undivided profits used or employed in the business" presents another problem. What is a corporation to do whose assets have increased in value for 20 years, but which increase has not been taken up on the books? Even if it has been taken up and credited to surplus account, is it to be considered as "capital invested," in view of the phrase "paid-in or earned" surplus, used in the law? Apparently surplus is not to be taken into account if it arises from an increase in value of assets. It seems also that the law will not permit consideration of surplus or undivided profits, unless used in the business, to be considered in determining the 8 per cent deduction, for it employs the term "used or employed in the business." Hence the income from surplus and undivided profits invested in securities must be included in the amount of "excess profits" to be taxed, but the 8 per cent deduction must be based on capital exclusive of such surplus.

A tax fraught with more difficulties of administration and more puzzling problems to the taxpayer is hard to conceive. The burden of the tax is excessive, its incidence falls on too small a proportion of the taxpayers, and, as if to add insult to injury, its method of computation is so difficult that the taxpayer will be compelled to incur much added expense in time and expert assistance in order to determine how much or how little he must pay.

The present income-tax law is far from perfect after a period of development of over three years. Its administration is trusted to a department which is undermanned and overburdened and is unable to give the time and attention necessary to work out the details of administration. Rulings under the amended law of September 8, 1916, for the guidance of taxpayers have not yet appeared, although they should in due course have been published before the beginning of the present year. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue in his last annual report repeatedly calls attention to the fact that the department is undermanned. Because of a lack of sufficient force of clerks, the auditing of the returns is more than a year in arrears. (Report of Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916, p. 28.) Reference to the numerical insufficiency of the force is again made on the same page, on page 29, and page 30. It is pointed out on page 34 of this report that the population of the country as assigned to each income-tax field officer is 364,963. The commissioner says in his report:

It would be idle to assert that the revenues of the Government could be fully collected by a system based on these figures unless they could be accepted as the evidence of superhuman zeal and activity. (Id., p. 35.)

Reference is again made to the necessity of increasing the force, on page 37, where the commissioner says that—

Notwithstanding the provision that has been made for some increase in the internal-revenue force it is not sufficient to keep a large volume of work current.

In view of this insufficiency of the force to properly administer existing tax laws it seems unwise at least to add a new, complicated, and loosely drawn law to the burdens of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The mere enactment of laws is not sufficient to collect revenue. The Government now has under the income-tax law an administrative machine, perfected to some extent, for the collection of revenue.

A few simple examples will show how the tax will work out. Thus a corporation having a capital of, say, \$100,000, earns \$20,000 of net income, according to its income-tax return. Its actual net income may be considerably less, for it is well known that the Treasury Department does not allow very generous deductions for depreciation. The proposed law permits (1) a deduction of \$5,000, leaving \$15,000; (2) a deduction of 8 per cent of \$100,000, its capital, or \$8,000, leaving \$7,000 to be taxed. Eight per cent of \$7,000 is \$560, to be paid in addition to an income tax of \$400, and a capital-stock tax of perhaps another \$100, or approximately \$1,060, in addition to its State and local taxes. Its competitor doing the same business, but as an individual, with the same capital, would pay the Federal Government \$320 as an income tax if married and \$20 more if single. In brief, to do business as a corporation is to be penalized to the extent of \$740.

Assume another corporation has the following capital: Common stock, \$100,000; preferred stock drawing 8 per cent dividend, \$100,000; bonds drawing 5 per cent interest, \$800,000. Its income account is as follows: \$100,000 annual income, of which \$8,000 pays preferred dividends, \$40,000 pays interest on its bonds, leaving \$52,000 net for common stockholders. The tax

on such a corporation will be \$3,920. As the preferred stockholders are paid the fixed preferred dividend regardless of the tax on the net profits, so long as there are sufficient profits remaining, the whole burden of the tax will fall on the common stockholders and will amount to 7½ per cent on the entire amount available for distribution to them. In the final analysis the proposed tax will be a tax on common stockholders, and one who purchases the common stock of the company considerably above par will bear an entirely disproportionate share of the burden.

As this proposed tax will be borne entirely by investors in common stock, in the purchase price of which the earning power of the corporation has already been capitalized at the time the law goes into effect, it is an iniquitous and morally indefensible tax, even though it may legally be constitutional and within the power of Congress; but will the proposed law be constitutional in its present form? Undoubtedly not. Its operation will, in some cases, confiscate the entire income of stockholders, as will be shown below.

Let us now consider an actual case of how the tax will operate inequitably. The Supreme Court of the United States has held (*Anderson v. 42 Broadway Co.*) that where the indebtedness exceeds the capital stock it should no longer be treated as an incident, but that the carrying of the indebtedness should be considered as a principal object of the corporate activities—that the operations of such a corporation are conducted more for the benefit of the creditors than of the stockholders—and that the limited amount of interest which can be deducted before assessing the income tax is not an arbitrary discrimination against the corporation and its stockholders.

Suppose such a real estate corporation having a capital of \$1,000 purchases a property then subject to a mortgage of \$5,000,000, which it assumes. These are approximately the figures in the 42 Broadway case. Suppose its net profits to be \$275,000 before deducting the interest charge of 5 per cent on the mortgage, which would amount to \$250,000. The net income to its stockholders would actually be \$25,000. But for the purpose of the income tax the entire interest charge may not be deducted, only the interest paid on one-half of the indebtedness plus an amount equal to the capital stock is allowable; that is, \$2,500,000 plus \$1,000, or \$2,501,000. Thus the net income shown by the income-tax return is \$149,950, and this fictitious income is the sum on which the proposed tax is to be levied. Applying the formula then, the tax will be 8 per cent of \$149,950, \$5,000, \$80, or \$11,589.60—over 46 per cent of the actual income. Add to this the income tax of 2 per cent on \$149,950—\$2,299—and we have a total for the two taxes of \$14,888.60, 58 per cent of the net income actually payable to the stockholders.

To show how absurd this proposed law is, let us assume that the income in the foregoing example was \$260,000, which, after deducting the interest payment of \$250,000, would leave \$10,000 for the stockholders. The net income figured according to the income-tax law would be \$134,950. The excess profits tax would be \$10,389.60, the income tax is \$2,699, the total \$13,088.60. Since its income is only \$10,000 the tax exceeds the ability of the corporation to pay by over \$3,000. Thus the corporation is literally taxed out of existence.

It will be said that this is an extreme case and that by a fairer definition of net income in the law the wrong will be avoided. A law must be judged by its extreme effects, and even though the tax should be imposed on the actual net income and not on a fictitious income, the proposed law will be complicated and difficult to comply with, the tax will penalize progress and initiative and rest on too small a portion of the annual net income of the country.

Corporations are now required to pay an income tax of 2 per cent under a law that is objected to because of its complexity and technicality, while the principle of the tax is generally approved and a capital-stock tax of 50 cents on each \$1,000 of the fair value of the capital stock over \$99,000, under a law that is so loosely drawn that its administration involves endless difficulties and differences of opinion between the tax collectors and the taxpayers. We are threatened with a third Federal tax whose only virtue is that it will make the existing law seem simple in comparison.

Mr. President, when the bill is again taken up for consideration, and the amendment on page 3 is reached, I shall submit some remarks against the Senate amendment which places a tax upon insurance companies. That amendment proposes to strike out the following words:

Excepting income derived from the business of life, health, and accident insurance combined in one policy issued on the weekly premium payment plan.

So that if the amendment is agreed to the first paragraph of section 201 will read as follows:

That in addition to the taxes under existing laws there shall be levied, assessed, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the net income of every corporation and partnership organized, authorized, or existing under the laws of the United States, or of any State, Territory, or District thereof, no matter how created or organized, a tax of 8 per cent of the amount by which such net income exceeds the sum of (a) \$5,000 plus (b) 8 per cent of the actual capital invested.

I hope that this Senate amendment may be disagreed to. As I say, I desire later to submit a few remarks on that subject; but as it is getting late, I shall not detain the Senate longer this evening. I also wish to say something a little later, perhaps, upon the Underwood amendment, but may not do so, as it has been so fully and ably discussed already. I am opposed to that amendment, and think it is a great injustice to the farmers of this country; and I fear its object is to enable the producers of oleo to impose upon the people of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEA of Tennessee in the chair). The question is upon the amendment of the committee, as amended.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, has the question been reached on what is known as the Underwood amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not yet.

Mr. KENYON. I desire to say just a word on that. Perhaps I may as well say it at this time.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, may I inquire what amendment is before the Senate now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the committee on page 11, section 401.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I will say what I have to say about this amendment at this time and shall be very brief. I do not want to delay the bill in any way.

In the arguments that have been submitted concerning the bill itself I have heard nothing said as to the causes making necessary the passage of this bill except the question of preparedness. The bill seems to be very deftly drawn in order to create the impression in the country that whatever deficit there may be in conducting the affairs of the Government is caused by preparedness expense. We never stop to consider that if the Government is running behind in its receipts, or if extraordinary expenses are incurred, we ought to commence at the other end and cut off some of the expenditures. I do not think the American people are going to believe that the taxation that is heaped upon them is imposed entirely for purposes of preparedness.

We are going to keep on having deficits in the Government not only because of preparedness but because of the utterly inefficient way in which the Government's business is carried on.

This year the Democratic platform declared for a budget system. I have prepared an amendment, which I have had printed and submitted to the Committee on Appropriations, along the line of the Democratic platform as nearly as I could construe it, for the purpose of starting, at least, a movement in the direction of a general budget system for our country. We are about the only civilized Nation in the world that does not have a budget system; and these extraordinary expenditures and this overlapping of the work of committees will never stop until we have some kind of a scientific budget system.

This extravagance, Mr. President, is growing upon us. Here is \$535,000,000 for the Navy in the naval bill—\$5.35 for every man, woman, and child in this country—a bill that really can not under present conditions be opposed. I should think it might be cut down somewhat; but everyone in this country is for a reasonable Navy. Where this is to end no one can predict. Now, this extravagance has developed a system of omnibus appropriations. I have been amazed at this session of Congress to see that this idea has so developed that now we have an omnibus fish-hatchery bill carrying practically \$1,000,000 that has passed the House and is on the Senate calendar. We have an omnibus public-building bill, which has passed the House, providing public buildings in towns of less than 600 population and providing sites for public buildings in towns that had no population when the census of 1910 was taken. That bill, I think, is sleeping "the sleep that knows no waking" in the committee; there are also other omnibus bills. A system is growing up of omnibus appropriations that is going to keep on and on calling upon the people for greater taxation, so we have to increase the revenue continually.

I do not like to oppose a revenue bill at this time, when the country needs the revenue; and I can not get very enthusiastic in opposing a tax upon the earnings of corporations in excess of 8 per cent. The bill as it now stands is, however, full of indefensible propositions. I can not vote for it in its present form.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PHELAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator, but I do not want the Senator to delay me. I want to get through.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I think I have a good deal of sympathy with the motives which actuate the honorable Senator and the purpose which he seeks to promote in the matter of taxation. It is really refreshing at this time to find a Member of Congress who will undertake to weather the storm of war hysteria which is sweeping over the country like a simoon, and dare to stand out in the open and defend the political and business rights of the plain people. Never before in the history of this Nation was greater demand for some one with the power to defend their rights and protect their interests. The question of expenses and the source whence the revenue comes are passed over by some as matters of inconsequential concern. The military spirit is in the ascendancy, and the question of preparing for war is of paramount importance. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa if he will not in the course of his remarks—that is, if he has the data at hand—state to the Senate the difference between the amounts appropriated for the current expenses of the Government—for public buildings, rivers and harbors, and other appropriations of that character—made by this Congress and the sessions of Congress preceding this administration. It is my impression that the appropriations for those purposes have not been greater for the last four years than they were prior to that time.

The enormous appropriations that we are to make at this session are largely for so-called "preparedness," and making ready for a war that will never be fought if we are true to ourselves as a Nation and a people and just to the nations of the world. I have no sympathy whatever with the proposition to increase our Army and to enlarge our Navy to the enormous proportions which the bills before Congress contemplate. It is an unwarranted prodigality of cash; in my judgment, a shameless disregard of our obligations to our constituents. It imposes a burden which will bear heavily upon the producers of this country; it is an injustice to the world and a pandering to the brutish instincts of man. To carry out this unfortunate policy we must tax several times everything that man uses between the cradle and the grave. There has never been advanced or suggested in this Chamber an argument based upon fact to justify such a policy.

Mr. KENYON. A large part of that, of course, is true. The appropriations, the Senator well knows, have been increased for all these other matters. Some years they have gone very high. In other years certain appropriation bills have been defeated. But there is a general increase in the omnibus appropriation bills and in the system of omnibus appropriations. We have a good-roads bill that will, I fear, grow into a mighty pork barrel before we get through.

I do not like the feature of the bill which gives the power to issue \$500,000,000 in certificates by the Treasury Department. That has been raised \$200,000,000 over the House. I trust this may not be agreed to. I hope the provision as to the tax on oleo or margarine may be wiped from the bill, and I rose just to offer an explanation of my vote on that question.

We have heard a good deal about the tax being a tax on the poor man's butter. Yet, if that argument holds good now the poor man's butter, if oleo is the poor man's butter, pays a tax of only one-fourth of a cent per pound, while under this bill it will pay a tax of 2 cents per pound if not colored.

It seems to me that if people want to eat oleo that is their right; it is their privilege. If people want to eat butter and can afford to do so, it is their privilege. But the tax on colored oleo of 10 cents per pound is virtually a tax on fraud to wipe out fraud. Feeling that way about it, I feel it is my duty to oppose the Underwood amendment and support the law as it now stands. It is not a tax upon the poor man's butter as it now stands. If the oleo is uncolored, it will be as severe as if the Underwood amendment is adopted.

I do not believe, Mr. President, as a general proposition we make any mistake in standing by the American cow. The cow is a very necessary friend of everybody in the Nation. We have been regaled to-day by various stories and interchanges between the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] as to their early experiences. The Senator from Vermont in his appeal for the American cow talks of rising at 4 in the morning and milking the cows, and the Senator from Wyoming goes him one hour better, and his hour to rise was 3 o'clock in the morning. Of course every man in public life has more or less from the stump talked that way, but I have never yet known of a politician getting up at 3 o'clock in the morning. I never claimed to get up any

earlier than 5 o'clock, but possibly after I have run for office as long as the Senator from Wyoming I may get around to 3 o'clock.

Mr. PENROSE. May I interrogate the Senator? I only wish to make an inquiry.

Mr. KENYON. I do not want to delay the bill.

Mr. PENROSE. Will not that pastoral condition which the Senator can look back to with such pleasure be largely eliminated by the machinery which milks the cows? I understand that they can be milked by electrical machinery now.

Mr. KENYON. Yes; and the Senator is probably glad that he is not operating any of those machines.

Mr. PENROSE. No; I have not tried to operate it.

Mr. KENYON. I will say to my farmer friend from Pennsylvania that the electric milker has not been a success. So the Senator from Wyoming may still have to rise in the early morning hour.

Mr. President, I do not desire to make any extended remarks. I shall vote against the Underwood proposition for the reasons which I have stated. It will help a fraud; it will help no one in this country but the packers; it will be a distinct blow against the American farmer in the hard conditions which so often confront him. Honest treatment is all we ask for the great dairy interests of this country. Let us put no premium on fraud and deception. Let us give the American cow a square deal.

I should like to have permission to insert as a part of my remarks the evidence given by ex-Governor Hoard, of Wisconsin, before the House committee some years ago when this question was there. I have marked the part which I ask that the reporter may insert.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The consumers and producers of butter have asked Congress to enact into law House bill 3717, which provides in the first section that all counterfeit substance for butter, when taken into any State or Territory, shall be subject to the laws of the State or Territory concerning such counterfeit.

With a tax of 10 cents a pound on the counterfeit, we believe these temptations for these profits and the deceptive sale and dishonorable and dangerous conspiring against the law and fraudulent competition against an honest industry will be greatly modified.

A great many people ask why it is not as permissible to color oleomargarine as it is to color butter. I would answer, because they are not colored for the same purpose. Butter in winter is too light to suit the taste of most consumers. The highest value is in fresh butter not more than 10 days old. The consumer asks that it bear the yellow summer color of butter. That is a matter of taste, not deception, for it is not colored to resemble something it is not. But oleomargarine is colored to make it resemble butter, which it is not. It is colored not for the benefit or taste of its consumer but to deceive the consumer.

Said President Cleveland, in his message approving oleomargarine legislation of 1886:

"Not the least important incident related to this legislation is the defense afforded to the consumer against the fraudulent substitution and sale of an imitation for a genuine article of food of a very general household use. . . . I venture to say that hardly a pound ever entered a poor man's house under its real name and in its true character."

The argument still holds good.

There is no credible evidence to show that oleomargarine is innocuous; no evidence to show that when eaten continuously in place of butter it is not harmful. But there are reports in great abundance to the effect that oleomargarine is harmful.

Mr. Edmund Hill, a member of the Somerset County Council, England, reports that the great bulk of oleomargarine, or "margarine," as it is called there, is eaten in public institutions, convents, schools, etc. At the Wells Asylum, with which he is connected, the inmates receive oleomargarine. In the asylums of Dorset, Wells, and Hants—the adjoining counties—butter is furnished, and the death rate at Wells is 30 per cent higher. At the Taunton Hospital there were 11 deaths in 13 months. Oleomargarine was substituted, and in 9 months the deaths rose to 22.

This accords with the experience in France, where its use in hospitals is forbidden. In the United States, in institutions for the blind and for girls, it has been noticed that the use of oleomargarine lowered the vitality of the inmates very perceptibly.

There is abundant reason for this. The normal heat of the human stomach is 98°. Butter melts at 92°, 6° below the heat of the stomach (passes into pancreatic emulsion and digestion). Nature designed this fat in its raw state for food.

Oleomargarine melts at the varying temperature of 102° to 108°, a temperature no healthful stomach ever attains. As a consequence, this unnatural foreign fat must be expelled by sheer gastric action and force.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I shall take only a very few minutes of the time of the Senate, more to explain my vote than anything else, but I can not let this opportunity pass to discuss such an important question as I regard this to be.

I am very sorry that the great dairy industry has been attacked. If the dairy industry is a dishonest one it ought to be discontinued. If the products from the cow, butter and cheese and other things which are manufactured from milk, form an unhealthy article of food we should discontinue producing it or manufacturing it.

I have no quarrel with men who are engaged in the business of manufacturing oleomargarine. It is a legitimate business if sold for what it is. That question has been so thoroughly discussed on this floor that it is hardly necessary for me to go into it. However, there is this about it. I do not know of a single instance where the dairy farmer or the creamery has made any attempt to sell its product to take the place of the product manufactured by the oleomargarine manufacturers. There is a difference of opinion as to how many farmers there are engaged in dairying, but there are in the United States between 20,000,000 and 25,000,000 milch cows. That is a great industry. It seems to me the question is, if these people are engaged in an honest industry, if they are producing an article of food that is healthful, it is wrong for anyone to try and impose upon this industry and to substitute an article which is adulterated to take its place, because that is a fraud.

I said, Mr. President, that I find no fault with the manufacturers of oleomargarine if they confine themselves in a legitimate way to disposing of their products. But we all know from the ingredients with which oleomargarine is manufactured that it is not butter. We all know that there is not a single pound of oleomargarine sold as butter that does not contain some butter or has not at least gone through the process of churning either in milk or in cream to make it appear like butter. It is this gigantic fraud that I am opposed to. It is this adulteration which has been committed by the American manufacturers ever since they commenced their business in this country.

Those of us who were engaged in the dairy business in the years of 1880 to 1890 well know that these same manufacturers were not even willing to sell their lard for what it was. Lard at that time was worth more than cottonseed oil. We lost our trade with England, we lost our trade with the European countries, simply because the manufacturers adulterated their lard and mixed it with cottonseed oil.

I certainly have no quarrel with the people who produce or manufacture cottonseed oil. That is a legitimate industry. But you have no right to take cottonseed oil and manufacture it into something else and call it something else, whether it is butter or lard or any other article of food.

The dairy industry is, as I believe, an honest industry. It is being carried on by millions of people who live in our country and it is the only business they have. It is not so with the manufacturers of oleomargarine. The manufacturers of oleomargarine control the entire product of beef. They control the prices not only of cattle but of swine and of sheep. It is not so with the millions of dairy farmers who in a legitimate way are producing an article of food that no man and no chemist has dared to say is unwholesome as an article of food.

When you talk about the uncleanness of these creameries, it is hardly necessary to make a reply to that statement. If you are afraid that this article of food is unwholesome and unhealthy, we ask you to make an appropriation and investigate these creameries, for we are appropriating every year \$3,000,000 for the inspection of meat. The Beef Trust does not pay for its own inspection; it is paid for by the Government of the United States, by the people of the United States.

Now, if you are afraid that butter and cheese and other articles produced on the farm are unwholesome, provide for Federal inspection, and I know that the farmers of the United States will welcome it. I know that they will be only too glad to have a Federal inspector inspect every pound of the product of the farm.

But it is not true, Mr. President, that these creameries are so insanitary as has been charged. I say it is not true in my section of the country, because we have inspection laws in our State. We have in the State of North Dakota, and I know they have in the State of Minnesota, and I presume they have in the other neighboring States, most rigid and drastic State inspection laws. So it is hardly fair to make such an onslaught upon this honest industry carried on by honest men and women who are making their livelihood from this industry.

Mr. President, I can hardly conceive that any man who has the interest of this class of people at heart would be willing to make such an indictment against this great industry. We are not claiming that the articles of the beef industry or the Beef Trust are unwholesome. We are not claiming here or anywhere that the great Beef Trust which controls the price of every animal product in our country, and not only that but branches out and controls the grain industry of the country as well—the men who have made their millions by purchasing their products from these millions of farmers are not satisfied to let the farmers continue when these great concerns find that they can make a substitute by which they can impose upon the American people fraudulently. I weigh my words when I say fraudulently, be-

cause I have before me here records to show that from 1880 to 1890 the lard manufactured by these great concerns was adulterated at least to the extent of 33½ per cent. They saw an opportunity to increase their profits by substituting cottonseed oil for lard. They have been knocking at the doors of Congress for 30 years, asking to be permitted to substitute oleomargarine for butter—not oleo alone but different articles mixed, vegetable oils, anything that could be purchased that was cheap. They have been asking to be permitted to make an imitation and to sell it for butter. And who, I ask, is paying for this adulterated article?

Mr. President, whenever the farmers ask for something they ask it for themselves, and they are honest enough to say that it is going to benefit them. But when these gigantic trusts and the men who have been found guilty under the law of imposing frauds upon the American people want the Congress of the United States to pass laws beneficial to them they come here masked. They are not asking it for themselves but for the poor laboring man and in behalf of the farmer. Oh, they are very generous! They always forget themselves. They always look out for the dear people; not for their own benefit, no, but for the benefit of the poor laboring man.

Mr. President, how are you going to benefit the laboring man by imposing a tax upon an article which you say is good for food? How are you going to benefit the laboring man by making it possible to have an inferior article sold for a superior article? Is it not reasonable to believe that the price of the inferior article will be brought up or that the article will be sold perhaps at as high a price as the better article?

Mr. President, it is a sham and a fraud upon the American people, and I am sorry that the great Democratic Party has seen fit to incorporate in a bill, which is said to be an emergency measure, a tax upon what you say is a necessary article of food. There is not a chemist in the United States who has said that butter is unwholesome; there is not a chemist in the world who has said that butter is subject to tubercular bacilli. I have here before me House hearings in 1910, and if I wanted to I could take up considerable time of the Senate; I have here hundreds of pages of testimony, and nowhere will you find that any of the men who ought to be looking after the welfare of the farmers rather than the welfare of the manufacturers have dared to say that butter is unwholesome, or that butter is more subject to tubercular bacilli than is any other article of food.

Oh, Mr. President, I hope that the farmers of this country will not be compelled to come to Congress and ask that the name of this great department shall be changed. We call it the Department of Agriculture; and yet when we read the statements of these experts, these men who are supposed to advise the farmers, we very often—at least, I do—infer that they are more friendly to those interests which are not beneficial to the farmer than they are to the farmer.

I repeat, I hope the day will never come when we shall make the change, although I have received hundreds of letters from farmers in different parts of the country saying that the name of the Agricultural Department should be changed, that instead of being called the "Department of Agriculture" it ought to be called the "Department of the Packers and Millers." Personally I think these charges are unwarranted.

There are 7,000,000 farmers in the United States, and the 35,000,000 people who are now on those farms making an honest living and doing the best they can, can not quit the farm because it is their home; it is not as it is in many money-making industries where, if the industry fails, you can shut down; but that can not be done on the farm. You have no right to impose upon a class of people of this kind a law such as is proposed in this bill, for it is a sham and a fraud not only upon the farmer but upon the consumer. If anyone wants to eat oleomargarine, let him buy it and let him eat it to his heart's content; but do not mislead him and say it is butter when you know it is not. When you take the numerous reports, you will find that on an average they use in the manufacture of oleomargarine about 4 per cent of butter and about 10 per cent of milk or cream, which amounts to the same as about 4 per cent of butter, for a gallon of cream will make about 4 pounds of butter. Does that not indicate that they are committing a fraud, that they are trying to make this article of food, which they say is so wholesome, look like something which it is not?

Mr. President, I am going to take up a few minutes to show the Senate that it is not only in the United States where these people are operating. I read from the House hearings of 1910, at page 113. I have here a report from James Foust, dairy and food commissioner of France. This report shows that the Government of France prosecuted 497 cases, I think, in a single month for the violation of the oleomargarine law. In France, as I understand, they do not permit colored oleomargarine to

be sold. I have here the translation of extracts from public document No. 1377, of the French Chamber of Deputies, extraordinary session, 1903, which reads as follows:

Falsifications of food products were becoming more and more common. In 1869 margarine was invented by M. Mège-Mouries, and its similarity to butter made it possible to offer it for sale as such. In fact, at first, margarine was only used for this purpose, until the numerous complaints led to the enactment of the law of March 14, 1887, which reserves the designation "butter" exclusively to products of milk. It was prohibited to sell the imitation under any other designation than margarine. The law, however, did not fix any penalties for infractions and violations. To discover the fraud was also nearly impossible, as the law only prohibited the substitution of margarine for butter, but did not refer to mixtures or fix any maximum or minimum proportion of margarine that might be permitted.

The complaints continued and led to the enactment of the law of April 14, 1897, the purpose of which was not only the punishment of frauds but also their prevention. One of the most important features of the new law was that it prohibited the manufacture and sale of butter and margarine in the same room. The one who procures and sells butter must not have margarine in his store. The law also provided for a system of inspection of the manufacturing and sale of margarine. Inspectors are appointed by the Government and have authority to enter stores, depots, magazines, and factories and to take the samples necessary for the examination.

The law further prescribes that margarine shall be labeled distinctly and indelibly as such, and that the name of the manufacturer shall appear very distinctly.

This led to another fraud. The manufacturers printed the name of the product in small, hardly visible, letters, while the name of the firm was printed so as to entirely catch the eye.

Now, just observe, Mr. President, that in order to stop this fraudulent practice in the country of France the manufacturers of this product, which it is claimed is demanded and so much desired by the American people, were compelled to print in large letters its real name. This very article, which some Senators have said is so superior to the article produced by the farmer or by the dairy industry, is required in France to be marked—not the package but the article itself—with large indelible letters. That is the only way the Government of France could prevent this great fraud being carried on and practiced upon the people of that country. I read again:

The committee recommends to reverse this, so that the very distinct and indelible shall refer to the product, while the name of the firm may be printed in smaller letters.

They simply changed the thing about, and instead of having the name of the firm printed in large letters they enacted a law declaring that the sellers and manufacturers of oleomargarine might use small letters to print their own name, but they must print in large letters the name of the article, to show that this fraudulent substance, oleomargarine, this substitute for and adulteration of butter, was not butter.

Article 2 of the law of April 14, 1897, reads:

All food products outside of butter, no matter what their origin or composition, which are similar to butter and prepared for the same use as butter, shall only be designated as margarine.

To margarine, thus defined, must not be added coloring matter.

So in France the coloring of margarine is absolutely prohibited by law.

ART. 3. Producers of butter must not keep margarine or oleomargarine in their stores or at other places; neither shall they permit anybody else to keep such products in their stores.

This prohibition also applies to merchants, agents, and dealers in butter.

Margarine and oleomargarine must only be offered for sale at places especially designated for that purpose by the municipal authorities.

ART. 4. All manufacturers of margarine and oleomargarine must make a declaration—in Paris to the chief of police, in the provinces to the mayor of the community.

ART. 5. Buildings where margarine is prepared, kept, or sold must be provided with a sign, in letters at least 30 centimeters high, containing the following: "Factory depot, for sale of margarine and oleomargarine."

ART. 9. All boxes, cases, and packages containing margarine or oleomargarine must be labeled as stated above.

ART. 11. It is prohibited to keep or sell margarine or oleomargarine not labeled as indicated above. The absence of the label will cause that the product will be considered as butter.

Now we come to the penalties.

ART. 16. Those who willfully violate the prescriptions of this law shall be punished by imprisonment from six days to three months and a fine of from 100 to 5,000 francs, or only one of said penalties. Persons who will not name seller or shipper of the goods will be considered as principals.

Express or transportation companies on land or sea that have violated the prescriptions in articles 10 and 12 may be fined from 50 to 500 francs.

Persons preventing inspectors and experts from performing their duties, refusing them admittance to their factories, depots, and stores, and refusing to deliver samples, may be fined from 500 to 1,000 francs.

ART. 17. The use of matter which may have an injurious effect on the health in making margarine shall be punished according to article 423 of the Penal Code.

ART. 19. The courts may always order verdicts of conviction of violation of this law published in newspapers or by means of placards.

ART. 20. Matters and mixtures designated as fraudulent may be confiscated.

A decree of November 9, 1897, contains the regulations for the application of the law of April 14, 1897.

So much for the country of France. If this article of oleomargarine is superior to butter, why have foreign countries

been compelled to enact laws compelling the manufacturers of oleomargarine to say that it is oleomargarine, and not butter?

I have never yet heard, even in the case of the operator of one of the little creameries so graphically described by Senators on this floor the other day, of a single prosecution of any one of the men engaged in the creamery industry or in the making of butter from milk for any violation of the law in attempting to sell their product as oleomargarine. As my friend from Oregon [Mr. LANE] so well said the other day, if butter is bad, it is honest enough to look you in the face and admit it. There is no deception about bad butter any more than there is about good butter. If butter becomes old and rancid, it is honest enough to tell you so. It is not like this fraudulent article of oleomargarine—and when I say "fraudulent" I mean when it is colored and sold as butter—and passed off for something that it is not.

I am sometimes surprised, Mr. President, that the great Beef Trust, which has been permitted under our laws and our institutions to make these hundreds of millions undisturbed, is shortsighted enough to attack an industry like the dairy industry of the country, for it simply goes to show that it is intoxicated with its power, and its greed and lust for money overpowers it. This same trust not only controls the entire beef industry of the country, but it is also attempting to, and it does, successfully control the grain industry of the country. Yet you are bringing in here a bill, and calling it an emergency measure, attacking these six or seven million farmers and these 35,000,000 people who are making an honest living—and that is all they make—out of this industry; not only that, but you want to impose upon the labor of this country and substitute in their diet this adulterated, fraudulent article and compel them to pay the trust's price, more than it is worth.

If the laboring man wants to buy oleomargarine uncolored, let him buy it. If the Beef Trust wants to sell oleomargarine for what it is, let it sell it. We find no fault with that; but you will not with my vote sell it for butter, because, as I have shown you here this afternoon, the makers of this product use on an average 4 per cent of butter in order to practice this fraud and deception, and they use on an average about 10 per cent of milk in churning and in mixing these different ingredients, making in all about 8 per cent of butter.

Mr. President, I make the statement, and I challenge contradiction, that there is not a single pound of butterine or oleomargarine sold without some butter in it; but it is being sold to these poor men whom this great, philanthropic trust is anxious to benefit as butter. They are not asking for legislation to benefit themselves. They are asking for this legislation in order to be able to help the poor man, the laboring man, the man who can not afford to buy butter!

Why, Mr. President, butter is not the only thing upon which these great philanthropists have practiced their fraud and deception. You all remember what a contest we had on bleached flour. You all know the great fight that has been going on trying to stop it, and I think it finally has been stopped—I refer to the practice of bleaching flour. As I said the other day, anyone who is at all familiar with the real value of wheat knows that it is the amber-colored part of the kernel, the aleurone or the gluten, that is valuable for flour. That is not white, but an amber color. Every woman who has made bread, and who is familiar with conditions, knows that it is not always the white bread that is the most wholesome bread. We had our fight on this bleached-flour question, but fortunately there came to our rescue at that time some of the great corporations, because their interests were affected; and if it had not been for those corporations I suppose we would have been told that flour and bread were unwholesome unless they were pure white.

I have shown to the Senate that in the country of France the laws prohibit the coloring of oleomargarine. They prohibit selling it in any store. Now, we will take the country of Germany. It is rather a daring thing, I suppose, to speak about Germany, but I am not going to speak about the people of Germany. I am simply going to talk about butter and oleomargarine.

In Germany they passed a law on June 15, 1897, to this effect:

The prescriptions, rules, and regulations governing the butter trade and the production and sale of margarine, margarine cheese—

These philanthropists are not satisfied with butter alone, but they want to get hold of the cheese industry as well. They have tried that for years, also—

and artificial fats are nearly identical with the French ones, only the German law does not contain any prohibition against coloring margarine, etc., so as to appear like natural butter, etc. These products have to be manufactured and sold in separate stores provided with signs indicating the kind of goods manufactured and sold. The packages have to be labeled as in France, and, besides, must be marked with a very conspicuous red border.

Just think of it! In Germany they have to mark these packages with a red border, I presume something like the color of the automobile of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], so that it can be easily detected.

When sold without wrappers the pieces shall have a cubic shape and the denomination of the goods must be imprinted in the goods itself.

That is where the fraud comes in in this bill. You do not provide in this bill that the goods themselves shall have an imprint upon them. You only provide for the label on the packages, and the packages can very easily be thrown away, as everybody knows.

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BRYAN. I understand it is the agreement to take a recess at 6 o'clock until 8 to-night. Let me ask the Senator if he would object to yielding the floor now, so that I may present a conference report?

Mr. GRONNA. No; I shall be very glad to do so. I will resume what I desire to say after 8 o'clock.

Mr. BRYAN. If it is agreeable to the Senator, then I submit the conference report on Senate bill 1878, and move that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1878) making appropriation for payment of certain claims in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims, reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts, and under the provisions of section 151 of the act approved March 3, 1911, commonly known as the Judicial Code, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert the following:

"ALABAMA.

"To the legal representatives of Isaiah Attaway, deceased, of Macon County, \$275.

"To Jane P. Paulk, of Bullock County, \$635.

"To the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church of Pleasant Springs, \$350.

"GEORGIA.

"To the trustees of the First Baptist Church of Rome, \$870.

"KENTUCKY.

"To R. W. Harris, administrator of James P. Harris, of Floyd County, \$330.

"To the vestry of Ascension Protestant Episcopal Church, of Mount Sterling, \$825.

"To the fiscal court of Oldham County, \$1,100.

"To the treasurer of the Christian Church of Stanford, \$420.

"LOUISIANA.

"To Madeleine Lement, administratrix of Pierre Lement, of St. Landry Parish, \$295.

"To Kate P. McWaters, Margaret McWaters Bell, James H. McWaters, B. P. McWaters, and Moses McWaters, jr., in equal shares, heirs of Moses McWaters, of West Feliciana Parish, \$950.

"MARYLAND.

"To the heirs of William H. Bradshaw, of Frederick County, \$137.50.

"MISSISSIPPI.

"To the trustees of the Protestant Orphan Asylum at Natchez, \$3,500.

"MISSOURI.

"To William W. Green, of Camden County, \$270.

"NORTH CAROLINA.

"To Sarah F. Trenwith, executrix of C. F. Simpson, deceased, of Craven County, \$815.

"To the deacons of the Baptist Church of Beaufort, \$250.

"OHIO.

"To the trustees of the African Methodist Episcopal Church of Gallipolis, \$250.

"SOUTH CAROLINA.

"To John Duncan, surviving partner of the firm of Duncan & Son, of Charleston, \$8,450.

"To the trustees of Beaverdam Baptist Church, of Marlboro County, \$1,600.

"To the trustees of St. Johns Baptist Church, of Bamberg County, \$275.

"TENNESSEE.

"To Lulu H. Doyle and Anna V. Berry, sole heirs of Patrick H. and Margaret E. Watkins, deceased, of Hamilton County, \$333.34.

"To the trustees of the Hobson Methodist Church, of Davidson County, \$1,800.

"To the treasurer of the corporation of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Chattanooga, \$500.

"To the trustees of the Christian Church of Columbia, \$375.

"To the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Murfreesboro, \$900.

"To the trustees of the McKendree Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Nashville, \$1,200.

"To the trustees of Liberty Springs Missionary Baptist Church, of Stewart County, \$475.

"VIRGINIA.

"To Lucy E. Johnson and John A. Johnson, sole heirs of Armistead M. Johnson, deceased, of Loudoun County, \$784.

"To the session of the Presbyterian Church of Greenwood, \$100.

"To the trustees of the Christian Church of Suffolk, \$540.

"WEST VIRGINIA.

"To the legal representatives of Josiah M. Davisson, deceased, of Taylor County, \$720.

"To the trustees of Christ Protestant Episcopal Church, of Bunker Hill, \$300.

"SEC. 2. That the foregoing several sums be, and they are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 3. That in case of the death of any claimant, or the death or discharge of the executor or administrator of any claimant herein named, payment of such claim shall be made to the legal representatives: *Provided*, That where a claimant is dead the administrator, executor, or legal representative shall file a certified copy of his bond, which bond must be at least equal in amount to the sum hereby appropriated: *Provided further*, That in all cases where the original claimants were adjudicated bankrupts payment shall be made to the legal representatives or next of kin instead of to the assignees in bankruptcy: *And provided further*, That wherever under this act it is provided that a payment be made to an executor or an administrator, whether original or ancillary or de bonis non, and such executor or administrator is dead or no longer holds his office, payment shall be made to the successor therein, his title to hold such office being established to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury; and wherever under this act it is provided that a payment be made to a corporation or quasi corporation and such corporation or quasi corporation has been merged in or consolidated with another corporation or quasi corporation, payment shall be made to the corporation or quasi corporation with which the consolidation or merger has been made."

And the House agree to the same.

N. P. BRYAN,
JOE T. ROBINSON,
A. J. GRONNA,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

A. W. GREGG,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
B. K. FOCHT,

Managers on the part of the House.

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

The report was agreed to.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me for a moment?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill, which has been read.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, after a conference lasting 20 days, and having once been rejected by the Senate, the conferees on the Indian bill (H. R. 18453) have submitted to the Senate, and it was printed some days ago, a full, final, and complete report. It is now obvious to me, and I believe also to other Senators, that with a certain provision in the bill the Senate will not adopt the conference report. I refer to the provision proposing to raise the salaries of certain Government employees. The Senate conferees agreed to the House amendment, but by virtue of certain action which has been taken in the Senate on a yea-and-nay vote, and from conversations I have had with many persons, it is evident that the Senate will never agree to the conference report on this bill with the House amendment in it, and that the Senate is going to insist upon and prefer what is termed "the Smoot amendment."

I therefore ask that the conference report be disagreed to, so that we may go back and try again to get this matter into a situation where it will be agreed to by both Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona requests that the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill be rejected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Arizona in what respect the report as agreed upon as to the salaries of clerks differs from the so-called Smoot amendment?

Mr. ASHURST. The amendment as agreed upon by the conferees provides that certain persons who are receiving salaries of \$1,200 per year or less shall have a certain increase—to wit, 15 per cent—and those receiving from \$1,200 to \$1,800, both inclusive, shall receive an increase of 10 per cent, whereas it is evident that the Senate wishes to adhere to what is termed "the Smoot amendment," which provides for a smaller raise in salaries.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator will indulge me further—

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Upon what action of the Senate does the Senator predicate that supposition or belief?

Mr. ASHURST. On a yea-and-nay vote on the Agricultural bill the other morning that very question was tested.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I for one did not regard that by any means as a test vote upon that question. There were other things involved in that report; and I for one voted to send it back because of another provision in the bill. Personally, I am heartily in favor of the increases made in this bill, as I understand them.

Mr. ASHURST. That is, the House amendment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I mean the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. ASHURST. We adopted the House amendment in conference.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; the House amendment. I altogether prefer it to the Smoot amendment, and I should be very glad to have an opportunity to have that matter tried out by the Senate.

Mr. ASHURST. Of course, it would be too late this evening, and I do not want to get this bill into a situation where by reason of the impasse we will be unable to do anything with it. I will say that it is my opinion that I can not get the conference report adopted or agreed to by the Senate with that amendment in it. That is my opinion. That, of course, will kill the bill.

Mr. BRANDEGEE and Mr. SMITH of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to any Senator—all Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator yield first?

Mr. ASHURST. To the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I thought it might be helpful if I should call the attention of the Senators present to the fact that before the vote was taken in reference to the action of the Agricultural Committee, I, having charge of that bill, made the statement that when the yea-and-nay vote was taken I would consider it as final and binding as to whether

the Senate was then instructing us by that vote in regard to the Smoot amendment. I did not take sides pro or con; and it was repeated over on this side when the vote was taken, which was, as I remember, 71 or 72 to 3 in favor of sending it back with reference to the Smoot amendment. I reiterated that once or twice, and the understanding of the conferees who have charge of the Agricultural bill was to the effect that the Senate had committed itself by that vote to the Smoot amendment. That was my understanding.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I did not so understand it.

Mr. ASHURST. Well, I do not wish to press the matter. It is now time to recess; but I should like to have some action taken at the very earliest moment, because the House has agreed to it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will ask the Senator if he will not call up this conference report this evening, or at the very earliest moment?

Mr. ASHURST. Why, certainly, Mr. President. I withdraw the motion at this time.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I simply wanted to know what the Senator from Arizona had done with this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from Arizona that the Senate disagree to the conference report is withdrawn for the present.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Oh! He withdraws the conference report?

Mr. ASHURST. I withdraw the motion.

WEST INDIAN ISLANDS—CONFERENCE REPORT (S. DOC. NO. 719).

Mr. STONE. I present the conference report on House bill 20755, known as the West Indian Islands bill, and ask that it lie on the table and be printed.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 20755) to provide a temporary government for the West Indian Islands acquired by the United States from Denmark by the convention entered into between said countries on the 4th day of August, 1916, and ratified by the Senate of the United States on the 7th day of September, 1916, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

"That, except as hereinafter provided, all military, civil, and judicial powers necessary to govern the West Indian Islands acquired from Denmark shall be vested in a governor and in such person or persons as the President may appoint and shall be exercised in such manner as the President shall direct until Congress shall provide for the government of said islands: *Provided*, That the President may assign an officer of the Army or Navy to serve as such governor and perform the duties appertaining to said office: *And provided further*, That the governor of the said islands shall be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *And provided further*, That the compensation of all persons appointed under this act shall be fixed by the President.

"Sec. 2. That until Congress shall otherwise provide, in so far as compatible with the changed sovereignty and not in conflict with the provisions of this act, the laws regulating elections and the electoral franchise as set forth in the code of laws published at Amalienborg the 6th day of April, 1906, and the other local laws, in force and effect in said islands on the 17th day of January, 1917, shall remain in force and effect in said islands, and the same shall be administered by the civil officials and through the local judicial tribunals established in said islands, respectively; and the orders, judgments, and decrees of said judicial tribunals shall be duly enforced. With the approval of the President, or under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, any of said laws may be repealed, altered, or amended by the colonial council having jurisdiction. The jurisdiction of the judicial tribunals of said islands shall extend to all judicial proceedings and controversies in said islands to which the United States or any citizen thereof may be a party. In all cases arising in the said West Indian Islands and now reviewable by the courts of Denmark, writs of error and appeals shall be to the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and, except as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, the judgments, orders, and decrees of such court shall be final in all such cases.

"Sec. 3. That on and after the passage of this act there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles coming into the United States or its possessions, from the West Indian Islands ceded to the United States by Denmark, the rates of duty and internal-revenue taxes which are required to be levied, collected, and paid upon like articles imported from foreign countries:

Provided, That all articles, the growth or product of, or manufactured in such islands from materials the growth or product of such islands or of the United States, or of both, or which do not contain foreign materials to the value of more than 20 per cent of their total value, upon which no drawback of customs duties has been allowed therein, coming into the United States from such islands shall hereafter be admitted free of duty.

"SEC. 4. That until Congress shall otherwise provide all laws now imposing taxes in the said West Indian Islands, including the customs laws and regulations, shall, in so far as compatible with the changed sovereignty and not otherwise herein provided, continue in force and effect, except that articles the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States shall be admitted there free of duty: *Provided*, That upon exportation of sugar to any foreign country, or the shipment thereof to the United States or any of its possessions, there shall be levied, collected, and paid thereon an export duty of \$8 per ton of 2,000 pounds irrespective of polariscope test, in lieu of any export tax now required by law.

"SEC. 5. That the duties and taxes collected in pursuance of this act shall not be covered into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States, but shall be used and expended for the Government and benefit of said islands under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe.

"SEC. 6. That for the purpose of taking over and occupying said islands and of carrying this act into effect and to meet any deficit in the revenues of the said islands resulting from the provisions of this act the sum of \$100,000 is hereby appropriated, to be paid out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and to be applied under the direction of the President of the United States.

"SEC. 7. That the sum of \$25,000,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be paid in the city of Washington to the diplomatic representative or other agent of His Majesty the King of Denmark duly authorized to receive said money, in full consideration of the cession of the Danish West Indian Islands to the United States made by the convention between the United States of America and His Majesty the King of Denmark entered into August 4, 1916, and ratified by the Senate of the United States on the 7th day of September, 1916.

"SEC. 8. That this act, with the exception of section 7, shall be in force and effect and become operative immediately upon the payment by the United States of said sum of \$25,000,000. The fact and date of such payment shall thereupon be made public by a proclamation issued by the President and published in the said Danish West Indian Islands and in the United States. Section 7 shall become immediately effective and the appropriation thereby provided for shall be immediately available."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WILLIAM J. STONE,
G. M. HITCHCOCK,
H. C. LODGE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
H. D. FLOOD,
PAT HARRISON,
HENRY ALLEN COOPER,
Managers on the part of the House.

RECESS.

Mr. SIMMONS. I move that the Senate now take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The Senate reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m. on the expiration of the recess.

THE NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT (S. DOC. NO. 718).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, submitting additional and supplemental estimates of appropriations required for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, amounting to \$164,784,859.01, including \$1,403,020 heretofore submitted. The communication and accompanying paper will be printed and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

THE SHIPPING BOARD.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask unanimous consent, from the Committee on Commerce, to report back the bill (S. 8168) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a United States Shipping

Board for the purpose of encouraging, developing, and creating a naval auxiliary and naval reserve and a merchant marine to meet the requirements of the commerce of the United States with its Territories and possessions and with foreign countries; to regulate carriers by water engaged in the foreign and interstate commerce of the United States; and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, and for other purposes, with amendments, and I submit a report (No. 1106) thereon. I ask that the bill be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

MARINE-HOSPITAL LANDS IN CHICAGO.

Mr. FLETCHER. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 7905) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to transfer and convey to the commissioners of Lincoln Park, of Chicago, Ill., the riparian rights of the United States, as the owner of land fronting on Lake Michigan and occupied as the site of the United States Marine Hospital in Chicago, Ill., and I submit a report (No. 1107) thereon. This bill has the approval of the department, subject to the conditions named in it.

Mr. LEWIS. In behalf of my colleague [Mr. SHERMAN] may I ask the Senate if possible that it may consent that the bill may be immediately put on its passage? Around the Marine Hospital there is some land which the park commissioners wish to take off the Government's hands and the city improve it itself, and the Government merely wishes to permit it. That is the end of the story. The park commissioners will take it and improve it as the Government wishes.

Mr. JONES. And it is to revert to the Government if the conditions are not complied with.

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish to state that the park commissioners will add 100 feet on the east of the land where the United States Marine Hospital on the lake shore fronts. It will relieve the Government of \$40,000 which is taken out of the bill by the Secretary of War to repair the breakwater. That will be done by the park commissioners and the maintenance guaranteed.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to have the bill read so that we can just see what the conditions are, and whether the land is to revert to the Government in case it is not used for the purpose named in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill.

The amendment of the committee was, in line 8, after the word "upon," to strike out "such terms and conditions as he may impose" and insert: "the condition that the said rights and any lands which may be added to the present water front of said Marine Hospital site shall be used for no other purpose than that authorized in the statute of the State of Illinois, entitled 'An act to enable the park commissioners having control of any park bordering upon public waters in this State to enlarge the same from time to time, and granting submerged lands for the purpose of such enlargements, and to defray the cost thereof,' approved June 15, 1895, and upon such other terms and conditions as they may impose."

Mr. FLETCHER. It should read as he may impose. The grant is made by the Secretary of the Treasury. The amendment is in accordance with the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask if there is any provision in the bill providing that if the land is not used for the purpose mentioned in the bill it shall revert to the Government of the United States?

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely that condition is contained in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I want to know and that is why I wanted to have the bill read.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the Senator will find the amendment meets the condition he has in mind.

Mr. SMOOT. If that condition is in the amendment, I have no objection to the bill; but unless that provision is in the bill, I shall object to the consideration of it. I ask that the amendment be read.

The SECRETARY. After the word "upon," insert:

the condition that the said rights to any lands which may be added to the present water front of said Marine Hospital site shall be used for no other purpose than that authorized in the statute of the State of Illinois, etc.

Mr. SMOOT. That does not state that in case the lands are not used for the purpose mentioned in the bill they shall revert to the Government. It says they shall be used for no other purpose than that authorized in the statutes of the State of Illinois. It is good as far as it goes, but in nearly all the grants of land reported by the Public Lands Committee of either House there is a provision that whenever the lands are not used for the pur-

pose named in the act they shall revert to the Government of the United States. I think that ought to be included in the amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. I understood that was in the bill. It was in the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, and if not in the bill I would be very glad to have added that in the event the conditions are not fulfilled it shall revert to the Government.

Mr. FLETCHER. The amendment is precisely in the language given by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. SMOOT. If the suggested amendment to the amendment is accepted, I have no objection to the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I think the amendment suggested by the Senator from Utah should in form and in the exact words be read before the bill is finally passed. I think the Secretary ought at least to take down in writing the words and read them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read as follows:

Provided, That in the event the said lands are not used for the purposes specified in this act the same shall revert to the Government of the United States.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

BATTLE FIELD OF GUILFORD COURTHOUSE—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I submit a conference report on the bill (H. R. 8229) to establish a national military park at the battle field of Guilford Courthouse, and I call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] to the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8229) to establish a national military park at the battle field of Guilford Courthouse, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 4. That the affairs of the Guilford Courthouse National Military Park shall, subject to the supervision and direction of the Secretary of War, be in charge of three commissioners, one of whom shall be an actual resident of Guilford County, State of North Carolina, one an actual resident of the State of Maryland, and one an actual resident of the State of Delaware. They shall be appointed by the Secretary of War, the actual resident of Guilford County, State of North Carolina, so appointed to serve, unless sooner relieved, for a term of four years. The resident commissioner shall act as chairman and as secretary of the commission. One of the other commissioners so appointed shall serve for a term of three years and the other for a term of two years unless sooner relieved. Upon the expiration of the terms of said commissioners the Secretary of War shall, in the manner hereinbefore prescribed, appoint their successors to serve, unless sooner relieved, for a term of four years each from the date of their respective appointments. The office of said commissioners shall be in the city of Greensboro, N. C. The resident commissioner shall receive as compensation \$1,000 per annum, the nonresident commissioners \$100 per annum each, and they shall not be entitled to any other pay or allowances of any kind whatsoever.

"SEC. 5. That it shall be the duty of the commission named in the preceding section, under the direction of the Secretary of War, to open or repair such roads as may be necessary to the purposes of the park, and to ascertain and mark with his-

torical tablets or otherwise, as the Secretary of War may determine, all lines of battle of the troops engaged in the Battle of Guilford Courthouse and other historical points of interest pertaining to the battle within the park or its vicinity; and the said commission in establishing this military park shall also have authority, under the direction of the Secretary of War, to employ such labor and services and to obtain such supplies and material as may be necessary to the establishment of said park, under such regulations as he may consider best for the interest of the Government, and the Secretary of War shall make and enforce all needed regulations for the care of the park."

And the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,
G. M. HITCHCOCK,
H. A. DU PONT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

S. H. DENT, Jr.,
S. J. NICHOLLS,
JULIUS KAHN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask for the adoption of the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

THE REVENUE.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask that the unfinished business be now proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20573) to provide increased revenue to defray the expenses of the increased appropriations for the Army and Navy and the extensions of fortifications, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, when the Senate took a recess I was trying to inform the Senate, quoting from the House hearings of 1910, of certain laws in the various countries of Europe. I find that in England the law of 1887 contains provisions practically identical with those of France and Germany. Fines are imposed for a violation of the law of £20 for the first offense, £50 for the second, £100 for the third, and later penalties are imposed. Holland has practically the same law. Belgium likewise has practically the same law relative to oleomargarine.

In Russia margarine may only be manufactured at places especially designated for that purpose. The establishment where margarine is prepared is subject to inspection. Colored margarine so as to make it appear like butter is absolutely prohibited. Packages containing margarine must be distinctly labeled and state the name of the manufacturing firm. The factories and stores must be provided with signs indicating the kinds of goods manufactured.

I realize that there are times when it hurts to know the truth, but, nevertheless, I am going to trespass upon your patience for a few minutes more and give you some information about oleomargarine.

I said that in Russia the coloring of margarine was absolutely prohibited, and that the factories and stores where this article is sold must be provided with signs indicating the kinds of goods manufactured and sold. Importations of margarine from foreign countries are also prohibited, and violations are punished by imprisonment of one month or a fine of 100 rubles. It seems that even in far-distant Russia, of which we hear so much, and sometimes not the most favorable comments, they have learned to know the real value of oleomargarine, and it has not been sold as butter.

They do not permit the coloring of oleomargarine in Russia; and yet we are about to attempt to legalize such an act here in the United States of America. In Austria they have practically the same law. The same is true of Denmark. When I speak of Denmark it must be remembered that it is a little country, comprising about 15,000 square miles, and yet feeding about two and a quarter of a million people; and I know of no country where the people are compelled to live on a dairy diet any more than they are in the country of Denmark. I should like to have the men who are so well prepared on statistics show me the tubercular bacilli affecting the physical condition of the Dane. I believe that the health conditions of the country of Denmark not only compare favorably with those of the United States, but that they are really much better. You can not show me a single country where the people live on dairy products in which they are not healthy.

In the countries where this deception and fraud is prohibited by law their chemists are perhaps as skillful as are our chemists. I made the statement before the recess this evening that not a single chemist in the United States has made the state-

ment that butter is unwholesome, nor has the statement been made that it is a dangerous food product. On the contrary, we know that it is being recommended as a most wholesome article of food.

Why, Mr. President, cottonseed oil has its place—I have no quarrel with the cottonseed-oil people—to be used for what God Almighty intended it for. It is useful as an article in mixing paint. It takes the place of linseed oil. We farmers in the West are using hundreds of thousands of gallons of cottonseed oil as a substitute for linseed oil, because it is a most excellent ingredient with which to mix paint; but it is not an article of food. Without some lubricant, some substance to go with it, as my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] said the other day, it would be a mighty hard article to consume or even to swallow.

Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] said yesterday, there are 32 States in the Union which have passed laws regulating the sale or coloring of oleomargarine. I have a list of the different States which have passed legislation on the subject and their laws regarding it, but I shall not trespass upon the time of the Senate to read them. I, however, desire to ask permission to have them printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that order will be made.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The following compilation of the substance of the dairy laws of the United States was published by the Agricultural Department under the seal of Secretary Wilson a year ago, and copies of the laws in full may be had from the Secretary of Agriculture:

ALABAMA—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Approved Feb. 18, 1895.]

No article which is in imitation of pure yellow butter, and is not made wholly from pure milk and cream, shall be manufactured, sold, or used in any public eating place, hospital, or penal institution, etc.; but oleomargarine, free from color or other ingredient to cause it to look like butter, and made in such manner as will advise the consumer of its real character, is permitted. It must be stamped with its name.

ARIZONA.

No dairy laws.

ARKANSAS—MUST BE LABELED.

[Approved Apr. 2, 1885.]

Substitutes for butter, whether in wholesale or retail packages, shall be plainly labeled "Adulterated butter," "Oleomargarine," or such other names as shall properly describe them. In hotels, etc., dishes containing said articles must be plainly marked in same manner.

CALIFORNIA—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Approved Mar. 4, 1897.]

Imitation butter and cheese defined as any article not produced from pure milk or cream, salt, rennet, and harmless coloring matter, which is in semblance of butter or cheese and designed as a substitute for such. Shall not be colored to imitate butter or cheese, and must be in such form as will advise consumer of its real character. Every package must be plainly marked "Substitute for butter" or "Substitute for cheese" and accompanied by a statement giving name of manufacturer, ingredients, etc., a copy of which must be given to each purchaser, with verbal notice, at the time of sale, in connection with which words like "creamery," "dairy," etc., are prohibited. Patrons of eating places shall be notified if substitutes of butter or cheese are used. Prohibited in State charitable institutions.

COLORADO—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Approved Apr. 1, 1895.]

All articles not produced from pure milk or cream, in imitation of pure cheese or yellow butter, are prohibited; but oleomargarine and filled cheese are permitted if free from color or other ingredients to cause them to look like butter or cheese; they must be made in such form and sold in such manner as will advise the consumer of their real character. Cheese containing any foreign fats, oleaginous substances, rancid butter, etc., shall be branded "Imitation cheese."

CONNECTICUT—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Public Acts, 1895.]

Imitation butter, defined as any article resembling butter in appearance and not made wholly, salt and coloring matter excepted, from cow's milk, is prohibited; but oleomargarine or imitation butter, free from color or other ingredient to cause it to look like butter, and made in such form and sold in such manner as will advise consumer of its real character, is permitted. Words like "butter," "dairy," etc., shall not form a part of its name or appear on its package. Imitation butter shall be sold only in labeled packages, or registered places which display signs, and purchasers shall be informed orally of the character of the article at the time of sale. Use of imitation butter in public eating places, bakeries, etc., must be made known by signs.

DELAWARE—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Passed May 8, 1895.]

The manufacture or sale of any article not produced from unadulterated milk or cream, which is in imitation of pure yellow butter or designed to take the place of pure cheese, is prohibited; but oleomargarine is permitted if in a distinct form, free from butter color and sold in such manner as to show its real character; it shall be plainly marked "Oleomargarine."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—BRANDING LAW.

[Approved Mar. 2, 1895.]

Substances in semblance of butter or cheese, not made exclusively of milk or cream, but with the addition of melted butter or any oil, shall be plainly branded on each package "Oleomargarine," and a label, similarly printed, must accompany each retail sale.

FLORIDA—MUST NOTIFY GUESTS.

[Approved Feb. 17, 1881.]

The sale of any spurious preparation, purporting to be butter, is prohibited. Guests at hotels, etc., must be notified if oleomargarine or other spurious butter is used.

GEORGIA—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Approved Dec. 16, 1895.]

Imitation butter and cheese are defined as any article not produced from pure milk or cream—salt, rennet, and coloring matter excepted—in semblance of butter or cheese and designed to be used as a substitute for either. Shall not be colored to resemble butter or cheese. Every package must be plainly marked "Substitute for butter" or "Substitute for cheese," and each sale shall be accompanied by verbal notice and by a printed statement that the article is an imitation, the statement giving, also, the name of the producer. The use of these imitations in eating places, bakeries, etc., must be made known by signs.

IDAHO—BRANDING REQUIRED.

[Approved Jan. 27, 1885.]

Brand required for sale of oleomargarine or butterine, imitation butter, or mixture imitating butter. These shall not be sold as butter.

ILLINOIS—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Approved June 14, 1897.]

Imitation butter is defined as any article not produced from pure milk or cream—salt, rennet, and coloring matter excepted—in semblance of butter and designed to be used as a substitute for it. Shall not be colored to resemble butter. All packages must be plainly branded "Oleomargarine," "Butterine," "Substitute for butter," or "Imitation butter." Each sale shall be accompanied by notice to the purchaser that the substitute is imitation butter.

INDIANA—LABEL LAW.

Butter other than that made from pure milk when sold or used in hotels, etc., must be plainly labeled "Oleomargarine."

IOWA—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Passed in 1893.]

Imitation butter or cheese is defined as an article not produced from pure milk or cream—salt, rennet, and coloring matter excepted—in semblance of butter or cheese and designed to be sold as a substitute for either of them. Shall not be colored to resemble butter or cheese. Every package shall be plainly marked "Substitute for butter" or "Substitute for cheese," and each sale shall be accompanied by a verbal notice and a printed statement that the article is an imitation, the statement giving also the address of the maker. The use of these imitations in hotels, bakeries, etc., must be made known by signs.

KANSAS.

No law.

KENTUCKY—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Act of 1898.]

Oleomargarine, butterine, or kindred compound, made in such form and sold in such manner as will advise the customer of its real character, and free from color or other ingredient to cause it to look like butter, is permitted.

LOUISIANA—LABEL LAW.

[Approved July 6, 1888.]

Such substances as oleomargarine, butterine, bogus butter, etc., shall be plainly labeled to indicate their composition. They shall not be sold as butter.

MAINE—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Approved Mar. 27, 1895.]

Any article in imitation of yellow butter or cheese and not made exclusively of milk or cream is prohibited.

MARYLAND—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Passed in 1888.]

The manufacture, sale, or use in public places of any article in imitation of and designed to take the place of pure butter or cheese and not made wholly from milk or cream is prohibited. Mixtures of any animal fats or animal or vegetable oils with milk, cream, or butter shall be uncolored and marked with names and percentages of adulterants, and this information shall be given to purchasers.

MASSACHUSETTS—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Approved June 11, 1891.]

An article made wholly or partly out of any fat or oil, etc., not from pure cream, and which is in imitation of yellow butter, is prohibited, but oleomargarine, free from color or other ingredient to cause it to look like butter and made in such form and sold in such manner as will advise the consumer of its real character, is permitted. It shall not be sold as butter, nor shall words like "dairy," "creamery," etc., or the name of any breed of dairy cattle be used in connection with it. All packages exposed for sale must be plainly marked "Oleomargarine," and labels similarly marked must accompany retail sales. Stores where it is sold and wagons used for delivery must display signs, and hotels, etc., using it must notify guests. Persons selling oleomargarine must be registered and conveyors licensed.

MICHIGAN—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Approved Apr. 15, 1897.]

Any article not made wholly from milk or cream and containing melted butter, fats, or oils not produced from milk and which is in imitation of pure butter is prohibited, but oleomargarine free from color or any ingredient to cause it to look like butter and made in such form and sold in such manner as will advise the consumer of its real character is permitted; its sale as butter is prohibited; signs must be displayed where it is sold or used, and its original packages must be plainly marked "Oleomargarine" if the article contains suet or tallow, or "Butterine" if it contains lard; retail sales shall be made from a package so marked, and a label similarly printed and bearing the name of the manufacturer shall be delivered with each sale; shall not be used in any public institution. (N. B.—The above law was invalidated in 1897 by the supreme court because of the fact that the enacting clause was omitted when it passed the senate.)

MINNESOTA—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Approved 1899.]

This law prohibits the sale of oleomargarine made in imitation of butter, and took the place of the pink law of 1891.

MISSISSIPPI LABEL LAW.

[Approved Mar. 9, 1882.]

Packages of oleomargarine or similarly manufactured butters shall be plainly labeled with the correct name of their contents, and the product shall be sold by that name. A privilege tax of \$5 is imposed upon the persons selling the articles named.

MISSOURI—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Approved Apr. 19, 1895.]

Imitation butter is defined as every article not produced wholly from pure milk or cream, made in semblance of and designed to be used as a substitute for pure butter; it shall not be sold as butter; shall not be colored to resemble butter unless it is to be sold outside the State; original packages shall be plainly stamped "Substitute for butter"; in hotels, etc., vessels in which it is served must be marked "Oleomargarine" or "Impure butter."

MONTANA—TAKED 10 CENTS A POUND.

[Penal Code of 1895.]

Any article in semblance of butter or cheese and not made wholly from milk or cream must be plainly labeled "Oleomargarine" or "Imitation cheese," and a printed label bearing the same word or words must be delivered to the purchaser with retail sales. Places where these articles are sold or used must display signs, and information as to their character be given if requested. Dealers must pay a license of 10 cents a pound on each pound sold.

NEVADA—BRANDING LAW.

[Approved Feb. 14, 1881.]

Any article in semblance of butter, but not made exclusively of milk or cream or containing melted butter, shall be in packages marked "Oleomargarine."

NEBRASKA—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Approved Mar. 16, 1895.]

Imitation butter and cheese are defined as any article made in semblance of and designed to be used as a substitute for pure butter or cheese and not produced wholly from pure milk or cream, salt, rennet, and harmless coloring matter. These articles, including any having melted butter added to them, shall not be colored to resemble butter or cheese; shall be plainly marked "Imitation butter" or "Imitation cheese"; verbal and printed information of the character of the articles and address of the maker shall be given at time of sale; signs shall be displayed in public eating places where used.

NEW HAMPSHIRE—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Approved Mar. 29, 1895.]

Any article not made wholly from unadulterated milk or cream which is in imitation of pure yellow butter or cheese is prohibited, unless in packages plainly marked "Adulterated butter," "Oleomargarine," or "Imitation cheese." A label printed with the words on the original package shall be delivered with each retail sale. Oleomargarine, free from color or ingredient to cause it to look like butter, and made in such form and sold in such manner as will advise the consumer of its real character, is permitted. Notice of the use of substitutes for butter in hotels, etc., shall be given to patrons.

NEW JERSEY—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Approved Mar. 22, 1886.]

Any article made wholly or partly out of any fat, oil, etc., not from milk or cream, artificially colored in imitation of pure yellow butter, is prohibited; but oleomargarine and imitation cheese are permitted, if free from artificial color and in the original package encircled by a wide black band bearing the name of the maker and having the name of the contents plainly branded on them with a hot iron. Retail sales shall be accompanied by a printed card on which the name of the substance and the address of the maker are plainly printed, and the customer shall be orally informed of the character of the article at the time of the sale.

NEW MEXICO.

No law.

NEW YORK—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Approved Apr. 10, 1893.]

The terms oleomargarine, butterine, imitation butter, or imitation cheese mean any article in the semblance of butter or cheese not the usual product of the dairy and not made exclusively from unadulterated milk, or having any oil, lard, melted butter, etc., as a component part. Imitation butter: The manufacture of oleomargarine or any article in imitation of butter wholly or partly from fats or oils not produced from milk, or the sale or the use in hotels, etc., of such articles, is prohibited. No article intended as an imitation of butter and containing oils, fats, etc., not from milk, or melted butter in any condition, shall be colored yellow.

NORTH CAROLINA—LABOR LAW.

[Ratified Feb. 28, 1895.]

Oleomargarine and butterine are defined as articles manufactured in imitation of butter, and which are composed of no ingredient or ingredients in combination with butter. Original packages shall be labeled with chemical ingredients and their proportions.

NORTH DAKOTA—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Laws of 1899.]

Law prohibits manufacture and sale of oleomargarine colored in semblance of butter.

OHIO—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Approved May 16, 1894.]

Oleomargarine is defined as any substance not pure butter of not less than 80 per cent butter fat and made for use as butter. It is permitted if free from coloring matter or other ingredient to cause it to look like butter and made in such form and sold in such manner as will advise the consumer of its real character.

OKLAHOMA.

No laws.

OREGON—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Filed Feb. 21, 1899.]

Forbids the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine colored in semblance of butter.

PENNSYLVANIA—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Passed in 1899.]

Prohibits manufacture and sale of oleomargarine made in semblance of butter.

RHODE ISLAND—BRANDING LAW.

[Laws of 1882.]

Any article not made wholly from milk or cream, but containing any melted butter or animal oil or fat not the product of milk, shall be plainly marked "Oleomargarine," and a label similarly printed shall be delivered with all retail sales.

SOUTH CAROLINA—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Approved Mar. 9, 1896.]

Imitation butter and cheese are defined as every article not produced from pure milk or cream, with or without salt, rennet, and harmless coloring matter, which is in semblance of, and designed to be used as a substitute for butter or cheese; they shall not be colored to resemble butter or cheese; original packages shall be marked "Substitute for butter," or "Substitute for cheese"; shall not be sold as genuine butter or cheese, nor used in hotels, etc., unless signs are displayed.

SOUTH DAKOTA—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Laws of 1897.]

Any article not made wholly from pure milk or cream, and in imitation of pure butter, is prohibited; but oleomargarine, colored pink and made in such form and sold in such manner as will advise the consumer of its real character, is permitted; notice of its use in public eating places must be given.

TENNESSEE—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Act of 1895.]

Any article which is in imitation of yellow butter and not made exclusively from pure milk or cream is prohibited; but oleomargarine, free from color or other ingredient to cause it to look like butter, and made in such form and sold in such manner as will advise the consumer of its true character, and other imitations if uncolored and labeled with their correct names are permitted; wholesale packages shall be plainly labeled, and a label shall accompany retail sales.

TEXAS.

No law.

UTAH—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Approved Mar. 8, 1894.]

Any article in semblance of butter or cheese and not made wholly from milk or cream shall be plainly marked "Oleomargarine butter," or "Imitation cheese," and retail sales shall be made from packages so marked. Such articles shall not be colored to resemble butter or cheese.

VERMONT—PINK LAW.

[Laws of 1884.]

The manufacture of any article in imitation of butter or cheese which contains any animal fat, or animal or vegetable oils or acids not produced from pure milk or cream, is prohibited.

Imitation butter.—Imitation butter for use in public eating places, or for sale, shall be colored pink.

VIRGINIA—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Approved Jan. 29, 1898.]

The manufacture or sale of any article made wholly or partly from any fat or oil not produced from unadulterated milk or cream, which is in imitation of pure yellow butter, is prohibited; but oleomargarine, butterine, or kindred compound, made in such form and sold in such manner as will advise the consumer of its real character and free from color or other ingredient to cause it to look like butter, is permitted. Signs, with the words "Imitation butter used here," shall be displayed in eating places, bakeries, etc., where the articles above named are used.

WASHINGTON—ANTICOLOR LAW.

[Approved Mar. 11, 1895.]

No article which is in imitation of pure yellow butter and is not made wholly from pure milk or cream, with or without harmless coloring matter, shall be manufactured, sold, or used in any public-eating house or eleemosynary or penal institution, etc.; but oleomargarine, free from color or other ingredient to make it look like butter, and made in such form and sold in such manner as will advise the consumer of its real character, is permitted.

WEST VIRGINIA—PINK LAW.

[Approved Feb. 16, 1891.]

Any substance in semblance of butter or cheese and not made wholly from pure milk or cream, and packages containing such substances, shall be plainly marked; printed statements explaining the character of the substance must be given to consumers.

Oleomargarine: Oleomargarine and artificial and adulterated butter shall be colored pink.

Mr. GRONNA. Now, Mr. President, what is oleomargarine? I read from the House hearings in 1910, on page 171, a statement made by Mr. Henry C. Pirrung, president of the Capital State Dairy Co., of Columbus, Ohio, a gentleman who admits that for many years he has been engaged in the manufacture of oleomargarine. I want to read a brief statement made by him:

Mr. PIRRUNG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in order to perhaps more forcibly illustrate the factory conditions existing in the manufacture of oleomargarine to-day, it will be necessary to state the reason why the present conditions are in force and in existence. It might seem to this committee and to those interested that perhaps my explanation of the factory and its conditions and the manufacture of oleomargarine may be exaggerated, but I assure you, gentlemen, that no exaggeration will be attempted and no departure from the truth.

We have known for many years, Mr. President, that certain Senators are not interested in the welfare of the farmer. It is

nothing new; it is the same old story. The farmer is a splendid citizen just before election, but subsequent to election he is often forgotten.

Mr. HAWLEY. Are you a manufacturer of oleomargarine?

Mr. PIRRUNG. I am, and have been for 22 years—a practical manufacturer. Years ago—we will say in 1884, 1885, and 1886—when the first law was attempted and enacted the cry by the opponents of oleomargarine was the debasement of materials, the inferior materials we used, the slovenly methods of manufacture; in fact, everything, even fraud was charged at that time. Prominent amongst the illustrative papers was the Police Gazette, which at that time had large pictures showing the dead animals that were used in the manufacture of oleomargarine. It was also stated and illustrated that skimmings of sewer drops in New York were used in the manufacture of oleomargarine, that the basic materials came from the garbage can, and every other vile and putrid matter that could be used. Now, of course, in that sense we must also state that the opponents of oleomargarine stated that this product manufactured from all these materials, which they only charged and never proved were used, was made in imitation of butter and to take the place of butter, and therefore they wanted it distinguished from butter.

Mr. Pirrung goes on to describe what "neutral" is, and I have some extracts marked here, which I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in my remarks without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that order will be made.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Will you tell us what neutral is? You used the term "neutral." Will you tell us what it is, so that we may understand what you refer to?

Mr. PIRRUNG. Yes; neutral is the oil product of the leaf of the pig. The leaf of the pig is first chilled and then it is hashed or cut into cubes of about an inch or 2 inches. The purpose of chilling, as you will understand, is so that it may be cut into cubes. It is then melted in its cubed condition and brought to a temperature of about 180 to 190 degrees. During the melting process the agitator stirs this neutral continuously in order to bring about the proper melting of the oil from the tissue and fiber. Then it is allowed to stand for a few minutes, and a shower bath of salt is hastily sprinkled over this in order to carry the tissue and fiber and extraneous matter to the bottom, whereon the pure oil of the pig remains on the top. It is then siphoned from the kettle and put into tierces and shipped out for the manufacture of oleomargarine, and thereby the name of "neutral" is attached to it, distinguishing it from the other products of the hog commonly known as lard.

[From statement of Mr. Thomas Sharpless, president of the Pennsylvania Butter Protective Association.]

In my position, in connection with the Butter Protective Association of Pennsylvania, I have found that 85 per cent of all the samples bought—and they were bought as butter—upon analysis were proved to be oleomargarine colored in imitation of butter.

Mr. GRONNA. Later on I find in these same hearings the statement of a certain gentleman who thinks we ought to abolish the cow; that we ought to do away with the dairy interests entirely. Those of us who are engaged in dairying have not been so uncharitable as that toward the men who are manufacturing oleomargarine. We are anxious to have the products which go into the making of oleomargarine manufactured, and, if no fraud or deception is practiced, we find no fault with the industry; but I, for one, do find fault with the practice of perpetrating fraud and deception upon the consumer. Not only are you proposing to tax a product which you say is a food product and a necessity in order to sustain life, but you tell me you are going to make it cheaper and easier for the poor man to obtain it by levying a tax upon it. I think you are also going to make it possible for the seller of this product to get an unfair price for it. It is absolutely certain that an unfair price will be asked if we are to permit this deception and fraud to go on. Instead of benefiting the laboring man, the provision in this bill will result to his detriment. The laboring man ought to be in a position to buy as good butter as you and I. If the conditions in our country are such that the laboring man can not afford to buy butter there is something wrong with our policies; there is something wrong with our country; there is something wrong with the fundamental principles of our Government. Let us change those principles and make it possible for these men to get the wholesome food that you and I get.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose to enter into a discussion of this important subject to delay a vote upon the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Alabama. This question is not a new one; it has been before Congress for more than a quarter of a century. The plan proposed by the Senator from Alabama is not a new one. If his amendment should be adopted it would be reenacting the old law; and under that old law the maximum amount collected as revenue was two million four hundred and some odd thousand dollars. I think the majority have failed in their estimate as to the revenue to be derived from this article under the amendment, just as they failed when they wrote their tariff law, which we were told was going to cheapen the food of the American people, lower the cost of living to the American people, and still bring sufficient revenue to pay the running expenses of the Government. Well, you succeeded admirably in failing in both. Food products have advanced—due to the war; of course it was not due to the Democratic

tariff law—and the revenues have decreased, so that the Treasury to-day is bankrupt. So it is said that this is an emergency measure, and that it is necessary to take an inferior article, which is claimed to be good enough for the laboring man of this country, and tax him 2 cents a pound, and then foster a gigantic trust in opposition to the millions of farmers who are engaged in the legitimate dairy industry.

Mr. President, I am sorry that I have to say these things to my friends on the other side—and I have many dear friends on the other side of the Chamber—but, like the parent who chastises the son, it is because I want to set you right that I am calling your attention to these matters. It is not because I dislike you; but you have failed in every attempt you have made to legislate for the American people; in every effort you have made to legislate for the laboring man you have made a dismal failure.

Suppose that we should enact a law permitting cotton two grades below medium to be mixed with medium, would you consider that desirable legislation for the South? Yet the mixture would be all cotton, although it would not be medium cotton. I do not care whether it is in the South or in the North, the great agricultural industry is entitled to protection. We have helped you when you asked us for help and established standards for the great product of the South. Nine grades have been established, four below and four above medium; and if the proposition were here before us now to repeal that law or to change that standard, I should be one of the first to vote against it, because I know it would be doing an injustice to the cotton producer of the South.

Mr. President, what is margarin, anyway? Well, I looked it up in the dictionary, and I find that the word "margarin" is defined as—

A fatty substance extracted from animal fats mixed with certain vegetable oils, formerly supposed to be a definite compound of glycerin and margaric acid, but now known to be simply a mixture of tristearin and tripalmitin.

Now, I find no fault at all with that description; but, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] said the other day—and I would as soon take his judgment as that of any chemist in this country—stearin is not a food product. I know it is a valuable product. I know that when I was running a thrashing machine, when I was a boy, I used stearin to put on the belts in order to keep them from slipping, and I presume it acts the same way in a person's stomach. It will stay there for a good, long while. It will keep the appetite from slipping, as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] says. Why, of course, any of these great corporations would gladly recommend this food product in the lumber camps and in other camps, because it is a product that will stay by you. We sometimes used soap to prevent the belt from slipping on the pulley, but stearin is the real thing; and I am calling attention to this because the Senator from Oregon, in describing this great product, said it was good to grease your boots with, but that it was not good to be used in making the old-fashioned tallow candles.

Mr. President, I know that those of you who favor this amendment are sincere in your belief. I do not question the motives of any Senator or of any other man. Undoubtedly you believe that this legislation will be beneficial to the American people; otherwise, I can not conceive that you would ask us to pass it. But I can not understand how you can justify your position in placing a tax of 2 cents a pound upon a food product which you say is a necessity, and compel these laboring men, for whom we always legislate, for whom we always pass beneficial legislation, as has been said, to pay that tax. You know that you are not benefiting the laboring man by taxing this product 2 cents a pound. You must also know that you make it possible for an unwarranted price to be charged by the men who control this product—and a few people in the United States control it. No man will deny that. Less than half a dozen men in this country control the product. It is an absolutely trust-controlled product. You make it possible, I say, for that trust to profit unduly, to get an unwarranted price for this article which you say is good enough for the laboring man. I do not think it is good enough for the laboring man. I want you to make conditions such that it is possible for the great dairy interests of this country to produce butter at a reasonable price so that every man, woman, and child in this country can afford to buy butter and to eat butter.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The laboring man can get it now.

Mr. GRONNA. As the Senator from Michigan says, the laboring man can get it now, as oleomargarine, at an additional cost of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound, and the consumer knows what he is buying if he buys it as uncolored oleomargarine. There is no deception and no fraud practiced upon the laboring man or upon the consumer if he buys the real article.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Many men buy it. I know of Senators in this body who buy it for their own tables because it is pure.

Mr. GRONNA. I am perfectly willing to take this one-fourth of 1 cent per pound off. I am perfectly willing that oleomargarine shall be sold to the public absolutely without any tax at all.

Mr. CLAPP. That is, uncolored.

Mr. GRONNA. Uncolored, certainly; but I do not care what the tax is, it is still a deception and a fraud upon the consumer of this country when it is colored. I, for one, would be willing to enact a law absolutely prohibiting the coloring of oleomargarine, the same as they have done in France years ago, and in other European countries.

Now, I have made some pretty serious charges against some of these people who attack the dairy industry. I said before the recess that a third of the lard sold by the American manufacturers was adulterated during the years 1880 to 1890, and I am going to substantiate what I said a moment ago. I read from the Encyclopaedia Britannica, volume 1, page 232:

Lard: Between the years 1880 and 1890 a gigantic fraudulent trade in adulterated lard was carried on from the United States. A great proportion of the American lard imported into England was found to consist of a mixture of more or less real lard with cottonseed oil and beef stearine. Cottonseed oil is one of the cheapest vegetable oils fit for human consumption, beef stearine the hard residue obtained in the manufacture of oleomargarine after the more fluid fat has been pressed from the beef fat. These mixtures were made so skillfully by large Chicago manufacturers that for some years they escaped detection. A bill introduced in 1888 into the American Senate to stop this imposture directed general attention to the subject, and energetic measures, taken both in America and in England, quickly put an end to it. From the memorial presented in the United States Senate in support of the bill it appeared that in about 1887 the annual production of lard in the States was estimated at 600,000,000 pounds, of which more than 35 per cent—

I said 33½ per cent—

was adulterated. Compounds were made containing only a small quantity of lard or none at all, yet were sold as "choice refined lard" or under other eulogistic names. Many lard substitutes, chiefly made from cottonseed oil, are still met with, but are most sold in a legitimate manner.

They even extracted oil from maize or corn and mixed it with lard.

Now, Mr. President, I have taken up a great deal more time than I intended, but I could not let some of these statements go unchallenged with reference to this great industry of dairying, an industry so vital not only to the 35,000,000 people who are engaged in it, but to the 100,000,000 consumers in the United States.

Mr. President, if conditions are such that the food article known as butter is an unwholesome product, then let us treat this industry as fairly as we treated the Beef Trust. Let us provide for a Federal inspection. Let every creamery in the United States be inspected at the cost of the Government of the United States or the people of the United States. We welcome an inspection system. Many of us have stood on this floor asking you to help us secure Federal inspection for our grain, and we certainly do not object to a system of inspection for every creamery that is manufacturing butter within our borders.

Mr. President, the revenue you will derive from this tax will not be enough to help your great deficit. It will add to the burden on the toiling millions in this country, who are always the ones to bear the heavy burden when food products increase in price, because wages do not always increase with the increased cost of living.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon an interruption?

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

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. I will ask the Senator if it does not strike him that the vice of the situation is not alone in the fact that it will add a burden to taxation of which the Government will get the proceeds—which is bad enough—but in addition to that, through continuing to allow oleomargarine to be colored, by which producers through the final distributors can add largely to the price, because it is an imitation of butter, it will add a large burden to the people which the Government does not get? That is the vice of this thing.

Mr. GRONNA. I think the Senator from Minnesota. He has stated it much more clearly than I could. He is absolutely right in his statement that the tax is only a bagatelle; but by allowing this deception and this fraud to go on, it is made possible for a large addition to be made to the normal price of this product, for which the farmers receive how much? Seven to eight cents a pound, on foot, is all the Beef Trust pays for cattle. That is a good average price. Yet you are going to say by this law: "We will make it possible for the manufac-

turer of this spurious article, this adulterated article, this inferior article, to charge as much as butter brings." That is the great evil, as the Senator from Minnesota has said.

I would not ordinarily have uttered a single word of criticism about these great industries, because I realize, as you realize, that these men who have amassed their hundreds of millions of dollars in this great enterprise have brought to this country a great business. I am not criticizing them so long as they keep within their own confines, so long as they do not attempt to deceive the American public.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama, and I hope a majority of the Senate will do likewise. I said a few moments ago that you can not show me a single country where the people live on dairy products where the people are not healthy. You talk about the insanitary conditions of the stable on the farm. Why, Mr. President, I could show you barns and stables by the hundreds and by the thousands that are less odoriferous than the slaughterhouses of the stockyards. The farmers of this country are making every possible effort to handle this product in as sanitary and as cleanly a way as it is possible for human beings to do. There may be exceptions, but it is not the rule, I think, that you will find the stables of the farmers in a condition such as was described by the Senator from Alabama the other day.

Mr. President, I feel like apologizing for having taken so much time of the Senate. The people of my State are not as heavily interested in dairying as the farmers are in other States. We are a new country, and we are engaged in the production of cereals, wheat, oats, barley, and seed, such as flax and grass seeds; but, Mr. President, whether North Dakota had a single creamery or not, I know the condition of the dairy farms, at least some of them. I know it is a most important industry and a most legitimate industry.

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, I shall vote against the amendment offered by my good friend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. I know he is just as sincere in his belief as I am in mine. I know him very well, having served with him in the other body the same as I am serving with him here. He needs no defense; his own record is sufficient. I say to you that the Senator from Alabama and those of you who are going to force this amendment upon the American people are mistaken. It will not bring you the revenue; it will not cheapen the cost of butter nor of oleomargarine. It will increase the price of oleomargarine because, in the first place, you add a 2-cents-a-pound tax, and as the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] so well said, you make it possible to practice fraud and deception upon the American consumer and upon the American laboring man, so that he will have to pay this unduly high price.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think I can in five minutes' time express my views on the oleomargarine amendment. Thirty-one years ago this Government enacted a law for the purpose of regulating the sale of oleomargarine and fixed a tax of 2 cents per pound. That law was surrounded with as many restrictions of a protective character as are to be found in the present Underwood amendment. Nevertheless the law proved unsatisfactory. It was found that oleomargarine was being palmed off for genuine butter and that every kind of fraud was being worked.

Fifteen years ago the present law was enacted fixing a tax of one quarter of 1 cent per pound upon oleomargarine that is not colored and 10 cents a pound on the colored article. The purpose of the law was to prevent the fraudulent sale of oleomargarine as butter, to protect the consumer and also to protect the producer of butter.

It can not be claimed that the proposed change in the law is intended solely as a revenue measure. That is not believed by anybody. If a revenue were desired, the tax would be fixed without regard to the question of color. We would not find the privilege of counterfeiting and imitating butter carefully carried into the revenue proposition. The fact about the matter is, and every man knows it, that this is a plain, bald attempt to permit the packing houses of the country to sell as butter that which is not butter, to counterfeit butter and to fraudulently put it forth upon the public. That is all there is to it, and you may talk about it until you are black in the face and "until the cows come home," and that it all there ever will be to it.

We have been passing pure-food laws in this country in order that men may know what they eat, and we have all said that was a good kind of legislation. Let a man eat what he pleases, but let him know what he is eating, and let not some scoundrel counterfeit some article and have people put it into their stomachs, not knowing what they are eating. We have passed a great deal of that kind of legislation. On the heels of it comes

the packing house and says, "Allow us at least to counterfeit butter." And now it is proposed that that privilege shall be granted to the packing houses, and, behold, it is done in the name of the poor and the humble. The breakfast table of the laboring man is lugged in here as Exhibit A in the argument of the advocates of the amendment.

I do not care how poor a man may be, he is entitled at least to the poor privilege of knowing that he is eating oleomargarine if that is all he can buy. He is entitled at least to protection against the fraud monger. He is entitled to be shielded against the counterfeiter. He is entitled to know when he sits down at his table and has to eat bull butter to know it is bull butter and not have it sold to him as real dairy butter. This act ought to be entitled "An act to encourage fraud and to render easy the counterfeiting of food products."

Now, mark you, it can not be said that it benefits the poor, because the poor man certainly when he can buy uncolored oleomargarine taxed only one-fourth of a cent a pound will get the oleomargarine cheaper than he will when he must pay a tax of 2 cents a pound and in return enjoy the blessed privilege of having some coloring matter put in it, poisonous or otherwise. The truth is that the man who wants to make oleomargarine intends to sell it not as oleomargarine but as butter.

Oh, but you say it is to be put in a package, and the package is to be branded. Yes; but when the butter is served in the hotels and the restaurants ninety-nine times out of one hundred, and in all the grocery stores where the poor man buys, the package is left off, and the oleomargarine is sold as butter.

Now, that is all there is in this case if you talk about it all night. This is a bold, plain proposal to make it easy for a packing house to sell "bull butter" for cow butter; and I use that term properly, because that is what it is known as in the trade.

I do not know what they make the stuff out of. I read a description the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] put into the Record, and which I assume of course was a correct description. Whatever they make it out of, it is not that product which the human family have regarded as a staple since the days when Abraham gathered his flocks about him. I do not care if all the chemists this side of heaven, living or dead, were to certify to me that a combination of tallow, lard, cottonseed oil, and other products is better than the natural product of that fluid that all members of the human family began life on, that they have used through all the ages—if anybody tells me these chemical compounds are as good as that thing the Lord produced in the chemistry of nature, I do not believe it. At least I insist that the consumer shall know what he is having, and that nobody has any right by law to sanction the counterfeiting of a food product any more than he has to sanction the counterfeiting of the coin of the country.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words concerning this oleomargarine amendment which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] have been discussing. The advocates of this amendment in seeking to maintain it have felt called upon to make some reflections upon the butter industry either as it exists at creameries or on the individual farm. They have charged that butter was produced under conditions even unsanitary, with the result that the product was unwholesome or unhealthy.

Mr. President, I am satisfied that all danger of an unhealthy food product in butter is, under modern conditions and under the care now exercised in making it, reduced to a minimum and that there is scarcely an article of food of any kind or description more free from deleterious substance or ingredient or unwholesomeness of any kind than the butter that is produced on the farm or at the creamery and sold in the market.

I want briefly to call attention to a few of the Federal statutory provisions in regard to inspection that go to insure a pure-butter product. I refer to two or three in the agricultural appropriation bill of the present year, which in these respects, Mr. President, is the same, I understand, as the agricultural bill of a year ago and is now a part of the Federal law.

For inspection and quarantine work, which includes this, "The inspection work relative to the existence of contagious diseases, and the tuberculin and mallein testing of animals," an appropriation for all the items mentioned in the paragraph of \$628,280.

It will be remembered, Mr. President, that it was charged that tuberculosis is a disease frequent in milch cows, and that there is danger of the disease being communicated to the consumer of the butter from such cows. I call attention to another provision. We have an experiment station over here at Bethesda, Md. A part of the work of the experiment station is the "investigations of tuberculin, serums, antitoxins, and analo-

gous products," and so forth, for which an appropriation of \$134,600 is made. I call attention to another provision of this same bill, and it is a part of our present law. "For all necessary expenses for investigations and experiments in dairy industry, cooperative investigations of the dairy industry in the various States, inspection of renovated butter, factories, and markets," an appropriation for these distinctive purposes, all relating to the dairy industry, of \$378,950.

So, Mr. President, from the Federal standpoint it would seem that pretty careful investigation of the dairy industry and the prevention of diseases among cattle and milk cows is provided for.

But, Mr. President, we are not limited in these inspections to insure the purity and wholesomeness of butter to what is done or is required to be done under Federal law.

I think nearly all the States of the Union, especially the States of the East, North, and West, have their dairy-inspection laws. I do not know that South Dakota is any exception to the general rule, for I am assuming, and I think it will be found correct, that nearly all these States have statutes something like that which I now read from the Revised Statutes of my State:

SEC. 2873. No person shall keep cows in a crowded or unhealthy condition for the production of milk for market or for sale or exchange, or to be manufactured into articles of butter or cheese, or feed cows on food that produces impure, unhealthy, diseased, or unwholesome milk, nor sell milk to any person or persons, nor deliver milk from diseased cows to any creamery or cheese factory. No person shall manufacture from impure, unhealthy, diseased, or unwholesome milk, or cream from the same, any article of butter or cheese. Whoever violates the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be punished as hereinafter provided.

Then, there are further provisions in these statutes which relate to the inspection of creameries, and the law requires that he or they who would operate or run a creamery or cheese factory in the State must procure a license and render their business subject to the inspection of the food and dairy commissioner of the State. That inspector makes two inspections and two reports to the governor of the State each year in regard to these various subjects. Penalties are provided for any violation of the law.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President—

Mr. STERLING. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BRADY. When was the law which the Senator from South Dakota has just read enacted?

Mr. STERLING. It was enacted in 1903, and is a part of the Revised Statutes of that year. I read from section 2873 of the Political Code.

Mr. BRADY. And ever since that time the Senator's State has been protecting the dairy interests of the State?

Mr. STERLING. Certainly. There are other very rigorous provisions of the law, I will say to the Senator from Idaho, which I shall not take the time to read. So, Mr. President, we have there this Federal inspection, in the first place; then we have the careful inspection provided for under State law.

Now, what do we have in addition to this official inspection by Federal and by State authorities? We, of course, have the care taken by the farmer himself on his own individual initiative and according to the dictates also of his good common sense. Therefore, under all these wholesome aids and influences, I can not help but think that the danger from an impure butter product is reduced, as I said a while ago, to the very minimum.

I have looked through this Agricultural bill, Mr. President, thinking that I might find something in it relating to the inspection of oleomargarine, but not a line have I been able to find in regard to the inspection of that product, nor do I know of a law on the Federal statute books that requires the inspection of oleomargarine and an investigation into the purity of the various ingredients that enter into that compound.

Mr. President, in these days, when our several States are passing new laws affecting the morals and the safety of the people, we are asking the General Government, as we did in the liquor advertising mailing bill, as we did in the "bone-dry" provision put into the Post Office appropriation bill the other day, to assist the States in carrying out their laws relating to the sale of intoxicating liquors. On the same principle, instead of the Federal Government denying the investigation and the inspection of this food product, oleomargarine, the Federal Government ought to give us ample inspection of it.

Let us glance for a moment, Mr. President, at the economic question involved in this proposed amendment. Whom does it affect, and how many? It vitally affects an industry in which more than 4,500,000 people are engaged, on which they depend, and not alone an industry on which they depend, but upon which the whole country depends. How has this industry been built up in the United States? By hard work, by the exercise of the greatest care and economy. It has been an industry peculiar

in itself in the encouragement it has given to the practice of thrift and economy on the part of that great body of producers, farmers and dairymen, engaged in the business.

Mr. President, that industry has been the salvation of certain parts of our great country. Take the States represented by the Senators from Vermont and New Hampshire—Vermont especially, that great dairy State. Under ordinary agricultural operations, such as the raising of grain, those States found that after a while they could not compete with the agriculture of the broader and the richer plains of the West and the Middle West. So, as a last resort, and for their own protection, they entered upon this great industry, which has made their people thrifty and prosperous and has made their States, otherwise comparatively poor, agriculturally speaking, rich and prosperous States.

In turn, Mr. President, this industry has been a boon to the States of the West. I remember how in the years between 1890 and 1900, those fateful years when in my own State we were visited with drought and with crop failure, the farmers were enabled to "stay by" and live by reason of the cooperative creameries established, as they were throughout a great part of our State, especially that part of it east of the Missouri River. Since that time creameries have been established in those sections west of the river. It is an industry peculiarly adapted to the semiarid regions, where you can not, year in and year out, depend upon the raising of crops.

Take the country over—the East and the West; the North and the South—and it has been the one great industry which has enabled the farmer to diversify the operations of the farm and to build upon that principle which alone can make agriculture successful and prosperous, namely, diversity in the industry and products of the farm.

Mr. President, will this amendment reduce the cost of living? Much has been said already upon that question. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] in his able argument, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and others have all considered it. Will it reduce the cost of living? Well, let us see. If I remember correctly, about 145,000,000 pounds of uncolored oleomargarine were produced last year or during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916. There was a tax of one-fourth of 1 cent a pound on those 145,000,000 pounds. Increase the tax to 2 cents a pound, and let the tax be added to the price, and the consumers of uncolored oleomargarine throughout the United States will pay, because of the tax alone, an addition of about \$2,500,000 for the oleomargarine they consume.

But that is not all. It is fair, I think, to assume, Mr. President, that in addition to the tax the consumer will pay under this amendment for the colored oleomargarine at least 10 cents a pound more than he is now paying for the uncolored product. I think that is a conservative estimate. Ten cents a pound on 145,000,000 pounds makes \$14,500,000. Add that to the \$2,500,000 paid on account of the tax and we have \$17,000,000 added to the cost of that quantity of oleomargarine. That is the tax, the additional burden, you would impose upon the people who consume the food product, and only \$2,500,000, as suggested by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], goes to the Government. So we have \$17,000,000 of tax to the consumers of oleomargarine in the additional price they will pay upon the product, with only two and a half million dollars going to the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, all I have to say, in conclusion, is simply this: That it would be most unjust to put this great and vital industry—the dairy and butter-making industry—in competition with a cheap product, made of cheap ingredients, and which, because of the facilities of the great companies and combinations manufacturing it, is produced at the very minimum of cost.

Is there any interest advocating this so-called Underwood amendment? Yes. The Cottonseed Crushers' Association are advocating it. Think, Mr. President, of the interests aside from this great monopoly that are to be affected, and affected to their detriment, by this proposed law and by the tax which it will impose and the liberties which it will allow in the way of coloring oleomargarine, thus enabling the producers thereof to perpetrate this great fraud upon the public. Yes; there is one other interest.

The great Beef Trust, the National Live Stock Association, is the other interest advocating this amendment, that interest which can take the by-products from the slaughterhouse and pen and manufacture them into oleomargarine with such extraordinary facility as to produce the article, as I said a moment ago, at the lowest possible cost.

Is there any other interest? There is no other interest, Mr. President, unless it be the authorities that have in hand the collection of the tax, the Secretary of the Treasury and the

Commissioner of Internal Revenue; and, if I remember correctly the reading of certain communications from those distinguished gentlemen, they base their argument for this provision on the ground of their individual convenience more than anything else, or the convenience of the Internal-Revenue Bureau of the Treasury Department. I do not believe, Mr. President, that the interests of 4,500,000 people engaged directly in the dairy industry, I do not believe that the interests of the people of the whole country, I do not believe the interests of those who want a cheap but pure food product should be rendered subordinate to the mere convenience of the Treasury Department in collecting this tax.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Asburt	Hollis	Martin, Va.	Simmons
Beckham	Hughes	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.
Brady	Husting	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Brandeggee	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Smoot
Bryan	Jones	Overman	Sterling
Chilton	Kenyon	Page	Stone
Clapp	Kern	Penrose	Thomas
Colt	La Follette	Pittman	Thompson
Cummins	Lane	Poindexter	Vardaman
Curtis	Lea, Tenn.	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Lee, Md.	Reed	Walsh
Fall	Lewis	Robinson	Warren
Fletcher	Lodge	Shafroth	
Gronna	McCumber	Sheppard	
Hitchcock	McLean	Sherman	

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the rest of the evening.

Mr. CHILTON. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is absent on account of illness, and that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] is detained by illness in his family.

Mr. LEWIS. I beg to announce that the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is detained by illness.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have printed in the RECORD certain telegrams that have come to me in the form of petitions. I ask that the first 2 may go into the RECORD in full, and that as to the 11 that follow, as they are all alike, the names of the signers of the telegrams may be noted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that certain telegrams be incorporated in the RECORD, and that two thereof be printed in full. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The telegrams are as follows:

CHEYENNE, WYO., February 23, 1917.

Hon. F. E. WARREN,
Connecticut Apartments, Washington, D. C.:

We will appreciate your good offices in securing the passage of a joint resolution giving from six months to a year before the Reed bill will take effect. Local merchants should have an opportunity to dispose of their stock of goods, and, in the spirit of fairness, we believe the proposition should be met half way.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK.

CHEYENNE, WYO., February 23, 1917.

Senator FRANCIS E. WARREN,
Washington, D. C.:

Please aid in securing passage of a joint resolution allowing six months' or a year's time before the Reed law takes effect.

CITIZENS NATIONAL BANK.

Telegrams from the following firms and citizens in Cheyenne, Wyo.: The Wyoming Commercial Co., R. Myers, R. R. Dodge & Co., The Albany Liquor Co., Charles Becker, The Trailmer Co., The Capital Cafe Co., The P. Schoenhofen Brewing Co., Idelman Bros. Co., Davis Mercantile Co., and The Tivoli Mercantile Co.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent at this time to offer an amendment to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 20783) and ask that it be printed and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LODGE. I desire to offer an amendment to the pending revenue bill (H. R. 20573), which I ask may be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment relieving the Navasota Transfer Co. from further performance of its contracts with the Government, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 20783), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment providing for the payment of the transportation and traveling expenses of certain rifle teams to the national matches at the State Camp, Florida, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 20783), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION—CONFERENCE REPORT (S. DOC. NO. 720).

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I present a conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill, which I ask may be printed, as we will not be ready to take action upon it this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19339) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 10, 14, 21, 24, 26, 29, 30, 44, 45, 48, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 75, 76, 77, 79, 82, and 84.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 12, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 25, 34, 35, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 72, 78, 80, 81, 83, 87, 89, 92, 94, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, and 105, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "establishment" in said amendment insert a comma and the word "equipment," and strike out "\$20,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 9, line 5, strike out "\$1,468,740" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,455,240"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 9, line 6, strike out "\$1,796,640" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,783,140"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of "\$269,200" insert "\$277,580"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the word "equipment" in the Senate amendment strike out the words "and maintenance"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of "\$2,604,956" insert "\$2,613,336"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$3,445,326" insert "\$3,555,326"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$90,010" insert "\$82,510"; and in lieu of "\$15,000" insert "\$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$112,200" insert "\$107,200"; and in lieu of "\$14,000" insert "\$9,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$2,460,530" insert "\$2,480,530"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$3,123,630" insert "\$3,143,630"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Before the figures "\$1,200" in the Senate amendment insert the words "not exceeding"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Transpose the comma and the figures "\$66,100," following the Senate amendment, to a position preceding said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of "\$1,814,567" insert "\$1,817,567"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of "\$3,261,475" insert "\$3,264,475"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$5,709,275" insert "\$5,712,275"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$2,992,580" insert "\$2,972,580"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$3,127,660" insert "\$3,107,660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$813,395" insert "\$843,395"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$1,688,575" insert "\$1,718,575"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the language "same to be additional to the existing 80 acres now used as a plant-introduction field station," and transfer the paragraph as thus amended to page 24, between lines 18 and 19, of the bill; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$139,500" insert "\$104,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$160,000" insert "\$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$24,581,213" insert "\$24,679,113"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "\$25,831,213" insert "\$25,929,113" and strike out the new language added by the Senate amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

E. D. SMITH,
HOKE SMITH,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

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

Managers on the part of the House.

(Mr. HAUGEN agrees to this report, with the exception of the Smoot amendment.)

THE REVENUE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20573) to provide increased revenue to defray the expenses of the increased appropriations for the

Army and Navy and the extensions of fortifications, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I simply rise to suggest that the amendment we were considering has been lost track of altogether. It is section 401.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As amended?

Mr. SIMMONS. As amended. It relates to the issuance of bonds to pay the Spanish War bonds which fall due the 1st day of August, 1918. I suggest that we go back to that and have a vote on it, and then if Senators desire to continue the discussion of the oleomargarine amendment when it is not before the Senate, of course, they are at liberty to do so.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator that we pass over the amendments preceding the oleomargarine amendment, and take up that amendment now and have the discussion finished, and then vote upon it. Then we can return to these other amendments, which I do not think will take very much time. The amendment immediately preceding the oleomargarine amendment will take some little time, but I believe that the Senators who desire to discuss it, or at least some of them, are not here to-night, being unable to be here on account of illness. It seems to me that the best way to proceed would be to pass over the amendments preceding the amendment relating to oleomargarine, take that up now, discuss it, and get through with it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I would more than gladly comply with the suggestion of the Senator from Utah but for the fact that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the author of this amendment, is not in the Chamber. I have tried to reach him and notify him that this amendment probably would be reached to-night, but have failed to do so. If I were to pass over other amendments and take up his amendment out of its order, in his absence, I am afraid he would have just cause of complaint.

Mr. SMOOT. There are a number of speeches yet to be made upon that particular subject. Why not get those speeches upon that question back of us now? Then, of course, if it becomes necessary to lay it aside before adjournment, that can be done.

Mr. SIMMONS. Would the opponents of that amendment agree, if it is taken up now for discussion, to fix a time to vote on it to-morrow?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should be glad personally to do it, but I will say to the Senator that I do not believe that this particular time is the proper time to ask for it. As far as I am concerned, I do not want to say a word upon it. Personally, I am ready to vote upon it now; but I know there are still some Senators who desire to speak upon it. It seems to me that the Senator's suggestion that we were talking about a matter that was not immediately before the Senate was a very proper suggestion to make; and as I know that there are speeches—not long ones, in some cases—which Senators desire to make upon that matter to-night, I made the suggestion that I did.

Mr. SIMMONS. I suggest to the Senator that we have a vote on the amendment that is now pending. It has already been amended, and has been discussed; and there is no reason why we should not have a vote on it, I think. Then we will take up the question of whether we will skip over the intervening amendments.

Mr. SMOOT. That amendment is section 401?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; section 401.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to that, Mr. President.

Mr. SIMMONS. Very well. Then, Mr. President, I ask that that be done.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, let there be no misunderstanding about the matter. I intend to submit some observations upon the so-called Underwood amendment. For a long time I have followed the practice of endeavoring, at any rate, to speak on the subject before the Senate, and I prefer that the bill be pursued in its regular order. When that amendment is reached for consideration I intend to be heard for a few minutes upon it.

Mr. SIMMONS. I knew the Senator felt that way about it, and I am anxious to get that amendment before the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to have the pending amendment stated.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative,

executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 62 and agrees to the same, recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 58 and agrees to the same with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, further insists upon its disagreement to the residue of the amendments of the Senate to the bill, requests a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee, Mr. SISSON, and Mr. GOOD managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

GOVERNMENT OF PORTO RICO—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I submit the conference report on the Porto Rican bill, and ask that it lie on the table and be printed.

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

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9533) "to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 25, 35, 36, 39, 42, 43, 81, 82, 90, 91, 92, and 94.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 37, 38, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 71, 73, 74, 77, 78, 79, 80, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, and 93, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: "That all money derived from any tax levied or assessed for a special purpose shall be treated as a special fund in the Treasury and paid out for such purpose only except upon the approval of the President of the United States"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: "subject to disapproval by the governor if he desires to act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: "and he shall perform such other duties, not inconsistent with this act, as may be prescribed by law"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: "governor, which appeal shall specifically set forth the particular action of the auditor to which exception is taken, with the reason and authorities relied on for reversing such decision. The decision of the governor in such case shall be final, subject to such right of action as may be otherwise provided by law"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: "and no senator or representative shall, during the time for which he shall have been elected, be appointed to any civil office under the Government of Porto Rico, nor be appointed to any office created by act of the legislature during the time for which he shall have been elected until two years after his term of office shall have expired"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following:

"That the first regular session of the Legislature of Porto Rico, provided for by this act, shall convene on the twenty-eighth day after the first election provided for herein, and regular sessions of the legislature shall be held biennially thereafter, convening on the second Monday in February of the year 1919, and on the second Monday in February of each second year thereafter."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following:

"Each house shall keep a journal of its proceedings, and may, in its discretion, from time to time publish the same, and the yeas and nays on any question shall, on the demand of one-fifth of the members present, be entered on the journal.

"The sessions of each house and of the committees of the whole shall be open.

"Neither house shall, without the consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other place than that in which the two houses shall be sitting.

"No law shall be passed except by bill, and no bill shall be so altered or amended on its passage through either house as to change its original purpose.

"No act of the legislature except the general appropriation bills for the expenses of the government shall take effect until 90 days after its passage, unless in case of emergency (which shall be expressed in the preamble or body of the act) the legislature shall by a vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to each house otherwise direct. No bill, except the general appropriation bill for the expenses of the government only, introduced in either house of the legislature after the first 40 days of the session, shall become a law.

"No bill shall be considered or become a law unless referred to a committee, returned therefrom, and printed for the use of the members: *Provided*, That either house may by a majority vote discharge a committee from the consideration of a measure and bring it before the body for consideration.

"No bill, except general appropriation bills, shall be passed containing more than one subject, which shall be clearly expressed in its title; but if any subject shall be embraced in any act which shall not be expressed in the title, such act shall be void only as to so much thereof as shall not be so expressed.

"No law shall be revived, or amended, or the provisions thereof extended or conferred by reference to its title only, but so much thereof as is revived, amended, extended, or conferred shall be reenacted and published at length.

"The presiding officer of each house shall, in the presence of the house over which he presides, sign all bills and joint resolutions passed by the legislature, after their titles shall have been publicly read, immediately before signing; and the fact of signing shall be entered on the journal.

"The legislature shall prescribe by law the number, duties, and compensation of the officers and employees of each house; and no payment shall be made for services to the legislature from the treasury, or be in any way authorized to any person, except to an acting officer or employee elected or appointed in pursuance of law.

"No bill shall be passed giving any extra compensation to any public officer, servant or employee, agent or contractor, after services shall have been rendered or contract made.

"Except as otherwise provided in this act, no law shall extend the term of any public officer, or increase or diminish his salary or emoluments after his election or appointment, nor permit any officer or employee to draw compensation for more than one office or position.

"All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the house of representatives, but the senate may propose or concur with amendments, as in case of other bills.

"The general appropriation bill shall embrace nothing but appropriations for the ordinary expenses of the executive, legislative, and judicial departments, interest on the public debt, and for public schools. All other appropriations shall be made by separate bills, each embracing but one subject.

"Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of both houses may be necessary, except on the question of adjournment, or relating solely to the transaction of business of the two houses, shall be presented to the governor, and before it shall take effect be approved by him, or being disapproved shall be repassed by two-thirds of both houses, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in case of a bill.

"Any person who shall, directly or indirectly, offer, give, or promise any money or thing of value, testimonial, privilege, or personal advantage to any executive or judicial officer or member of the legislature to influence him in the performance of any of his public or official duties, shall be deemed guilty of bribery, and be punished by a fine not exceeding \$5,000, or imprisonment not exceeding five years, or both.

"The offense of corrupt solicitation of members of the legislature, or of public officers of Porto Rico, or of any municipal division thereof, and any occupation or practice of solicitation

of such members or officers to influence their official action, shall be defined by law, and shall be punished by fine and imprisonment.

"In case the available revenues of Porto Rico for any fiscal year, including available surplus in the insular treasury, are insufficient to meet all the appropriations made by the legislature for such year, such appropriations shall be paid in the following order, unless otherwise directed by the governor:

"First class. The ordinary expenses of the legislative, executive, and judicial departments of the State government, and interest on any public debt shall first be paid in full.

"Second class. Appropriations for all institutions, such as the penitentiary, insane asylum, industrial school, and the like, where the inmates are confined involuntarily, shall next be paid in full.

"Third class. Appropriations for education and educational and charitable institutions shall next be paid in full.

"Fourth class. Appropriations for any other officer or officers, bureaus, or boards shall next be paid in full.

"Fifth class. Appropriations for all other purposes shall next be paid.

"That in case there are not sufficient revenues for any fiscal year, including available surplus in the insular treasury, to meet in full the appropriations of said year for all of the said classes of appropriations, then said revenues shall be applied to the classes in the order above named, and if, after the payment of the prior classes in full there are not sufficient revenues for any fiscal year to pay in full the appropriations for that year for the next class, then, in that event, whatever there may be to apply on account of appropriations for said class shall be distributed among said appropriations pro rata according as the amount of each appropriation of that class shall bear to the total amount of all of said appropriations for that class for such fiscal year.

"No appropriation shall be made nor any expenditure authorized by the legislature whereby the expenditure of the government of Porto Rico during any fiscal year shall exceed the total revenue then provided for by law and applicable for such appropriation or expenditure, including any available surplus in the treasury, unless the legislature making such appropriation shall provide for levying a sufficient tax to pay such appropriation or expenditure within such fiscal year.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following:

"That the qualified electors of Porto Rico shall at the next general election choose a Resident Commissioner to the United States, whose term of office shall begin on the date of the issuance of his certificate of election and shall continue until the 4th of March, 1921. At each subsequent election, beginning with the year 1920, the qualified electors of Porto Rico shall choose a Resident Commissioner to the United States, whose term of office shall be four years from the 4th of March following such general election."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: "but the legislature may consolidate departments or abolish any department with the consent of the President of the United States"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following:

"That nothing in this act contained shall be so construed as to abrogate or in any manner impair or effect the provision contained in section 3 of the joint resolution approved May 1, 1900, with respect to the buying, selling, or holding of real estate; that the Governor of Porto Rico shall cause to have made and submitted to Congress at the session beginning the 1st Monday in December, 1917, a report of all the real estate used for the purposes of agriculture and held either directly or indirectly by corporations, partnerships, or individuals in holdings in excess of 500 acres."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate strike out all of section 40 in the engrossed bill; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the enrolling clerk shall renumber the sections of the bill in accordance with this conference report.

JOHN F. SHAFROTH,
JOHN W. KEERN,
MILES POINDEXTER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

W. A. JONES,
FINIS J. GARRETT,
H. M. TOWNER,
Managers on the part of the House.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me to have the action of the House of Representatives on the legislative bill (H. R. 18542) laid before the Senate? Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments and agree to the further conference asked for by the House, the same conferees to be appointed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the parliamentarian at the desk that the Senate can not act upon a House report in this form.

Mr. OVERMAN. I did not understand the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will lay before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the legislative appropriation bill.

The SECRETARY:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
February 23, 1917.

Resolved, That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62 to the bill (H. R. 18542) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes," and agrees to the same.

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58 and agrees to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: " *Provided*, That hereafter no Government official or employee shall receive any salary in connection with his services as such an official or employee from any source other than the Government of the United States, except as may be contributed out of the treasury of any State, county, or municipality, unless otherwise authorized by law, and no person, association, or corporation shall make any contribution to, or in any way supplement the salary of, any Government official or employee for the services performed by him for the Government of the United States, unless otherwise authorized by law. Any person violating any of the terms of this proviso shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$1,000 or imprisonment for not less than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment as the court may determine."

That the House further insists upon its disagreement to the other amendments of the Senate to said bill and asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, Mr. SISSON, and Mr. GOOD be the managers of the conference on the part of the House.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate agree to the conference asked for by the House, further insist on its amendments in disagreement, and that the Chair appoint the conferees.

Mr. POINDEXTER. This report has not yet been printed, has it?

Mr. OVERMAN. No. I do not ask for its consideration now, however.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understood that the motion of the Senator from North Carolina was to agree to the partial report.

Mr. OVERMAN. No; this is a request for a further conference. The House rejected the report and asked for another conference. I move that the Senate agree to the further conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I misunderstood the Senator's motion. I understood the Senator to be submitting a partial report and asking for a further conference.

Mr. OVERMAN. No; the whole matter goes back to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina moves that the Senate insist upon its amendments, grant the further conference asked for by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. BRYAN, and Mr. SMOOT conferees at the further conference on the part of the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. I present the conference report on the legislative, and so forth, appropriation bill, and ask that it lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be received and printed in the RECORD.

The conference report is as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 5, 23, 24, 25, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 51, 53, 55, 59, 61, 69, and 70.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 40, 41, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 54, 56, 57, 60, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, and 71, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Senate resolutions Nos. 561, Sixty-third Congress, third session, and 101, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, are hereby repealed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The Bureau of Efficiency shall investigate the methods of examining and auditing claims against the United States and accounts of disbursing officers, and of accounting for receipts and disbursements and shall submit a report to the Secretary of the Treasury and to Congress, with recommendations, at its next regular session.

"The Bureau of Efficiency shall investigate the work performed by the Subtreasuries and report to the Secretary of the Treasury and to Congress at the beginning of the next regular session what part of the work of the Subtreasuries may be transferred to other offices of the Government, banks of the Federal Reserve System, or farm-loan banks, and for the purpose of this investigation the representatives of the Bureau of Efficiency shall have access to all necessary books and other records of the Government.

"The Bureau of Efficiency shall investigate the methods of transacting the public business in the Civil Service Commission and report to Congress through the President at the next regular session of Congress. The officers and employees of the Civil Service Commission are hereby directed to furnish said bureau with such information as it may require to carry out this provision.

"The Bureau of Efficiency shall ascertain the rates of pay of employees of various State and municipal governments and commercial institutions in different parts of the United States, and shall submit to Congress at its next regular session a report showing how such rates compare with the rates of pay of employees of the Federal Government performing similar services.

"Officers and employees of the executive departments and other establishments shall furnish authorized representatives of the Bureau of Efficiency with all information that the bureau may require for the performance of the duties imposed on it by law, and shall give such representatives access to all records and papers that may be needed for that purpose."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "Departments," insert the following: "and independent establishments of the Government"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For employees now paid from appropriation for emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service, \$4,140"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Federal Farm Loan Bureau: For four members of the board, at \$10,000 each; secretary to the board, \$4,500; chief, bond division, \$3,000; 4 private secretaries, at \$2,000 each; clerks—1 of

class 4, 1 \$900, 3 at \$720 each, 1 \$600; clerk and stenographer, \$1,200; stenographers—7 at \$1,000 each, 4 at \$900 each, 3 at \$720 each; messenger; and 3 assistant messengers; in all, \$77,920.

"For salaries and expenses under the Federal Farm Loan Board created by the act approved July 17, 1916, including the actual necessary traveling expenses of the members of the board and such salaries, fees, and expenses as are authorized by said act, including farm-loan registrars, examiners, and such attorneys, experts, assistants, clerks, laborers, and other employees in the District of Columbia and elsewhere as the Federal Farm Loan Board may find necessary, \$182,080; in all, \$260,000. A detailed statement of expenditures hereunder shall be made to Congress.

"Estimates in detail for all expenditures under the Federal Farm Loan Bureau for the fiscal year 1919, and annually thereafter, shall be submitted to Congress in the annual Book of Estimates."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and in lieu of the matter inserted by said Senate amendment, insert the following: " : *Provided*, That on and after July 1, 1919, no Government official or employee shall receive any salary in connection with his services as such an official or employee from any source other than the Government of the United States, except as may be contributed out of the treasury of any State, county, or municipality, and no person, association, or corporation shall make any contribution to, or in any way supplement the salary of, any Government official or employee for the services performed by him for the Government of the United States. Any person violating any of the terms of this proviso shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$1,000 or imprisonment for not less than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment as the court may determine"; and the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 8. The Bureau of Efficiency shall investigate duplication of service in the various executive departments and establishments of the Government, including bureaus and divisions, and make a report to the President thereon, and the President is hereby authorized, after such report shall have been made to him, wherever he finds such duplications to exist to abolish the same. Report of the action taken hereunder shall be made to Congress at its next regular session."

And the Senate agree to the same.

LEE S. OVERMAN,
N. P. BRYAN,
REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
T. U. SISSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19119) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76 to the bill and agrees to the same with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, further insists upon its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, further insists upon its disagreement to the residue of the amendments, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and had appointed Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, Mr. McANDREWS, and Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota managers at the conference on the part of the House.

THE REVENUE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20573) to provide increased revenues to defray the expenses of the increased appropriations for the Army and Navy and the extensions of fortifications, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] requests that the pending amendment be stated. The Secretary will state the pending amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 11, after line 4, the committee proposes to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 401. That the Secretary of the Treasury in his discretion is hereby authorized to borrow on the credit of the United States a sum not exceeding \$63,945,460 and to prepare and issue therefor bonds of the United States, the proceeds of such bonds to be applied to the redemption on August 1, 1918, of the bonds of the 3 per cent loan of 1908 to 1918 authorized by the act approved June 13, 1898, and then maturing, such proceeds to be applied to no other purpose: *Provided*, That in his discretion the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to receive at the Treasury prior to August 1, 1918, any of the bonds of the 3 per cent loan of 1908 to 1918 maturing on such date and to issue in exchange therefor an equal amount of bonds of the United States herein authorized: *Provided further*, That the bonds herein authorized shall be in such form as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, redeemable and payable at such times within 50 years from date of issue as the Secretary may direct, bearing interest payable quarterly at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, and the bonds herein authorized shall be payable, principal and interest, in United States gold coin of the present standard of value, and both principal and interest shall be exempt from all taxes or duties of the United States as well as from taxation in any form by or under State, municipal, or local authority, and said bonds shall not be receivable by the Treasurer of the United States as security for the issue of circulating notes to national banks: *Provided further*, That said bonds may be disposed of by sale or exchange by the Secretary of the Treasury at not less than par, under such regulations as he may prescribe, and in case of sale all citizens of the United States shall be given an equal opportunity to subscribe therefor, but no commissions shall be allowed or paid thereon, and a sum not exceeding one-fifth of 1 per cent of the amount of bonds herein authorized to be issued is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to pay the expenses of preparing, advertising, and issuing the same and the expenses of refunding the bonds of the 3 per cent loan of 1908 to 1918: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed as modifying section 11 of the act approved March 14, 1900, authorizing the refunding of the bonds of the 3 per cent loan of 1908 to 1918 into 2 per cent consols of the United States bearing the circulation privilege: *Provided further*, That in lieu of any of the bonds provided for in this act the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized in his discretion to issue serial bonds of the United States maturing in equal amounts from 1 year from date of issue to 25 years from date of issue at a rate of interest not exceeding one-fourth of 1 per cent in excess of the rates provided for in this act.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Is the last proviso a committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a proviso to the committee amendment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That the Senate has already agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has. It amended the committee amendment accordingly.

Mr. WEEKS. I wish to make an inquiry. I did not understand exactly the committee amendment which has been amended since the bill was presented, whether it was made mandatory for the Secretary of the Treasury to issue these bonds in serial form or—

Mr. SIMMONS. Permissive only.

Mr. WEEKS. I wish to ask the Senator from North Carolina if he does not think that the Senate should take positive action in this matter and require that the Government bonds issued hereafter should be issued in serial form.

Mr. SIMMONS. One difficulty, I imagine, would be the market value of these short-term bonds as compared with the market value of longer term bonds.

Mr. WEEKS. I have made very careful inquiry among bond men who are thoroughly conversant with the market for bonds of all kinds, and it is the universal opinion that a serial bond under present conditions sells as readily and at as high a price as a sinking-fund bond or any other bond.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think I might with propriety state that in a conversation I recently had with the Secretary of the Treasury he expressed to me the opinion that it would be difficult to float at this time a short-term bond as low as 3 per cent.

Mr. WEEKS. I am quite in agreement with the Secretary of the Treasury on that proposition. I think it would be difficult to float any considerable issue of bonds on a 3 per cent basis. If we were actually in a state of war I have no doubt that the patriotic sentiment would be such that any rate which the Government wished to place on its bonds would bring about a flotation of a considerable issue, but it is below the market rate for bonds to-day. Not very long ago the State of Massachusetts, which has excellent credit, as the Senator knows, issued, I think, five or ten million dollars of 4 per cent bonds that sold on only a 3.9 per cent basis. They were retailed on about a 3.7 basis. Since that time, since the breaking of relations with Germany, municipal and State and governmental bonds have increased in the rate of interest which they carry from one-tenth to one-fourth of 1 per cent. So I think it will be fair to say that the very best bonds issued by our State would not sell on a much better than 4 per cent basis, if any. Under those circumstances I do not think a Government bond which has not the privilege of

issuing circulation against it would sell much better than on a $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent basis.

I think that if any issue of bonds is to be made it should bear $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent interest, and then it will sell at a sufficient premium to make the net rate which it would bear a fair market rate. I am afraid that a 3 per cent rate will not go, and it would be a great misfortune for the Government to attempt to sell bonds and not have them all taken.

It is possible, of course, that this issue of \$63,000,000 might sell on a 3 per cent basis, but it certainly would not sell unless the bonds carried a provision which would enable those who bought the bonds to refund them on the same basis that future issues might be made; that is to say, we are almost sure to make other issues; in fact, this bill provides for issuing more bonds; and if we could sell this issue of \$63,000,000 on a 3 per cent basis it would be necessary to give the privilege to those who buy the bonds to refund them on a $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent basis, or whatever basis future issues are sold upon.

Mr. SIMMONS. I agree with the Senator about that; and I think that would be a very good provision.

Mr. WEEKS. I wish to say to the Senator that I have included paragraph 401 in the substitute which I have offered to the bill. If the Senator insists on taking it up now, I should like to have time enough to prepare an amendment which would cover what I think are very safe restrictions relating to an issue of bonds of this kind.

This paragraph itself, Mr. President, illustrates the carelessness and unbusinesslike way in which we have been handling our Government indebtedness. These were Spanish War bonds. They should have been retired within 20 years—that is, by next year—and yet we made no provision for their retirement, and now the proposition which came in here from the committee provides that they shall be refunded for 50 years. It is perfectly ridiculous from any business standpoint to issue Spanish War bonds running for 20 years and then refund them for 50 years, making the Spanish War debt last 70 years. That ought not to be done. I hope the Senator will be willing to allow this to be passed and let me prepare the amendment. These bonds have been redeemable ever since 1908, I understand, but the Government has not redeemed them.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will state to the Senator that I am sure the Secretary of the Treasury is under the impression that he would not at this time have any serious difficulty in floating these bonds at 3 per cent. I am sure he also feels that he could not float a short-term bond at that rate. I think, however, if the amendment the Senator suggests allowing them hereafter to be taken up when a higher rate bond is issued, provided the market of other bonds should be increased, helps the situation very much. If the Senator desires until to-morrow to prepare the amendment and will then offer it I have no objection to letting the matter go over.

Mr. WEEKS. I think it would be along the line of good legislation if that were done.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no objection to letting the amendment go over until to-morrow in order to give the Senator from Massachusetts time to prepare his amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will take up the section just read.

Mr. SIMMONS. That, however, goes over at the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts, if the Senator understood my statement.

Mr. SHERMAN. That it go over in the hope of attaching the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts; but I wish to apply myself to some other features of the amendment, not only those referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts but some of the general aspects of the section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS in the chair). The Chair desires to make an inquiry. Is there a mutual agreement that the Senate shall recess at 11 o'clock?

Mr. SIMMONS. No, Mr. President; there is none, but I will move that the Senate take a recess—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I offer two amendments to the bill (H. R. 20573), to be printed.

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

RECESS.

Mr. SIMMONS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 10.30 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock p. m., Friday, February 23, 1917) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, February 24, 1917, at 10.30 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 23, 1917.

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

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

O Lord God Almighty, arouse within us the holy spirit of truth that we may think clearly, do justly, and follow the dictates of conscience in the abnormal conditions which confront us, arising out of the widespread clash of arms around us; that we may quit ourselves like men and leave behind us a record which we can look back upon with just pride; and Thine be the praise through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the location of the armor-plate plant.

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

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker; I ask unanimous consent for permission to extend my remarks very briefly on the subject of making the days longer.

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a short editorial from the Washington Post this morning advising the people to go slow on war; also one from the Akron Beacon-Journal, which suggests the mobilization of the editors of the country for fighting purposes. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by presenting a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington in regard to preparedness and to extend remarks on other subjects in connection therewith.

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

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. 8126. An act to extend the time for the cutting of timber on the Coconino and Tusayan National Forests in Arizona; and

S. 7710. An act to amend the irrigation act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stats., p. 1095), section 18, and to amend section 2 of the act of May 11, 1898 (30 Stats., p. 404).

CONFERENCE REPORT, PAYMENT OF FINDINGS, COURT OF CLAIMS.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the conference report on the bill S. 1878.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1878. An act making appropriations for payment of certain claims in accordance with the findings of the Court of Claims reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and Tucker Acts, and under the provisions of section 151 of the act approved March 3, 1911, commonly known as the Judicial Code.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the report was read on yesterday, and I would ask that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read the statement.

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1514).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1878) making appropriation for payment of certain claims in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and Tucker Acts, and under the provisions of section No. 151 of the act approved March 3, 1911, commonly known as the Judicial Code, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert the following:

"ALABAMA.

"To the legal representatives of Isaiah Attaway, deceased, of Macon County, \$275.

"To Jane P. Paulk, of Bullock County, \$635.

"To the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church of Pleasant Springs, \$350.

"GEORGIA.

"To the trustees of the First Baptist Church of Rome, \$870.

"KENTUCKY.

"To R. W. Harris, administrator of James P. Harris, of Floyd County, \$330.

"To the vestry of Ascension Protestant Episcopal Church, of Mount Sterling, \$825.

"To the fiscal court of Oldham County, \$1,100.

"To the treasurer of the Christian Church of Stanford, \$420.

"LOUISIANA.

"To Madeleine Lement, administratrix of Pierre Lement, of St. Landry Parish, \$295.

"To Kate P. McWaters, Margaret McWaters Bell, James H. McWaters, B. P. McWaters, and Moses McWaters, jr., in equal shares, heirs of Moses McWaters, of West Feliciana Parish, \$950.

"MARYLAND.

"To the heirs of William H. Bradshaw, of Frederick County, \$137.50.

"MISSISSIPPI.

"To the trustees of the Protestant Orphan Asylum at Natchez, \$3,500.

"MISSOURI.

"To William W. Green, of Camden County, \$270.

"NORTH CAROLINA.

"To Sarah F. Trenwith, executrix of C. F. Simpson, deceased, of Craven County, \$815.

"To the deacons of Baptist Church of Beaufort, \$250.

"OHIO.

"To the trustees of the African Methodist Episcopal Church of Gallipolis, \$250.

"SOUTH CAROLINA.

"To John Duncan, surviving partner of the firm of Duncan & Son, of Charleston, \$8,450.

"To the trustees of Beaverdam Baptist Church, of Marlboro County, \$1,600.

"To the trustees of St. John's Baptist Church, of Bamberg County, \$275.

"TENNESSEE.

"To Lulu H. Doyle and Anna V. Berry, sole heirs of Patrick H. and Margaret E. Watkins, deceased, of Hamilton County, \$333.34.

"To the trustees of the Hobson Methodist Church of Davidson County, \$1,800.

"To the treasurer of the corporation of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Chattanooga, \$500.

"To the trustees of the Christian Church of Columbia, \$375.

"To the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Murfreesboro, \$900.

"To the trustees of the McKendree Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Nashville, \$1,200.

"To the trustees of Liberty Springs Missionary Baptist Church, of Stewart County, \$475.

"VIRGINIA.

"To Lucy E. Johnson and John A. Johnson, sole heirs of Armistead M. Johnson, deceased, of Loudoun County, \$784.

"To the session of the Presbyterian Church of Greenwood, \$100.

"To the trustees of the Christian Church of Suffolk, \$540.

"WEST VIRGINIA.

"To the legal representatives of Josiah M. Davisson, deceased, of Taylor County, \$720.

"To the trustees of Christ Protestant Episcopal Church, of Bunker Hill, \$300.

"Sec. 2. That the foregoing several sums be, and they are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purposes of this act.

"Sec. 3. That in case of the death of any claimant, or the death or discharge of the executor or administrator of any claimant herein named, payment of such claim shall be made to the legal representatives: *Provided*, That where a claimant is dead the administrator, executor, or legal representative shall file a certified copy of his bond, which bond must be at least equal in amount to the sum hereby appropriated: *Provided further*, That in all cases where the original claimants were adjudicated bankrupts payment shall be made to the legal representatives or next of kin instead of to the assignees in bankruptcy: *And provided further*, That wherever under this act it is provided that a payment be made to an executor or an administrator, whether original or ancillary or de bonis non, and such executor or administrator is dead or no longer holds his office, payment shall be made to the successor therein, his title to hold such office being established to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury; and wherever under this act it is provided that a payment be made to a corporation or quasi corporation and such corporation or quasi corporation has been merged in or consolidated with another corporation or quasi corporation, payment shall be made to the corporation or quasi corporation with which the consolidation or merger has been made."

And the House agree to the same.

A. W. GREGG,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
B. K. FOCHT,
Managers on the part of the House.
N. P. BRYAN,
JOS. T. ROBINSON,
A. J. GRONNA,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1878) making appropriation for payment of certain claims in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims, reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts, and under the provisions of section No. 151 of the act approved March 3, 1911, commonly known as the Judicial Code, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying report as to each of the amendments of the House, namely:

On amendment No. 1: This amendment provides that the receipt of the claimants for the amounts appropriated in the bill shall be a full and final release and discharge of their respective claims. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 2: This amendment strikes out the claim of Anastacio de Baca, administrator of Francisco de Baca. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 3: This amendment strikes out the claim of Prairie County, Ark. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 4: This amendment inserts 32 new claims at the end of the Senate bill, and also inserts the appropriating section and a section providing that in case of the death of any claimant payment shall be made to the legal representatives. The Senate recedes and agrees with an amendment, omitting the claim of the legal representatives of Samuel Schiffer and correcting an error in printing an initial.

A. W. GREGG,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
B. K. FOCHT,

Managers on the part of the House.

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

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

DISPOSITION OF PAPERS IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following reports:

Mr. TALBOTT, from the Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, reported that that committee had examined the useless files and papers in the following departments and found that they are not needed in the transaction of current business of such departments and

bureaus and have no permanent value or historical interest, and submitted reports thereon:

Department of Labor (H. Doc. 1135; H. Rept. 1542);
Department of the Interior (H. Doc. 1814; H. Rept. 1542);
Department of Labor (H. Doc. 1996; H. Rept. 1542); and
Post Office Department (H. Doc. 2042; H. Rept. 1543).

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed and filed.

NANCY E. MULLINS.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 18566, unanimously reported from the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 18566) for the relief of Mrs. Nancy E. Mullins.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Nancy E. Mullins, mother of W. S. Mullins, late captain Company I, First Regiment Mississippi National Guard, shall be regarded as the duly designated beneficiary of the late Capt. W. S. Mullins under the act approved May 11, 1908, as amended by the act approved March 3, 1909.

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

CONFERENCE REPORTS—PENSION BILLS.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. To call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 18181) entitled "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 SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1537).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18181) entitled "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," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 22, 33, and 41.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, and 49, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$30"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out and in lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$24"; and the Senate agree to the same.

ISAAC R. SHERWOOD,
JOE J. RUSSELL,
JNO. W. LANGLEY,

Managers on the part of the House.

CHARLES F. JOHNSON,
WM. HUGHES,
REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18181) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of the soldiers and sailors of said war, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference as to each of said amendments, namely:

On amendment No. 1 (case of Robert Leeson): Provides increase of pension to \$24, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$30, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 2 (case of Mary Lenz): Strikes out the provision for pension for Mary Lenz.

On amendment No. 3 (case of Josiah Swails): Provides increase of pension to \$36, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$50, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 4: Strikes out the provision for pension for Margaret Wilson.

On amendment No. 5 (case of Horace L. Brown): Provides increase of pension to \$30, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$36, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 6 (case of Joseph Walker): Provides increase of pension to \$24, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$30, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 7 (case of James M. Gibbons): Correction in spelling.

On amendment No. 8 (case of Alexander Wilson): Correction in spelling.

On amendment No. 9 (case of Alexander Wilson): Provides for increase of pension to \$24, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$30, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 10: Strikes out the provision for pension for George F. Derr.

On amendment No. 11: Strikes out the provision for pension for John L. Andrews.

On amendment No. 12 (case of Ransom W. Dwyer): Correction in phraseology.

On amendment No. 13 (case of William M. Horrad): Correction in phraseology.

On amendment No. 14: Strikes out provision for pension for John B. Cason.

On amendment No. 15: Provides for increase of pension for Adam Lambert to \$30, instead of \$36, as provided by the House, and \$24, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 16 (case of Carroll C. M. Frame): Strikes out provision for increase of pension.

On amendment No. 18: Strikes out provision for pension for Catherine Steele.

On amendment No. 19 (case of Ferdinand Opperman): Provides for increase of pension to \$24, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$30, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 20: Strikes out provision for pension for Serelda Pargin.

On amendment No. 21 (case of Nelson W. Haskell): Provides for increase of pension to \$24, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$27, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 22 (case of Thomas W. Elliott): Provides for increase of pension to \$40, as provided by the House, instead of \$30, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 23 (case of Wyatt L. Starrett): Correction in spelling.

On amendment No. 24 (case of Henry H. Stevens): Provides for increase of pension to \$24, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$30, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 25: Strikes out provision for pension for James Cottman.

On amendment No. 26: Strikes out provision for pension for Laura E. Smith.

On amendment No. 27 (case of Parker T. Gibbs): Provides for increase of pension to \$40, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$50, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 28: Correction in initial (George F. Cooper).

On amendment No. 29 (case of William H. Weaver): Correction in phraseology.

On amendment No. 30 (case of Samuel L. Kennedy): Correction in phraseology.

On amendment No. 31 (case of Robert W. Ross): Provides for increase of pension to \$24, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$30, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 32 (case of Isaac Lambert): Correction in spelling.

On amendment No. 33 (Frances McGee): Restores the provision for pension as provided by the House which was stricken out by the Senate.

On amendment No. 34 (Robert W. Johnson): Provides for increase of pension to \$24, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$30, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 35: Strikes out provision for pension of Green Williams.

On amendment No. 36 (case of Miles Beckwith): Correction in phraseology.

On amendment No. 37 (case of Nathan Baker): Provides for increase of pension to \$40, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$50, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 38 (case of Joseph L. Reel): Provides for increase of pension to \$24 instead of \$30, as provided by the House, which was stricken out by the Senate.

On amendment No. 39: Strikes out provision for pension for William Sprouse.

On amendment No. 40: Strikes out provision for pension for William G. Jackson.

On amendment No. 41 (case of Michael Russell): Provides for increase of pension to \$40, as provided by the House, instead of \$30, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 42 (case of Frederick Mayer): Provides for increase of pension to \$30, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$36, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 43 (case of John E. Opdyke): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 44: Strikes out provision for pension for Whitfield H. Lance.

On amendment No. 45: Strikes out provision for pension for James J. Short.

On amendment No. 46: Strikes out provision for pension for Edgar W. Rose.

On amendment No. 47 (case of Gilbert O. Hoffman): Correction in phraseology.

On amendment No. 48: Strikes out provision for pension for Samuel P. Young.

On amendment No. 49 (case of Elizabeth C. Wallace): Correction in phraseology.

ISAAC R. SHERWOOD,
JOE J. RUSSELL,
JNO. W. LANGLEY,

Managers on the part of the House.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 19937, of same title.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report. The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1539).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19937) entitled "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," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8, 9, 27, 36, 43, and 49.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, 48, 50, 52, and 53, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$30"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out, and in lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$24"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$36"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$36"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Insert the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "Regiment" where it first occurs; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$36"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out, and in lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$24"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 62, line 5, of the bill, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$24"; and the Senate agree to the same.

ISAAC R. SHERWOOD,
JOE J. RUSSELL,
JNO. W. LANGLEY,

Managers on the part of the House.

CHARLES F. JOHNSON,
WM. HUGHES,
REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19937) 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, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference as to each of said amendments, namely:

On amendment No. 1: Strikes out provision for pension for Cordelia Briggs.

On amendment No. 2 (case of Alexander Swisher): Provides for increase of pension to \$30, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$36, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 3 (case of John F. Michael): Provides for increase of pension to \$30, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$36, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 4 (case of James H. Campbell): Provides for increase of pension to \$30, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$36, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 5 (case of David Gilchrist): Strikes out provision for increase of pension.

On amendment No. 6 (case of Henry C. Bowers): Correction in spelling.

On amendment No. 7: Strikes out provision for pension for Thomas Phillips.

On amendment No. 8 (case of Henriette L. Eggert): Restores provision for pension provided by the House, but stricken out by the Senate.

On amendment No. 9 (case of George Lee): Provides for increase of pension to \$36, as provided by the House, instead of \$30, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 10: Strikes out provision for pension for Alonzo Pendland.

On amendment No. 11: Strikes out provision for pension for Charles S. Hubbard.

On amendment No. 12 (case of Philip McKinney): Provides for increase to \$24, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$30, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 13 (case of George Lloyd): Provides for increase to \$24, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$27, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 14 (case of Cornelius McCafferty): Provides for increase of pension to \$30, instead of \$27, as provided by the Senate, and \$40, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 15: Strikes out provision for pension for Frederick Brunner.

On amendment No. 16: Strikes out provision for pension for Annie M. France.

On amendment No. 17: Strikes out provision for pension for Henry O. Nickerson.

On amendment No. 18: Strikes out provision for pension for Samuel Shoup.

On amendment No. 19 (case of Andrew Kerr): Provides for increase to \$30, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$40, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 20 (case of J. Harrison Rennard) : Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 21: Provides for increase of pension of Isaiah E. Lawrence to \$24 instead of \$30, as provided by the House, which had been stricken out by the Senate.

On amendment No. 22 (case of Alethea L. Sands) : Provides for increase of pension to \$24, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$30, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 23: Strikes out provision for pension for Margaret McEvoy.

On amendment No. 24: Strikes out provision for pension for Lucy W. Lockwood.

On amendment No. 25 (case of Francis R. Culp) : Provides for increase of pension to \$30, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$36, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 26 (case of Pitsar Ingram) : Correction in spelling.

On amendment No. 27 (case of Pitsar Ingram) : Provides for increase of pension to \$30, as provided by the House, instead of \$24, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 28 (case of Alanson Tilden) : Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 29 (case of Charles H. Williams) : Provides for increase of pension to \$30, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$36, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 30 (case of John B. Gillaspie) : Provides increase of pension to \$24, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$30, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 31 (case of Edmond Ames) : Provides for increase to \$36, instead of \$30, as provided by the Senate, and \$40, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 32 (case of Benjamin B. Griffith) : Provides for increase to \$24, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$30, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 33: Strikes out provision for pension for Horace F. Calkins.

On amendment No. 34 (case of John E. Whipple) : Provides for increase of pension to \$30, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$36, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 35 (case of William Heller) : Provides for increase of pension to \$36, instead of \$40, as provided by the Senate, and \$30, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 36 (case of William G. Richey) : Provides for increase of pension to \$36, as provided by the House, instead of \$30, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 37 (case of Charles Young) : Correction in service.

On amendment No. 38 (case of George R. Bowker) : Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 39 (case of James B. Erskine) : Correction in phraseology.

On amendment No. 40 (case of James B. Erskine) : Correction in punctuation.

On amendment No. 41 (case of Samuel B. Shadle) : Provides for increase of pension to \$30, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$36, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 42 (case of Daniel Hough) : Provides for increase of pension to \$24, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$36, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 43 (case of William H. Cranston) : Provides for increase of pension to \$50, as provided by the House, instead of \$72, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 44: Strikes out provision for pension for Albert Bennett.

On amendment No. 45 (case of Victor E. Burnham) : Provides for increase of pension to \$36 instead of \$40, as provided by the House, and \$30, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 46 (case of John A. Medley) : Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 47 (case of Dorothy Fisher) : Correction in spelling.

On amendment No. 50 (case of William W. Keen) : Provides for increase of pension to \$24, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$30, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 49 (case of Charles Grant) : Provides for increase of pension to \$50, as provided by the House, instead of \$40, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 50 (case of William W. Keen) : Provides for pension at \$24, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$30, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 51 (case of John Cochrane) : Provides for increase to \$24 instead of \$30, as provided by the House, which was stricken out by the Senate.

On amendment No. 52 (case of Levi Coon) : Strikes out provision for increase.

On amendment No. 53 (case of Emily W. Lothrop) : Correction in spelling.

On amendment No. 54 (case of Henrietta Nokes) : Provides for increase of pension to \$24, on account of the support of a dependent child.

ISAAC R. SHERWOOD,
JOS. J. RUSSELL,
JNO. W. LANGLEY,

Managers on the part of the House.

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

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Did the House ask for the conferences?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. The House asked for a conference in two cases and the Senate in the last case. The next case the Senate asked for a conference.

Mr. MANN. This one now pending? This is a House bill with Senate amendments, and I take it the Senate asked for a conference.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. The House bill with Senate amendments. We asked in the last case for conferees so as to expedite the time, and the clerk of the Senate committee told me the committee said for us to go ahead and put all through at once.

Mr. MANN. I know; but the clerk of a Senate committee is not the man who regulates the parliamentary procedure by a long shot.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I understand; but it has been done sometimes, and I thought there would be no objection to it.

Mr. MANN. I am not going to object to it, but the House that agrees to the conference ought to act on it first.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. The third case is H. R. 20451. In that case the Senate asked for the conference and we agreed to it.

Mr. MANN. It is very bad practice and mixes everybody up, and nobody can keep track of the thing easily, much less the clerks, unless we follow the established practice.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I hope the gentleman will not object. I want to get them through and in the hands of the enrolling clerk.

Mr. MANN. I am not going to object. It will not take any longer for the Senate to act first.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. We would have to take the matter up here, and it would cause some little delay.

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

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 20451, of similar title.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report. The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1538).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 20451) entitled "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," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 10, 12, 20, 22, 25, and 28.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$30"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$36"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$30"; and the Senate agree to the same.

ISAAC R. SHERWOOD,
JOE J. RUSSELL,
JNO. W. LANGLEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

CHARLES F. JOHNSON,
WM. HUGHES,
REED SMOOT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 20451) 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 submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference as to each of said amendments, namely:

On amendment No. 1: Strikes out provision for pension for Jackson S. Fugate.

On amendment No. 2 (case of Fannie J. B. Kelley): Provides for increase to \$25, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$40, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 3 (case of Martin Waymire): Provides for increase to \$24, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$30, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 4 (case of Michael T. Dwyer): Provides for increase of pension to \$24, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$30, as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 5 (case of Daniel Torpy): Provides for increase to \$40, as proposed by the House, instead of \$30, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment No. 6 (case of Emma Koontz): Change in phraseology.

On amendment No. 7 (case of Newton E. Eldred): Provides for increase of pension to \$30, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$36, as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 8 (case of Thomas H. Glenn): Provides for increase to \$30, instead of \$24, as proposed by the Senate, and \$36, as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 9 (case of Emergene J. Mitchell): Provides for increase to \$24, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$30, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 10 (case of Clarinda Branch): Provides for increase to \$20, as proposed by the House, which was stricken out by the Senate.

On amendment No. 11 (case of Edgar G. Spaid): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 12 (case of John W. Echols): Provides for increase of pension of James W. Echols, as proposed by the House, which was stricken out by the Senate.

On amendment No. 13 (case of Ogden C. Lowell): Provides for increase to \$24, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$30, as proposed by the House.

On amendments Nos. 14 and 15 (case of Margaret I. Reider): Correction in name.

On amendment No. 16: Strike out provision for increase of pension of George C. Wachob.

On amendment No. 17 (case of Robert Walker): Provides for increase of pension to \$24, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$30, as provided by the House.

On amendment No. 18: Strikes out the provision for pension of Charlotte M. Eckstine.

On amendment No. 19: Strikes out provision for pension of Edward H. Miner.

On amendment No. 20 (case of Charles Michel): Provides for increase of pension to \$24, as proposed by the House, which was stricken out by the Senate.

On amendment No. 21: Strikes out provision for pension of James T. Rolff.

On amendment No. 22 (case of Timothy J. Hurlbut): Provides for increase of pension to \$30 per month, as proposed by the House, which was stricken out by the Senate.

On amendment No. 23 (case of James A. Hibbard): Provides for increase to \$50, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$40, as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 24: Strikes out provision for pension of Sarah E. Freed.

On amendment No. 25 (case of Anna Sophia Moldenhauer): Provides for pension of \$20, as proposed by the House, which was stricken out by the Senate.

On amendment No. 26 (case of William M. Fultz): Provides for increase of pension to \$36 instead of \$30 as proposed by the Senate and \$40 as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 27 (case of Louisa M. Tobey): Provides for increase of pension to \$24 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$30 as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 28 (case of Charles Henry): Provides for increase of pension to \$30, as proposed by the House, which was stricken out by the Senate.

On amendment No. 29: Strikes out provision for pension of Charles W. Everson.

On amendment No. 30 (case of Jacob F. Minch): Provides for increase of pension to \$30, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$36, as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 31: Strikes out provision for pension of Anna Smith.

On amendment No. 32 (case of John W. Pence): Provides for increase to \$30, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$36, as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 33 (case of George W. Easton): Provides for increase to \$24, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$40, as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 34 (case of William Vanatta): Provides for increase to \$30, instead of \$36, as proposed by the House, and \$24, as proposed by the Senate.

ISAAC R. SHERWOOD,
JOE J. RUSSELL,
JNO. W. LANGLEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

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

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is that all of the pension bills?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. That is all of the conference reports. There are two Senate bills here.

The SPEAKER. I know; but you can not get them up now. Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. That is what I thought.

INTOXICATING LIQUORS IN NATIONAL PARKS, ETC.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill S. 4862, an act to exclude intoxicating liquors from national parks and national forest reserves, and ask that it be placed before the House for consideration, a similar bill (H. R. 6814) being on the calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will withdraw that for the time being. He will have plenty of opportunity to bring that up.

Mr. RANDALL. I will say to the gentleman who has made Milwaukee famous that I withdrew it yesterday on his request.

Mr. STAFFORD. I recognize that. I had an understanding with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands, who reported this bill, that he would not bring it up until there was a large membership in the House, and I had his assurance to that effect.

Mr. RANDALL. The Record does not show that any such agreement was made.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was a private understanding had with the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Wisconsin after the matter was withdrawn.

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman from Wisconsin requested that it be withdrawn yesterday on account of the exercises on Washington's Birthday. Now that is over, and the session of Congress will soon be over.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the bill S. 4862.

During the reading,

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a point of order in due season about the bill not being of right before the House at this time.

The SPEAKER. What is the trouble with it?

Mr. STAFFORD. If the Chair will hear me, first, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there has not been a House bill of substantially the same character favorably reported by a committee of the House. Next, I make the point of order that the Committee on the Public Lands has not by motion directed that this Senate bill be taken from the Speaker's table and considered, as required under section 2 of Rule XXIV.

The SPEAKER. Now, the Chair overrules the first point of order and will hear the gentleman on the second point.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is a question of fact. I will ask any member of the Committee on the Public Lands, the chairman of the committee not being here, if any action has been taken by

that committee authorizing the gentleman from California to bring up this bill and take it from the Speaker's table.

Mr. RANDALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. RANDALL. The chairman himself called up the bill yesterday, and the author of the bill—

Mr. STAFFORD. There has been no action taken, Mr. Speaker, and the gentleman virtually admits it, authorizing the gentleman from California [Mr. RANDALL] to bring up this bill and take it from the Speaker's table. The rule is clear that it is one of the express conditions before a bill can be taken from the Speaker's table that the committee which has acted upon a bill substantially the same has authorized the person to make the motion.

The SPEAKER. There is no question in the world about that rule. Now, the Chair will ask the gentleman from California [Mr. RANDALL] whether the Committee on Public Lands authorized him to call this bill up?

Mr. RANDALL. The chairman of the Committee on Public Lands has so authorized me.

The SPEAKER. I know; but the chairman can not do that. The Chair will render his opinion after investigating thoroughly the rulings in the Sixty-second Congress. It takes an actual meeting of the committee. It can not be done even by getting a majority of the committee to sign. And if the committee did not authorize it, the point of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is well taken.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to ask the indulgence of the Chair before he rules on the first point of order, that the matter go over, and that he grant me the privilege to be heard on that point of order.

The SPEAKER. Let the matter go over, and the Chair will get the two bills. The Chair is proceeding on the statement of the gentleman from California [Mr. RANDALL] that these two bills are practically the same.

Mr. STAFFORD. They are not.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 18894. An act to amend the public-building act approved March 4, 1913, authorizing the acquisition of a suitable site for a public building at Pittston, Pa.; and

H. R. 16855. An act for the relief of Riverside Military Academy.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the following titles:

H. R. 19300. An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918;

H. R. 19937. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 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 the soldiers and sailors of said war.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution and bills of the following titles:

S. J. Res. 201. Joint resolution requesting the President of the United States to designate and appoint a day on which funds may be raised for the relief of the Ruthenians (Ukrainians);

S. 8252. An act to authorize the change of name of the steamer *Charles L. Hutchinson* to *Fayette Brown*; and

S. 7601. An act for the relief of Caleb T. Holland.

BILLS STRICKEN FROM CALENDAR.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, there are four bills on the Private Calendar that have been taken care of in other legislation. Therefore, I desire to ask unanimous consent that these bills be stricken from the calendar and lie on the table. I send a list of them to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the annotations.

The Clerk read as follows:

Private bills to be stricken from the Private Calendar:

Calendar No. 251 (H. R. 13636) for the relief of E. L. Jennings.

Calendar No. 256 (S. 606) for the relief of James C. Hilton.

Calendar No. 535 (S. 4368) for the relief of D. A. Barbour and Andrew P. Gladden.

Calendar No. 544 (S. 5768) for the relief of Frank Carpenter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the bills should be left hanging between heaven and earth. The gentleman ought to ask unanimous consent that they be laid on the table.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. That was my request. I first said "Speaker's table," and then suggested that they be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, these bills will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying statement be read in lieu of the conference report.

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

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, nobody will listen to it anyhow. The statement is longer than the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I withdraw the request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee withdraws the request. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1540).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 5, 23, 24, 25, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 51, 53, 55, 59, 61, 69, and 70.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 40, 41, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 54, 56, 57, 60, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, and 68, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Senate resolutions numbered 561, Sixty-third Congress, third session, and 101, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, are hereby repealed"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Amend the matter inserted by said amendment as follows: In line 10, strike out the word "or" and in lieu thereof insert a comma (,); in the same line, after the word "System," insert "or farm loan banks." In line 16, strike out the word "Senate" and in lieu thereof insert "Congress." In line 20, strike out the word "resolution" and in lieu thereof insert "provision"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "departments," insert the following: "and independent establishments of the Government"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For employees now paid from appropriation for emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service, \$4,140"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: " : *Provided*, That hereafter no Government official or employee shall receive any salary in connection with his services as such an official or employee from any source other than the Government of the United States, except as may be contributed out of the treasury of any State, county, or municipality, and no person, association, or corporation shall make any contribution to, or in any way supplement the salary of, any Government official or employee for the services performed by him for the Government of the United States. Any person violating any of the terms of this proviso shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$1,000 or imprisonment for not less than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment as the court may determine"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"In order to promote economy in the distribution of supplies and in auditing and accounting, the Postmaster General may hereafter designate districts and central offices in such districts through which supplies shall be distributed and accounts rendered and may establish such branch offices within such districts as he may deem necessary; but in no case shall the postmaster at the central office be given authority to abolish offices, to change officers or employees in offices included in such districts: *Provided*, That any district established hereunder shall not extend beyond a county except in cities lying within two or more counties."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 8. The Bureau of Efficiency shall investigate duplication of service in the various executive departments and establishments of the Government, including bureaus and divisions, and make a report to the President thereon, and the President is hereby authorized, after such report shall have been made to him, wherever he finds such duplications to exist to abolish the same. Report of the action taken hereunder shall be made to Congress at its next regular session."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 20, 21, 22, and 71.

JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
T. U. SISSON,
JAMES W. GOOD,

Managers on the part of the House.

LEE S. OVERMAN,
N. P. BRYAN,
REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of the said amendments, namely:

On Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4, relating to the Senate: Strikes out the provision, proposed by the Senate for an additional assistant clerk at \$1,440 to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; appropriates \$1,800, as proposed by the Senate, for rent of a warehouse for storage of public documents; inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate repealing certain Senate resolutions, modified so as to eliminate from such repeal Senate resolution No. 421, Sixty-third Congress, second session.

On No. 5: Appropriates for clerk hire to Members and Delegates, as proposed by the House, instead of as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 9, relating to the Library of Congress: Appropriates \$900, as proposed by the Senate, for an assistant in the reading room for the blind; makes the appropriations of \$1,400 for waterproofing parts of the east driveway and \$1,075 for fire hose and fittings "immediately available," as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 10: Makes the appropriation of \$12,000 for the Botanical Garden available for the purchase of "office equipment," as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 11, 12, and 13, relating to the Bureau of Efficiency: Appropriates \$60,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$43,000, as proposed by the House; inserts the paragraphs, proposed by the Senate, for an investigation by the Bureau of Efficiency of auditing and examining claims and the accounts of disbursing officers, an investigation of the work performed by the Subtreasuries, an investigation of the methods of transacting public business in the Civil Service Commission, an investigation of the rates of pay of employees of State and municipal governments and commercial institutions as compared with rates of pay of the Federal Government for similar services, an investigation of the classification, salary, and efficiency of Government employees in the District of Columbia; and requires officers and employees of the Government to furnish representatives of the bureau with information necessary for the performance of the duties imposed upon it by law.

On No. 14, relating to the Civil Service Commission: Limits the appropriation of \$7,500 for field examiners at the rate of \$1,500 per annum to five persons, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 15, 16, 17, and 18, relating to the State Department: Provides for a chauffeur at \$1,080, and strikes out provision for a driver at \$840 and a hostler at \$720; appropriates \$4,140, as proposed by the Senate, for employees now paid from the appropriation for emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service, and makes the appropriation of \$4,000 for an automobile, for official use of the Secretary of State, immediately available, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 19: Abolishes the branch printing office in the State, War, and Navy Department Building, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 23: Strikes out the appropriation of \$250, proposed by the Senate, for law books for the Comptroller of the Treasury.

On Nos. 24 and 25, relating to the Office of the Auditor for the Navy Department: Transfers a clerk of class 3 from the register's office, as proposed by the House, instead of a clerk of class 4, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 26: Provides for an "unapportioned" check assorter at \$900, as proposed by the Senate, in the Office of the Auditor for the Interior Department.

On Nos. 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31, relating to the Office of the Auditor for the Post Office Department: Appropriates \$254,730, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$284,730, as proposed by the House, for compensation of employees auditing accounts and vouchers of the Postal Service, and makes permanent, as proposed by the Senate, the authority granted the Secretary of the Treasury to diminish positions as vacancies occur and use the unexpended balances of salaries for the payment of employees in auditing accounts.

On Nos. 32, 33, and 34: Omits a clerk of class 3 in the office of the register, as proposed by the House, instead of one of class 4, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 35 and 36: Appropriates \$1,400, as proposed by the Senate, for a private secretary for the captain commandant in the Office of the Coast Guard.

On Nos. 37, 38, and 39: Appropriates \$4,500 for the pay of the Chief of the Secret Service Division and \$3,500 for the assistant chief, as proposed by the House, instead of \$4,000 and \$3,000, respectively, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 40 and 41: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the language relative to per diem in lieu of subsistence in appropriations for collecting internal revenue.

On Nos. 42, 43, and 44: Provides for 61 assistant messengers, as proposed by the House, instead of 40, as proposed by the Senate, in the Office of The Adjutant General, and restores the language, stricken out by the Senate, requiring employees of The Adjutant General's Office to be exclusively engaged on the work of his office during the fiscal year 1918.

On No. 45: Appropriates \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, for a blue-printing plant in the Bureau of Steam Engineering of the Navy Department.

On Nos. 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, and 51, relating to the General Land Office: Provides for two additional clerks at \$1,600 each, three additional clerks at \$1,400 each, four additional clerks at \$1,200 each, and four additional clerks at \$1,000 each, as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out the paragraph, inserted by the Senate, authorizing the use of \$6,500 of the appropriation for surveying for the current year in the payment of field employees detailed to the General Land Office.

On Nos. 52, 53, 54, and 55, relating to the Pension Office: Strikes out a chief of division at \$2,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides for a law clerk at \$2,250, as proposed by the House, instead of a chief of the law division at the same salary, as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out the language,

inserted by the Senate, modifying the limitation on the filling of vacancies occurring during the fiscal year 1918.

On Nos. 56 and 57, relating to the Patent Office: Appropriates \$10,000 for special and temporary services of typewriters to keep current the work of furnishing manuscript copies of records; and inserts authority for the purchase of law books, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 58, relating to the Bureau of Education and the General Education Board: Inserts a substitute for the matter proposed by the Senate which prohibits Government officials and employees from receiving salary as such officials from any source other than the United States Government or State, county, or municipal governments and affixes a penalty for the violation of the act.

On No. 59: Strikes out the appropriations of \$20,000 for rent for the Geological Survey and \$6,000 for the Bureau of Mines, proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 60, 61, and 62, relating to the Post Office Department: Appropriates for the officers and employees of the Post Office Department in the manner proposed by the Senate, instead of in the manner proposed by the House; strikes out the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, placing postmasters in the classified service; inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, relative to central accounting and distributing districts in the Postal Service, modified so as to prevent any district which may be established from extending beyond a county.

On Nos. 63, 64, and 65, relating to the Census Office: Provides for an additional chief statistician, at \$3,000, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates \$647,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$512,000, as proposed by the House, for securing information for census reports.

On No. 66: Appropriates \$120,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$110,000, as proposed by the House, for contingent expenses of the Steamboat-Inspection Service.

On No. 67: Increases the amount for personal services in Washington that may be used from the appropriation for the enforcement of wireless-communication laws from \$7,150 to \$8,050, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 68: Reduces the rate per day to be paid to experts and temporary assistants in Children's Bureau from \$8 to \$6, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 69 and 70, relating to the Court of Claims: Provides for four stenographers, at \$1,200 each, as proposed by the House, instead of five stenographers, at \$1,200 each, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 72, relating to the section authorizing the President to report upon the coordination of the work of the departments: Inserts a substitute for the Senate amendment requiring the Bureau of Efficiency to investigate the duplication of work and to report such duplication of service to the President; and gives the President authority to abolish duplications where they may be found to exist.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the following amendments of the Senate:

On Nos. 20 and 21: Relating to an assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, at \$5,000 per annum from March 1, 1917, to June 30, 1918.

On No. 22: Relating to the appropriations for the Federal Farm Loan Board.

On No. 71: Relating to increased compensation during the fiscal year 1918 to employees provided for in the bill.

JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
T. U. SISSON,
JAMES W. GOOD,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is entitled to an hour.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman to yield some time on amendment No. 62.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. STEENERSON. Well, I would like to have 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Can not the gentleman get along on five minutes? We have some other matters to discuss on this report, and the sundry civil bill is pending in the House.

Mr. STEENERSON. I might cut it down to 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, amendment numbered 62 comes back here with an amendment which simply provides "That any district established hereunder shall not extend be-

yond the county except in cities lying within two or more counties." It may extend in such cases to two or more counties.

This is a provision for branch post offices. It is the provision that has been before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads several times in various forms and before the House of Representatives in various forms, and it has been voted down. It was placed in the Postal Savings Bank bill last year in conference—or, rather, it was put in by the Senate and was taken out in conference. It reappeared and was inserted again in the Post Office appropriation bill. It came here as an amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill on day before yesterday, and upon a vote it was stricken out.

Notwithstanding the fact that the House had stricken it out, the conferees on this bill included the same provision in this agreement. It reads:

In order to promote economy in the distribution of supplies and in auditing and accounting, the Postmaster General may hereafter designate districts and central offices in such districts through which supplies shall be distributed and accounts rendered, and may establish such branch offices within such districts—

And this is the meat in the coconut—

such branch offices within such districts as he may deem necessary; but in no case shall the postmaster at the central office be given authority to abolish offices, to change officers or employees in offices included in such districts: *Provided*, That any district established hereunder shall not extend beyond a county, except in cities lying within two or more counties.

That last is the proviso I have just read—that it shall not embrace more than one county, except when a town is situated in two or more counties.

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

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Under the amendment that the gentleman refers to, in the counties, may the Postmaster General abolish post offices and establish branch offices?

Mr. STEENERSON. Certainly; and this does not change the proposition in the slightest degree. They have never advocated, before the committee or anywhere else, that they would establish larger postal districts, in the first instance, than a county. They said they would probably have one head office in each county. This, however, authorizes them to establish a head office for two or more counties where a city is located in two or more counties.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will state to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that that would not apply possibly to any place except New York and Boston.

Mr. STEENERSON. But it authorizes the establishment of branch offices in such districts as they may prescribe. This limitation does not amount to anything here. It is the same provision that we voted down yesterday.

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

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. Does not the gentleman construe this amendment to mean that it would apply to rural districts and counties as well as cities?

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. Then the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] is not correct when he says it applies only to cities like New York and Boston?

Mr. STEENERSON. He is not. I disagree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This amendment on its face shows that it applies only to the cases mentioned by the gentleman from Minnesota, to cities lying within two or more counties.

Mr. CANNON. That is the exception.

Mr. STEENERSON. That is not what it means at all.

Mr. CANNON. It applies to all other counties.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes. It applies to all other counties.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. These shall be limited to the county.

Mr. HAMLIN. And they may have one office in the county and all the other offices are branches.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. One accounting office in a county.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, this is a repetition of the process of trying to deceive this House by "jokers" which nobody understands. This provision is intended to reach the third and fourth class post offices. Nobody claims there is economy in it or anything else, except to make third and fourth class post offices account to the larger offices. This is intended and will accomplish the abolition of all third-class offices now in the United States, because they will be attached to the larger first and second class offices for these purposes. They will be branch offices, and a clerk under the civil service will be put in charge of those offices.

That is what it means. The Post Office Department will not deny it. I have discussed it with the Post Office Department officials for several years. It is in line with their particular hobby. It is in line with their proposition to make all post offices a part of the classified civil service.

This will accomplish that same purpose to the extent that it will only retain an office in the postal district created by the order of the Postmaster General. They may create 3,000 postal districts, which will be one district for each county, or they may create 1,500, which will put two counties in each district. We have about enough first and second class offices to supply the requirement as distributing points in 1,500 districts. There are more than 6,000 third-class offices, which, of course, would be made branch offices; and a branch office is well recognized under the postal laws. It is an office that is put in charge of a civil-service clerk. It seems to me that after the House voted this down two or three days ago it would be ridiculous to vote it up now. The only thing you can do is to vote down the conference report and refuse to agree to this part of it. There is a disagreement on this bill, anyway. That is, this report is not final. It does not embrace all the items in dispute on this bill between the two Houses, and therefore it will not delay the matter if you disagree to this amendment No. 62 as amended by the conferees. It will expedite it just as much to disagree to it, because there must be another conference upon the remaining disagreements, anyway.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEENERSON. I have very little time.

Mr. BLACK. I know the gentleman is well posted on this subject.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. And on every other.

Mr. BLACK. Is not this the same amendment we voted on in the House here a few days ago?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; exactly; and on motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BLACKMON] we struck out the words "branch offices," which left it so that they could establish postal districts for the distribution of supplies to fourth-class offices; and that is the only item on which they claim they can economize. Now, to show you how ridiculous some of the claims of the department are, the Auditor for the Post Office Department, before the Appropriations Committee of this House, stated that he would save \$30,000 by this item; that the estimates were \$30,000 less if they got this provision. The hearings two years ago upon this subject before the Post Office Committee showed that in every instance where they had established a branch office the expenditures had increased from \$500 to \$1,000. And to cap the climax of inconsistency the Postmaster General handed me a letter a short time ago in which it was stated that this provision would save \$250,000. But all of the savings that they have contended for consist in bookkeeping, keeping the accounts of some 50,000 fourth-class offices. The motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BLACKMON], which we sustained day before yesterday, I think unanimously, leaves that provision so that you can get all the economy there is in it. There is nothing left except the permission that they can make branch offices wherever they please. It covers first, second, and third class offices. That the House does not want. We have already rejected it.

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon].

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, this amendment probably ought to have been upon the Post Office appropriation bill instead of upon the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, just, perhaps, as the prohibition amendment ought to have been on some other bill than the Post Office bill; but the Senate has seen fit to make its amendments as it has, and of course we must consider them as made.

There is a good deal of misunderstanding about this proposition. Gentlemen are of the opinion that the purpose of it is to abolish second and third class offices and put them under the control of some dominant first-class office in the county or district, and therefore affect the civil service to that extent. That is not true in reference to this matter. It is a business proposition for the saving of money in the administration of the postal affairs.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does this apply to fourth-class post offices?

Mr. MOON. It applies to fourth-class post offices. Now, I want to try to explain this matter. The amendment as now

reported by the conferees and insisted upon by them reads this way:

In order to promote economy in the distribution of supplies, and in auditing and accounting, the Postmaster General may hereafter designate districts and central offices in such districts through which supplies shall be distributed and accounts rendered, and may establish such branch offices within such districts as he may deem necessary; but in no case shall the postmaster at the central office be given authority to abolish offices, to change officers or employees in offices included in such districts: *Provided*, That any district established hereunder shall not extend beyond a county except in cities lying within two or more counties.

Now, there are post offices in cities in the United States that extend beyond the boundaries of a single county, and this proviso is intended to apply to those cases.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOON. I wanted to discuss this for a moment without being interrupted; but if the gentleman insists, I suppose I shall have to quit.

Mr. DOWELL. Under this amendment you provide that he may establish such branch offices within such district as may be necessary. Under the law the Postmaster General may abolish the offices, may he not?

Mr. MOON. Of course; some of them.

Mr. DOWELL. This does not permit the postmaster to abolish an office, but the Postmaster General may do so. Then there is a provision here for the establishment of branch offices, and under this provision is it not possible that both the fourth and third class offices might be abolished and branch offices established within the county?

Mr. MOON. The gentleman has simply stated the question I was about to discuss.

Mr. DOWELL. I am asking for information.

Mr. MOON. I am not going to answer questions categorically unless I want to. I yielded to the gentleman to ask a question, and I will answer it in my own way. Now, before that question was asked I was proceeding to discuss this question. I took up the proviso first to show the necessity where there was an office whose jurisdiction spreads over two counties that the act be made to apply to both, because you do not want a divided jurisdiction as to a particular office. But the act applies only to single counties outside of that situation.

Mr. STEENERSON. It applies to every county in the United States.

Mr. MOON. Why, of course; to every single county in the United States, but not to any combination of counties.

Mr. STEENERSON. If the gentleman—

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman allow me—

Mr. MOON. No; I can not. I do not want to be interrupted any more until I have finished what I have to say. If I can have an opportunity to say what I mean, then I will yield to anybody for a question; but I do not like to be interrupted and thrown off the line of argument I am intending to make by a lot of questions that I am proposing to answer, if I can, before the inquiry is made.

Let us look at this proposition a moment, gentlemen. What is the purpose of it?

In order to promote economy in the distribution of supplies and in auditing and accounting the Postmaster General may hereafter designate districts and central offices in such districts through which supplies shall be distributed and accounts rendered, and may establish such branch offices within such districts as he may deem necessary.

Now, I take it that every gentleman in this House wants to promote economy in the distribution of supplies, and he wants to promote economy in auditing and accounting in these offices. The question is, Can it be done? You have counties, and we take the county as a unit. Here we have 20 post offices, say, in one county. Each one of these 20 post offices renders an account to the Post Office Department at Washington of the condition of the office, and it requires an auditing and accounting here. Now, if they made a statement without extra cost, and there would be none under the law, to a central office in that county, there would be 20 accounts disposed of there by a return to the postmaster at the central office; and in Washington, instead of auditing 20 accounts from that one county, you would have to audit but 1, and we would transact the business of the office in a more orderly way and with a better system of bookkeeping. In view of that item the Senate has reduced the expenses affecting that item alone \$30,000, which will be saved if this provision is adopted. It will be a convenience to the department and a wiser and better system of bookkeeping. I may say also that it will facilitate the distribution of the supplies and save a large amount of money in that way. The whole provision will save \$250,000, as I am advised.

The Postmaster General is to establish branch offices in the district as he may deem necessary. Now, why is it that a

branch office should not be established, if one is necessary, to promote economy and the distribution of supplies and the accounting in that business. It seems to me it is hardly necessary to argue a question of that sort. Why prohibit him from establishing a branch office when it will promote economy and save money in a single county and in all counties. You say that he may abolish some post offices and that he may change employees. Let us see what the act says:

But in no case shall the postmaster at the central office be given authority to abolish offices, to change officers or employees in offices included in such district.

Now what does that mean?

Mr. STEENERSON. But the Postmaster General has that authority.

Mr. MOON. I do not yield now. I am going to present my views upon the question, and then I will yield if I have time.

Now, the postmaster at the central office can not do it—he is prohibited from doing it—and that is the main and disturbing proposition. The Postmaster General has got that authority to-day, this does not prohibit him, but it prohibits the postmaster at the central office from doing it. The Postmaster General has the power to-day under the law to change these offices, so far as fourth-class postmasters are concerned, and 90 per cent of the offices in these counties are fourth-class post offices. But gentlemen fear that there is going to be a change of second and third class offices. There is no indication of it, and the best judgment of the Post Office Department is against it, and all considerations of orderly business transactions and common sense would not justify any suspicion of that sort. The President himself under the power now existing might remove any second or third class postmaster, but he could not—except temporarily—name another without the advice and consent of the Senate, so this provision would not and could not put first, second, and third class postmasters under civil service. Fourth-class postmasters are now under it. It is not proper to limit the power and discretion of the Postmaster General, in order to prevent the consolidation of offices, if it appears that the general purpose will result in the general good, just for mere fear that somebody in a second or third class post office may be disturbed. I am not in favor of disturbing these people in these offices. I believe there is nothing here that will justify that fear.

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

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I want to put in the Record a few reasons from the Post Office Department affecting this question, and why the Senate amendment should be agreed to, as I have not time to discuss them.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to, furnished by the Post Office Department, is as follows:

It is very desirable that amendment 62 of the legislative, judicial, and executive bill, authorizing the establishment of branch offices, be adopted as agreed to by the conferees and the words "for such purposes," which were included in the Senate amendment, be eliminated. If they are retained it would practically nullify the usefulness of the proposed amendment, because—

(a) It would limit the establishment of such branch offices solely to the purposes of accounting and distribution of supplies, for which purpose they are unnecessary, as these functions would be performed by the accounting offices.

(b) It would prevent the extension of City Delivery Service to such branches, and there are many towns to which such service could be extended at a reasonable cost, thus increasing the efficiency of the Postal Service and its advantages to the public.

(c) Under the present law for the establishment of branch offices it is impossible to provide adequate service in boom towns, such as those where munition and other large manufacturing establishments are located, because it is necessary to establish fourth-class offices at such places, and they must continue as such for a year, making it impossible to provide adequate postal facilities. This could be obviated if the department had authority to establish branches at such places and make them a part of the nearest large office.

(d) It would prevent the establishment of stations at points where the troops are mobilized, as such mobilization camps are frequently located far distant from a large office and the only service that can be rendered such camps is from a near-by fourth-class office, which makes it impossible to render efficient service.

(e) It would limit the economical administration of the service by continuing the establishment of independent offices which are unnecessary.

(f) It would also provide for a different class of offices and branches than those now in existence, which would be very confusing in the administration of the service.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the amendment under consideration is an important and far-reaching one, and whatever your opinion may be with regard to it, the matter at least should have your very careful consideration. It proposes a plan and a program that would largely revolutionize the postal situation in

the country. Gentlemen who are favoring the amendment lay great stress on its first provision, under which the Postmaster General may create districts within which supplies may be delivered and within which joint reports may be made. None of us have any objection to that. I think that is a very excellent proposition. It will probably result in economy. It might be well to have the country postmaster in a county seat handle the supplies for the entire county and become the accounting officer of the department for the entire county and all the offices in the county. I hope that will prove to be a wise provision.

But the conferees have written into their agreement a provision that was neither in the Senate bill nor has at any time been agreed to by the House. On the other hand, the House has strenuously opposed it whenever the opportunity to do so has been given. Furthermore, the conferees went beyond their power and authority and jurisdiction as conferees, in my opinion.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If that be true—

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, it is too late to make a point of order now. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Wyoming happened to be called out at the time this was taken up and lost the opportunity. I am not sure that the point of order would be sustained, but I have an idea that it might have been. The provision, as agreed to by the conferees, provides that the Postmaster General may establish such branch offices in the districts he creates as he may deem necessary. Here is a provision under which districts are to be established for report, for the handling of supplies, and, in addition to that, the Postmaster General is to be given authority to establish branch offices in such districts. No such authority is now vested in the Postmaster General. If it were, this would not be necessary. The result of this provision would be that it would be entirely possible within a few years, by the abolishment of fourth-class offices, by failure to appoint fourth-class postmasters, to finally create a condition in which there would be only one postmaster in a district.

Under the plan that gentlemen have in mind the county seat in a majority of cases would be the central office in a given district. While gentlemen are careful to say that the postmaster of the central office may not abolish offices, they are equally careful not to provide that the Postmaster General may not do so. Clearly, the House would not have supported a proposition under which a given postmaster at the county seat might abolish offices. But in my opinion the House should not approve a provision under which the Postmaster General may do that thing. There may be some argument in favor of a centralized postal system, such as is proposed. If post offices and the Postal Service were entirely free from all political influences and could be kept free from political influences, it is possible, I grant you, that a system of this sort under civil service might have some advantages—might have. I doubt if it would have, but it might have. But the post offices are not free from political influences. The post offices will not in our time be entirely free from political influences, and this amendment as agreed to by the conferees provides for the establishment of the finest political system that has ever been suggested by anyone; under it the postmaster in a county seat would be practically the dispenser of all of the patronage for his county or district.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Why is this provision in this bill? Does not the mere fact that it is inserted in this bill, where it does not belong, suggest that there is some scheme behind it?

Mr. MONDELL. Of course, there is a scheme behind it. It is a scheme that certain gentlemen have been trying to write into law for a long time on one bill or another, and they have tried it first on one bill and then on another. Finally, they have gotten the conferees upon this bill to accept an adroitly worded provision under which they have accomplished their purpose, without that accomplishment being plain enough on its face that "he who runs may read," unless he read carefully.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. COX. If there is any scheme in this proposal, it must be laid at the door of the junior Senator from the State of Washington over at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know about that; but I know, and the gentleman knows, that this proposition of having postal districts within which to establish a local postal czar has been agitated for some time, and the House, so far as I have understood it, has been almost solidly against it.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will not the effect of this be, if adopted, to aid by indirection the scheme to classify postmasters which the House so overwhelmingly repudiated the other day?

Mr. MONDELL. It does in a way classify postmasters, because the clerk or the official in charge of the branch office would probably be under the classified service; and he would be the lieutenant of the postmaster in the central office in a business way and in a political way.

Mr. LANGLEY. The effect would be to aid in the extension of that general scheme.

Mr. MONDELL. I am not so much worried about whatever aid this might render toward the extension of civil service. I believe in civil service of the right kind, and where it can be properly operated. For nearly 20 years I had the nominating of all of the postmasters in my State, and I never care to have that responsibility again. It never did assist me politically, in my opinion. It was a trying and vexatious duty. I tried to perform my duty in making those nominations, but if we are to depart from the system now established and maintained, let us depart from it intelligently, and not, under a pretense of reform, actually establish a spoils system more objectionable than any we have ever had in connection with the Postal Service. [Applause.] That is exactly what we would do if we adopted this conference report and this amendment. We would enable the Post Office Department to establish a system under which, scattered all over the country, would be these zones, these districts of local political authority. Just now they would be in Democratic hands. When the administration changes, they will be in Republican hands; but they will be almost as objectionable in one case as in the other.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I understand that one of the objects of this amendment is economy. As a matter of fact, would it not require—

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

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman grant me two minutes more.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am very sorry, but I have more requests for time now than I can fulfill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. The argument in opposition to this proposition is based on fear. This proposal has not its genesis with the present Postmaster General. It first originated more than eight years ago with a committee of expert accountants employed to investigate the conditions in the Post Office Department and to make a report as to economies in the administration of the department and the Postal Service. I happened to be chairman of the subcommittee that went over that voluminous report. The special accountants recommended that instead of imposing this burden of accounting on little post offices to report to the Post Office Department here in Washington with the same minutia of detail as if it were a first, second, or third class office, that it would be a better economical business management to enable them to purchase their supplies from a central office established in a nearby neighborhood. There was no attempt at that time to discontinue the fourth-class post offices. There is no attempt by this provision to discontinue the fourth-class post offices. The Postmaster General has the same authority to do that without this amendment as he has with it. But I direct the attention of the committee to what really is proposed by this proposal. You will notice that it is for the purpose of promoting economy in the distribution of supplies and in auditing and accounting and of authorizing the Postmaster General to designate districts and central offices. What is proposed under this authority? The department instead of sending out supplies to every little fourth-class post office, where the salary is two, three, or four hundred dollars, will send supplies to some central office in the county. That central office will furnish the printed matter, will furnish the stamps, will furnish the money-order blanks, and all matters of that kind to these little fourth-class post offices, and the fourth-class post offices, instead of being compelled to account directly for money-order blanks or order for stamps, or order for stamped envelopes, or other things that the post offices are required to do, will be saved of that burden. Any person who is acquainted with the conditions will realize that it is in the interest of economy. Now, assuming the system has been established, the fourth-class post offices will get supplies perhaps from the office at the county seat. That will give the gentleman who happens to be postmaster at the county seat no greater authority than he has to-day in the management of the post office.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman overlooks the fact that the Blackmon amendment, which was adopted as part of this same provision in the Post Office bill, leaves this provision intact, and only struck out the branch post offices—

Mr. STAFFORD. I overlooked nothing. I am discussing this proposition, and I overlooked nothing in the amendment. The gentleman is conjuring up fears, as other gentleman have, of a political bugaboo. The gentleman from Wyoming frankly admits fourth-class postmasters' appointments are a political handicap.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not yield further. No matter how you study this proposition you will see the one and only purpose of it is to relieve the fourth-class postmasters of the detail of accounting in the purchase of their supplies. Nothing further, and the committee has gone further and restricted it so that the supplying office can not cover more than one county; that the district must be coterminous with the county, unless the post office happens to be located in two counties.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Do I understand it includes all the fourth-class post offices? How about the second and third?

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman thinks the Postmaster General will eliminate second and third class offices, a second-class office where the post-office receipts must be above \$40,000. It is beyond comprehension to me, even including the third-class offices, I will say to the gentleman frankly—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BLACKMON]. [Applause.]

Mr. BLACKMON. Mr. Speaker, the amendment to the legislative bill presents a rather novel proposition. The Post Office Committee of the House has repeatedly turned down the proposition here asserted, and only two days ago the House of Representatives, by an overwhelming majority, went on record as opposing the proposition here asserted, and yet it is claimed that the persistent efforts to force this provision mean nothing. If they do not, I want to ask the House why, then, is it placed on the legislative bill, a place where, it must be conceded, such a provision is not entitled to be? If it does not mean exactly what it says, that is, that it authorizes the Postmaster General to make substations out of presidential offices, then it means nothing on earth. [Applause.]

Again there is another reason aside from this why we should turn down this provision. Coming as it does on the legislative bill shows that the Postmaster General or some one else is evidently undertaking to do that which, as I have said, is in direct conflict with the will of this body heretofore expressed when this identical proposition was placed squarely before us.

I submit that the Appropriations Committee has no jurisdiction whatever of the subject matter of the proposed amendment. It seems to me, therefore, that the House of Representatives ought not to stand for it. In view of this performance, I am not surprised at the strong opposition that developed among Members when it was suggested that we have a budget committee, and that the budget committee should be the Appropriations Committee of the House. I for one, and in my judgment, the House, will never allow the Appropriations Committee, or any other committee, to assume jurisdiction over a subject which clearly belongs to another and legally constituted committee of the House. If the Appropriations Committee can take a provision that has been rejected by a regularly and legally constituted committee of the House, and, indeed, by the House itself, and place it on a conference report on another bill in disregard of the wishes of the House, what excuse or purpose can we give for the existence of any other committee?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACKMON. I do.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say to the gentleman that the amendment was put on in the Senate, if I remember correctly, by the Senator from Washington, and the Senate conferees insisted strongly that the amendment should go on in order to reach a conclusion and make a report to the House, and the House conferees yielded because they thought the amendment was proper. I think that the reflection that the gentleman is seeking to make against the Appropriations Committee of the House is wholly unfounded and unjust.

Mr. BLACKMON. I am not making any reflection against anyone in the House, but the conferees from the House of Representatives ought to have known that two days ago this House overwhelmingly said, "We will not stand for this provision"; and if there is any criticism it is of the conferees for consenting to do that which they know, or ought to have known, that the body they represent had turned down.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say to the gentleman that the House conferees have been in conference several days upon this proposition, and, so far as I am personally concerned, I knew nothing about any action taken by the House two days ago or at any other time on a proposition similar to this.

Mr. BURNETT. Does not the gentleman know it is a matter over which this committee had no jurisdiction?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BLACKMON] has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads I am more or less familiar with the proposition now under discussion, and I thoroughly concur with my colleagues on that committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BLACKMON] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON], in the statements which they have just made that this amendment as sought to be modified by the conferees ought not to be agreed to. [Applause.]

There is one feature that would follow the adoption of this suggested amendment that has been overlooked in the speeches just made by the gentlemen who have addressed the House, and that is that if the Postmaster General, acting under the authority which would be granted him by this proposal, should abolish certain post offices in a county and make them branch offices of a central office he would not have the power to reestablish such offices, if the need for it should arise, except by express statutory enactment. In other words, if I interpret the situation correctly, if we should adopt such a law as is proposed in this amendment, then we ought to follow it up with a general provision giving the Postmaster General authority to restore what he had discontinued whenever in his judgment the needs of the public service should require it. We had a concrete example of what I am talking about when the gentleman from California [Mr. RANDALL], a member of our committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, came before the House the other day with a bill seeking to give the Postmaster General authority to restore post offices that had been abolished and made branch offices under the authority that the Postmaster General now has to establish branch offices in villages, towns, or cities of 1,500 or more inhabitants not distant more than 5 miles, as near as may be, from the center boundary or limits of such city or town in which the principal office is located. According to the ruling of the Postmaster General, as I understand he has expressed it to Mr. RANDALL, after a post office has once been abolished and made a branch office to a central office, then it matters not how irksome the change may become to the patrons or how inconvenient the change may be, you can not restore the offices except by an act of Congress giving the Postmaster General the authority to discontinue such branch offices and reestablish them as separate and independent post offices.

If I have not stated correctly the interpretation which Postmaster General Burleson places on existing law, then I would like to be corrected. But I am sure I have made no mistake in what I have stated to the House in respect to this matter. The gentleman from California [Mr. RANDALL] stated to the House the other day, when he was endeavoring to get his bill up for consideration, that the patrons of the post offices which had been discontinued and made branch offices of the Los Angeles post office were dissatisfied with the change, and want again to have their offices made separate post offices, but that the Postmaster General had told him that, notwithstanding he was inclined to do so, and would like to do so, that he did not have the authority to reestablish them except by authority of an act of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, let there be no misapprehension concerning the extent of the authority granted to the Postmaster General by the provision which we now have under discussion. I have read it very carefully, and it is my opinion that under it he will have the unquestioned authority to establish a central office in every county of the United States, and make every other office in the county a branch office to that central office; and, according to my interpretation of it, it can not mean anything else. Now, what does a branch office mean? It means that the office in question loses its identity as a separate office and becomes attached as a branch to such designated central office. I do not believe that this House wants to place that authority in the hands of the Postmaster General, and has expressed itself directly to the contrary within the last few days. [Applause.]

Now, if the phrase "and may establish such branch offices within such districts as he may deem necessary" is omitted, I apprehend that this House will be willing to accept the rest of the provision without objection.

Now, upon the general proposition that the establishment of branch offices would promote economy and efficiency of the service I will say to you that if I believed that result would follow, then I would advocate the amendment. I would not consciously oppose any amendment to the postal laws and

regulations which I believed would promote economy and efficiency in the Postal Service.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I regret to say that I can not; I have not the time. I have only two minutes. But I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] that the investigation that our committee has made of this subject, and which we have approached with no other idea or purpose than to conserve the interests of the people, brings us to the unquestioned opinion that it will not work for economy and the betterment of the service; and therefore I hope that the House will stand by the Senate amendment as it now appears in the Senate bill on page 120, and will not consent to the modification of that amendment by agreeing that the phrase "and may establish such branch offices within such districts as he may deem necessary." [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BLACKMON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], who last addressed the House. I am satisfied that this legislation should not be enacted for any reason that has been assigned. As to the method by which legislation is to be forced through the House or the Senate from time to time, so far as that is concerned, it arises largely out of the rules of the House and the Senate, which put nine-tenths of all the important legislation upon appropriation bills that must pass. But I will not discuss that. It is funny, if it were not serious, but the Senate, or somebody, when they set their head for legislation, take all the chances. The Post Office Committee has this identical matter in conference now on substantially similar amendment, but they can not wait. They put it on the legislative bill. They want to attach it here, there, and yonder. Whether it will get on the deficiency bill or the Military Academy bill, God knows! You have got to watch it [laughter] when you deal—and I speak respectfully of the other branch of Congress—with the Senate, and under the practice that has grown up somewhat in the House, but very greatly in the Senate.

Now, I do not believe the supply proposition is an economical one, and I will tell you why. In the event this amendment passes you will send to 3,600 counties the supplies, and then they will go to the branch post offices. There will be double accounting. And then the branch post offices will report to the central post office. They have got to report, and the auditing that is now done in Washington would be done in between three and four thousand central offices, I assume, in the counties of the United States, and then it would go to the grand accounting here.

Mr. ASHBROOK. And it will require additional clerical force in each central office?

Mr. CANNON. The centralization comes running all along the line, and it ought to stop. We ought to popularize this service. We ought not to put it under 3,600 bosses. You may ask if the Democrats are not in possession of the post offices in my county, with nearly 100,000 people. Yes; and they all ought to be in existence, and they are all filled by Democrats, who are performing their duty, so far as I know, and will render their accounting as the law now provides. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson].

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, as one of the conferees I want to state that this bill has been in conference for quite a number of days. Your conferees have labored earnestly with the conferees of the Senate to endeavor to reach an agreement. Your managers on the part of the House have absolutely no pride in defending this particular amendment. The Senate insists upon it, and the House does not want it, and we bring it back to you. But the criticism made that the committee goes out of its way under the rules of the House is an unjust one, because in two instances this is under the jurisdiction of this committee. First, it deals with the purely administrative office here in the city of Washington, to wit, the Post Office Department, and the business is audited here. Second, under the Holman rule, on its face it reduces expenses, and is therefore in order on this or any other appropriation bill.

But what does the amendment do? It simply reduces the auditing in the city of Washington to about 4,000 accounts, in round numbers, instead of a million accounts. The audit is made from the postmasters of the county to the one postmaster. The supplies, the postage stamps, and the business that is transacted in the county are transmitted and transacted through that postmaster, and the postmaster is held accountable for that business within the county by the department here. That is the way it affects all the post offices within the county. That is the assurance of the department. It simply means that you

save the auditing of something over a million accounts. Under the system that is proposed in the Senate—and your conferees, after quite a contest, have agreed to it—it simply means you will have 4,000 audits here, and so far as saving money is concerned there is no sort of question on earth about it, because the postmaster in the county would get absolutely nothing more than he now gets for auditing the accounts. The postmaster in the county will be the county auditor, and he would make his audit to the Postmaster General's office here in the city of Washington.

That, as we understand, is the sole and only purpose of this item here. It does not affect the present postmasters or their standing or their status. If the President should decide to do so, he to-morrow could virtually put every postmaster under the civil service and could hold examinations. There is no reason on earth why he should not do it under the general law. Therefore you are gaining nothing by voting this item down, except that thereby you would say you will keep up the old-fashioned system of auditing. That is all there is to it. I do not believe in raising a mountain out of a molehill.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Inasmuch as the gentleman knows that this conference report is as dead as a doornail, would he not save time by asking for a record vote on it? [Laughter.]

Mr. SISSON. I do not know that this conference report is as dead as a doornail. [Laughter.] I do not know, either, since when the gentleman has gotten to be such a great conservator of time and the mentor of this House. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. Does not the gentleman believe that the system proposed here simply adds another middleman to the service?

Mr. SISSON. I do not.

Mr. BARNHART. I can not see it in any other way.

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

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. Does the gentleman believe that the construction which he gives is the construction that the Postmaster General will put on this clause?

Mr. SISSON. I do not know what construction the Postmaster General will put on it, or what any other man will put on the law. I only want to know what the language of the amendment is.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, just why this very important amendment relating to the Postal Service comes from this committee I do not know. I want to call your attention to one fact, gentlemen, before you vote on this proposition, and it occurs to me that when we know the purpose of it, it can not have the sanction of this House.

The Postmaster General in his last annual report, referring to the branch post offices, states as follows:

Attention is again invited to the advisability of removing the legal restrictions as to the establishment of branch post offices and postal stations and providing for the establishment of nonaccounting offices, which would make possible a more efficient and economical administration of the Post Office Service.

This provision removes the restriction which he asks to be removed in order that he may have a central post office in every county in the United States. If you adopt this provision, it is clear that the plan of the department is to be carried out, and every second and third class office in the country will be abolished, and we will have one central office in every county in a State for distribution, and all the others will be branch offices.

It seems to me that the purpose of this provision is clear, and everyone who votes for it votes to empower the Postmaster General to carry out this plan and establish a central office for every county. This is the proposition advocated by the Postmaster General when he asks that the restrictions of the law be removed in order that he may do identically what is authorized in this amendment. [Applause.]

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, we have been discussing this morning a very important matter touching the Postal Service. I desire to call the attention of the conferees on the part of the House and the membership of the House itself to another provision in this conference report which very vitally affects the efficiency of the work of the Department of Agriculture.

I refer to amendment numbered 58, which would absolutely paralyze, if it is permitted to become the law, the activities of the Department of Agriculture along many of its lines of work. The provision is this:

That hereafter no Government official or employee shall receive any salary in connection with his services as such an official or employee from any source other than the Government of the United States, except as may be contributed out of the treasury of any State, county, or municipality.

If that language is allowed to become the law, it practically repeals the provisions of the agricultural extension act. It practically paralyzes the county-agent work of the Northwest and the North and the Northeast. It paralyzes the county-agent work of the South. It destroys the cooperative work that is now being carried on by the Bureau of Markets. It would destroy the work that is now being carried on for the eradication of citrus canker. It would destroy the work that is proposed to be carried on under a provision inserted in the Senate for the eradication and arrest of the white-pine blister rust.

The prohibition contained in the Senate amendment undoubtedly was aimed at certain cooperative arrangements of other educational agencies with the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Institute. I desire to say that the Department of Agriculture does not now and has not within the past two years had any relationship in the least with those two institutions. We provided against it in the Agricultural appropriation bill of 1914, I think. I hold in my hand a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, written very recently, saying that he could absolutely state in all positiveness that there was no such relationship existing between the Department of Agriculture and these foundations. I desire that this conference report shall be voted down, not only for the reasons that have been suggested by other gentlemen but for the to me more important reason that if you agree to this Senate amendment you have practically locked the wheels of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will yield to the gentleman just for a question.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman explain to the House from what sources these agents derive compensation other than from State, county, and municipal?

Mr. LEVER. The agricultural extension act provides, in addition to that, that the Department of Agriculture may receive contributions from colleges, local authorities, or individual contributions within the State for the maintenance of these cooperative arrangements. The current law for the Agricultural Department provides that in the demonstration work they may receive contributions in addition to those had from State, county, and municipal agencies, also from associations of farmers, individual farmers, universities, colleges, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, other local associations of business men, business organizations, and individuals within the State. That is for your demonstration work. Now, under the Bureau of Markets provision is made—

For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distributing of farm and nonmanufactured food products and the purchasing of farm supplies, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the department, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the transportation, marketing, and distributing of farm and food products.

There may be cooperation through the same agencies, and by the adoption of this amendment you have paralyzed the service.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER].

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I desire to emphasize what has already been so well said by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] in reference to this provision, amendment No. 58, to which he called attention. He did not read quite all of it. It goes further and provides that no person, association, or corporation shall make any contribution to or in any way supplement the salary of any Government official.

Now, just take a practical illustration in my own county. For instance, the young lady who has charge of the canning-club girls

in that county, and work along that line, receives from the Government of the United States part of her salary. The county pays part of it and the banks and private individuals pay the balance, so that her salary is paid by the Government, the county, the banks, and individuals. Her name is Miss Elizabeth Brown, and she is doing splendid work. The same provision would apply to the county demonstration agents in Mississippi as well as in other parts of the country. The county agent in my county is Mr. W. T. Pollard, a most excellent agent, who is also doing fine work. Here it is proposed to enact into law that no patriotic citizen in the United States desiring to contribute to this kind of salaries and to help thereby to develop the resources of his county, State, or Nation will be allowed to do so. By this provision he would not be permitted to contribute one single, solitary cent to the pay of those who are laboring for the advancement of this great cause. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] called attention to certain lines of cooperative work. Here is one:

For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distributing of farm and nonmanufactured food products and the purchasing of farm supplies, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the department, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the transportation, marketing, and distributing of farm and food products.

Not a single solitary dollar could be contributed by any citizen, any banker, any corporation, or by any person in the United States for the purpose of carrying out that work in cooperation with the Government of the United States, but this amendment No. 58 would absolutely prevent that being done. [Applause.]

Mr. BURNETT. Does not the gentleman think that is leveled against the action of the Bureau of Education more than anything else?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Probably that is true.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It may have been the intention to limit it to contributions of that kind, but this provision goes much further and forbids any and all contributions from any and all sources to aid any and all work. It would destroy all cooperative work, and especially the cooperative agricultural work North, South, East, and West, which is proving so beneficial to the farmers and agricultural interests of the country. I know the Members of this House do not want to do that, and therefore to prevent it you must vote down this report. Vote "no" good and strong when the vote is taken. [Applause.]

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

Mr. GILLETT. I should like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question or two about a matter which has not been referred to. There seems to be a discrepancy in one matter between the statement made by the conferees and the conference report. I notice the report says that the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17 and agrees to the same with an amendment, whereas the statement says that the House agrees to the Senate amendment and appropriates \$4,140 for the clerks as proposed by the Senate. I should like to ask the gentleman which is correct?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The statement is correct. The gentleman will recall that the House made an appropriation of \$4,000 to pay for an automobile for the Secretary of State—

Mr. GILLETT. Not to pay for an automobile—that is 16; I refer to amendment 17. That statement says that it—

Appropriates \$4,140, as proposed by the Senate, for employees now paid from the appropriation for emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that the Senate inserted an amendment providing for four emergency employees in the State Department, amounting to \$4,140. The conferees agreed to an amendment which was suggested in conference to make a lump-sum appropriation of \$4,140 for that purpose, but without designating the number of persons to be employed.

Mr. GILLETT. What was the purpose of that amendment?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that it is an emergency fund, appropriated in order to give the Secretary of State the privilege of employing extra employees if he desires to do so.

Mr. GILLETT. Of course—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It has always been the custom to make these appropriations in lump sums, and to give some leeway as to the number he may employ. He may desire to employ one for a year or for only two or three months.

Mr. GILLETT. The Senate amendment put on an appropriation for four clerks, naming what classes. Those would be under the civil service, and I wondered, and I would like to ask the gentleman whether the purpose of the House amendment

was that they should not be under the civil service but should be appointed as the Secretary of State pleased.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can only say that so far as the House conferees are concerned, and certainly from my viewpoint, the object was to make this appropriation and give the Secretary of State the privilege of employing extra clerks in the State Department to this extent, for such time during the year as he may think necessary, whether it be for 12 months, 6 months, or 3 months.

Mr. GILLETT. That could be done under the Senate provision. Did the House conferees invent this amendment?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That amendment came from the Senate; but, as I say, the Senate made provision for the employment of four employees throughout the year.

Mr. GILLETT. It did not say throughout the year. I do not know whether the gentleman misunderstands me or whether he does not wish to state the facts. What I want to know is whether the purpose was to take them out of the civil service or not?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will state to the gentleman that the amendment will have the effect of taking them out of the civil service.

Mr. GILLETT. That is what I suspected. Allow me to further suggest that it naturally excites a suspicion, I will not say of myself, but it would excite the suspicion that here was an appropriation of just about enough to give the appointment of a clerk to each one of the conferees. We all know that when an arrangement like that is made it is made for the purpose of giving patronage to somebody, and I would like to know whether that suspicion is justified.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has five minutes.

Mr. GILLETT. I did not hear the gentleman's answer.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not care to spend my remaining five minutes on this question; but I will say that so far as I am concerned and so far as any member of the Appropriations Committee of the House is concerned, none of us have one dollar of this patronage, nor will any of us receive any in the future under this appropriation.

Mr. GILLETT. I expected that answer, and I am glad the gentleman has given it, for I assume it was the Senate for whom this patronage is provided; but I regret to see the conferees of the House responsible for an amendment like this, whose real purpose is obviously to take some clerkships out of the civil service and make patronage of them; and I also regret and am mortified that the House conferees should be used as a cat's-paw to pull this patronage out for the benefit of the Senate.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman knows that one can not get all he wants in a conference. One set of conferees can not have their way independently of the views of the others.

I think the Secretary of State needs the additional service. Now, Mr. Speaker, a good deal has been said here concerning the post-office provision, and I think gentlemen are laboring under a serious misapprehension. Under the present law every fourth-class postmaster has an account in the Post Office Department here. There are more than 56,000 first, second, third, and fourth class offices in the country. That necessitates having more than a million accounts with which the Auditor for the Post Office Department has to deal every year. If this amendment is adopted, it will permit the Postmaster General to establish a central accounting office in each county, so that the Post Office Department will have then not exceeding 150,000 accounts with which to deal here in Washington.

In addition to that, it is proposed by the Postmaster General, if this amendment is adopted, to establish a monthly system of accounting with these central offices in various counties.

Now, gentlemen, it simply means that if the provision goes in it will save to the Government more than \$250,000 every year in the Post Office Department here alone. This provision, if it goes in, will reduce the expenses of the Auditor's Office of the Post Office Department \$30,000 in this bill for this year; but if you vote the report down, if you do not put this amendment in, we will have to go back to the Senate and restore the \$30,000 to the bill for the Office of the Auditor for the Post Office Department. The Postmaster General says that in his judgment, if you will permit him to put this provision into effect, he will save to this Government more than half a million dollars every year. I submit that this House ought not to sit here and, simply because somebody has a suspicion that some postmaster in some county may lose his job, subject the taxpayers to more than half a million dollars' expense each year.

It has been stated that the Appropriation Committee in adopting this amendment has undertaken to go beyond its jurisdic-

tion. This amendment was put on the bill in the Senate, and the Senate conferees stood solidly and unanimously in favor of it and insisted that it should go on this bill. Upon that conference committee was a member of the Senate Post Office Committee. The chairman of the Post Office Committee of the House has addressed you this morning and has urged you to adopt this provision in the interest of economy, efficiency, and good service in the Government. That is all there is to that.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; I can not; I have yielded all my time, and I want to discuss one other amendment.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I ask for one minute more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to refer to the remarks made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] with reference to the amendment reported by the conference committee providing that no employee of the United States Government shall receive any additional salary as such employee from any other source except it come from from a State, county, or municipal agency. I submit that that will take care of the demonstration work being done by the Agricultural Department in cooperation with the county, State, and municipality. For my part, I do not believe that a United States officer should receive compensation as such officer from an individual or any association of individuals in the country, using the Government frank, acting in behalf of this Government, and with the stamp of approval of this Government. I have no objection to a great endowment fund, the great funds that are being used in various directions for the benefit of the people, but I believe, gentlemen of the House, that this Government is able to pay its own bills and that it should not go into partnership with private individuals in the performance of governmental activities. I do not believe that we ought under the practice of the payment of a dollar a year permit men to come in and occupy desks in our bureaus and in some cases act as chief of a division, receiving, as they do, a large salary from outside sources.

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

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have one minute more; I want to ask him a question.

Mr. BURNETT. Make it two minutes; I want to ask him a question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee may proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think that where the law now allows cooperative farmers' organizations to contribute something toward the cost of experts in the Agricultural Department in order to have farm demonstration work that that is an injury?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that this amendment would cut that all out.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not, I will say to the gentleman. There is no reason on earth why individuals in any State or county could not make a contribution for that purpose through the county court.

Mr. MANN. The county court has no jurisdiction, at least not in my State.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I know in my own State that individuals in the county have raised funds and through the county court of the county have contributed to the payment of expenses and salaries of farm demonstration agents.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think the only thing for us to do is to instruct the conferees.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The conferees certainly do not desire to do otherwise than carry out the wishes of the House.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. Is anyone except the faker at the head of the Educational Bureau employing these dollar-a-year men? Is it being done anywhere else?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I dissent most earnestly from the designation of the gentleman occupying the position of Commissioner of Education as a faker.

Mr. BURNETT. I think he has proven to be a faker.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman occupying that position is a man of high character and a distinguished educator. He has rendered great and distinguished service to the cause

of education, and certainly does not deserve the designation given him by the gentleman.

Mr. BURNETT. Let the gentleman answer my question. Is anyone doing that except him?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have been informed, and I can only state this upon information—the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] probably knows—that there are more than a hundred in the Agricultural Department who are receiving a dollar a year.

Mr. LEVER. That is very true; but the Secretary of Agriculture had a letter printed in the RECORD some time ago in which he said that none of his cooperative work is in connection with the General Education Board or the Carnegie Institution.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That answers the question of the gentleman from Alabama to the effect that that practice is going on not only in the Bureau of Education but in the Agricultural Department as well, and possibly in some other department.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee) there were—ayes 21, noes 199.

So the conference report was rejected.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments and ask for a further conference.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the motion, so that we may have a separate vote on amendments 4, 22, 58, 62, and 71. One of them is an attempt to repeal a Senate resolution by action of the House, and on that I desire a minute. The others are the Farm Loan Board proposition, and this proposition that was just up in respect to the Department of Agriculture, the Post Office proposition, and the clerks' pay.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think that the gentleman will insist upon a vote on Senate amendment No. 4, will he?

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will yield me a couple of minutes, I shall not, but that is the only way that I can get the time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I shall be very glad to yield to the gentleman. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I may want some time on the separate propositions. The Senate inserted an amendment in this bill repealing certain Senate resolutions, simple Senate resolutions. The Senate can repeal those simple Senate resolutions when they desire. The House has taken the liberty, on the part of the conferees, of insisting upon a change in the amendment by which the resolutions were repealed. The Senate has nothing to do with simple House resolutions and can not repeal them. The House has nothing to do with simple Senate resolutions and can not repeal them. It is none of our business, and I object to the House conferees agreeing to the Senate amendment at all, and much less agreeing to it with an amendment, thereby undertaking to tell the Senate what simple resolutions shall be repealed by an act of Congress.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, if the Senate needs help, does not the gentleman think the House should be glad to give the help that it needs to regulate its affairs?

Mr. MANN. I am afraid the gentleman from New York too often does that to the disadvantage of the House—privately.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I do not do anything privately.

Mr. MANN. I do not believe it is our business. Suppose the Senate had put an amendment in the bill repealing a simple House resolution?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is a different matter; but as they can not repeal their own simple resolutions by resolution of the Senate and they need the help of the House, I do not think that we ought to be finicky about it.

Mr. MANN. The House conferees struck out the Senate amendment and undertook to tell the Senate what simple Senate resolutions shall be repealed, and it is none of their business.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But the Senate is willing to have us do it. They need our help.

Mr. MANN. If the Senate wants to repeal a Senate resolution, let the Senate do it. I am opposed to the precedent. I do not believe that the Senate should be consulted about simple House resolutions, and I do not think the House has any wish to interfere with simple Senate resolutions.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But they are appealing to us to help them, and what can we do otherwise?

Mr. MANN. I grant that the gentleman from New York makes the best excuse that can be offered for the action, and that is the only excuse that has been offered. But if they want the services of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] in the Senate, they might elect him an honorary Member.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It probably would not do the Senate any harm.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the facts are that these three Senate resolutions enumerated in this amendment of the Senate provided for the employment of three \$1,440 clerks who were assigned to three different Senate committees and paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. MANN. With which we have nothing to do.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, certain Senators desired to repeal these resolutions, and the Senate adopted this amendment, which repealed those three resolutions but at the same time placed one of these clerks, a clerk to the Post Office Committee, upon the regular statutory roll. The House conferees were unwilling under the circumstances to agree to that extra clerk because the House Post Office Committee has only about \$4,900 in clerical assistants—a clerk, an assistant clerk, and a janitor—and the Senate Post Office Committee already has a clerk and an assistant clerk, two other clerks at \$1,400 each, and a messenger. In other words, the House Post Office Committee has an expenditure for clerks each year of about \$4,900, whereas the Senate has an expenditure of over \$8,900, or about that sum.

The House conferees felt it was unfair for the Senate Post Office Committee to ask for another \$1,400 clerk in addition. It was insisted by the Senate conferees, one of whom was a member of the Post Office Committee, that this clerk was necessary, and it was agreed by the Senate conferees that they would yield on the amendment placing the clerk on the statutory roll, but would strike out this provision repealing one of these resolutions so as to permit the Post Office Committee of the Senate to retain that clerk and pay him out of its contingent expenses. There were two amendments which repealed two Senate resolutions—

Mr. MANN. Three.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Two after that was stricken out—two Senate resolutions calling for clerks at \$1,400, and, as the gentleman from New York has stated, the Senate conferees asked the House conferees to help them save this money to the Public Treasury. This bill, of course, can repeal the Senate resolution, and the House conferees gladly yielded on that, because it meant an actual saving of \$2,880 and helped to reduce the great number of clerks the Senate has put upon the rolls of the Senate in the past.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield a little more time? He took up the most of my time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman's time had expired.

Mr. MANN. Not at all.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman has used more than two minutes, but I will gladly yield to him such time as he desires.

Mr. MANN. I have used about two and a half minutes. The Senate amendment undertook to repeal three resolutions and each of those resolutions provided for a particular employee. The Senate action was to repeal three resolutions, cutting out three employees. The House conferees insisted upon leaving one employee by cutting out the repeal of one of these resolutions. In other words, the Senate having acted, I think, illegally, as far as that is concerned, by inserting a provision in this bill for the repeal of three resolutions which carried employees, the House conferees insisted that the Senate should not repeal one resolution and should not dispense with one employee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. MANN. That is the record and the gentleman can not go behind the record. Now, the gentleman says the House conferees did that at the request of the Senate conferees, but I know very often the House or Senate conferees go into conference in favor of an amendment with their fingers crossed, not representing either body, but asking the conferees on the other side to insist upon something they wanted. The Senate cut out one employee that one of the Senate conferees wanted to retain, and at the request of the Senate the conferees on the part of the House insisted that the House should interfere and keep him on there—wholly improper, and the whole thing is improper. It is none of our business. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the House will turn to page 7 of the legislative bill it will find the Senate placed an amendment upon the bill for an additional assistant

clerk to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads at \$1,400—

Mr. MANN. That has nothing to do with Senate amendment No. 4.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That clerk has formerly been carried upon the rolls of the Senate and paid out of the contingent expenses of the Senate under Senate resolution 421, Sixty-third Congress, second session. Now, when the conferees came together the House conferees insisted that the Senate ought not to insist upon adding to its already large number of clerks for the Post Office Committee, and the Senate conferees agreed that they would not ask for this clerk to be carried on the statutory rolls, but they insisted that he was needed by the Post Office Committee, and therefore they insisted they did not care then to repeal Senate resolution 421 which permitted them to carry this clerk of the Post Office Committee on the contingent-fund roll of the Senate—

Mr. MANN. Keep him in office.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Retaining him in office, and certainly, as the gentleman from Illinois has just said, this House has nothing to do with the business of the Senate. If the Senate wants to pay that clerk to the committee out of the contingent fund I submit this House can not prevent it except possibly at the expense of good feeling between the two bodies.

Mr. MANN. Is this clerk carried on page 7?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The House struck out that clerk from the regular statutory roll, where they were proposing to place him, and left it to the Senate as to whether or not they continue to keep him under resolution 421. Now, that explains that.

Now, with reference to these other two resolutions, it was represented to the House conferees that these two clerks were carried on certain other committees, and it was the desire of Senators to repeal those resolutions so as to avoid that expense and that drain upon the contingent fund expenses.

And being perfectly willing to help the Senate conferees save \$2,880 for the people, the House conferees gladly came to their rescue and agreed that those two resolutions might be repealed. As a matter of fact, when this amendment came up in the Senate the repeal of these three resolutions was voted on as one proposition. The Senate conferees requested the House conferees to agree, that these two resolutions might be repealed and those two useless offices abolished. That is all it means.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the first half of the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] that the House further insist on its disagreement to all Senate amendments.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question. I ask for a separate vote on 42, 58, 62, and 71. I have no objection to the others.

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman is for a separate vote on amendments 42, 58, 62, and 71. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? [After a pause.] If not, the Chair will put the rest of them en grosse. Those in favor of further insisting on a disagreement to the rest of Senate amendments say "aye." [After a pause.] The ayes have it.

Now, as to amendment 42, those in favor of further insisting—

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield me one or two minutes?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will yield to the gentleman for one or two minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire of the gentleman whether he desires to insist on amendment 42, which reduces the number of messengers in The Adjutant General's office?

Mr. MANN. I ask to change from 42 to 22. It is on page 42.

The SPEAKER. The question is on further insisting on disagreement to Senate amendment 22.

Mr. MANN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in amendment No. 22.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman offers a preferential motion to concur.

Mr. MANN. In amendment 22 with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. In amendment No. 22 with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MANN. Referring to the House print, as far as the page and line are concerned, by striking out on page 43, line 1, the sum of "\$182,380" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$222,380"; and in line 2 strike out "\$260,000" and insert "\$300,000."

Mr. LEVER. What is that?

Mr. MANN. The Farm Loan Board.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

* The Clerk read as follows:

On page 43, line 1, strike out "\$182,380" and insert "\$222,380." And in line 2 strike out "\$260,000" and insert "\$300,000."

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield me five minutes?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; but before I yield will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question? As I understand your amendment, it would make the total appropriation, if it was to go in as it is written in the bill, of \$377,000?

Mr. MANN. Three hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is the House provision, in other words?

Mr. MANN. As to the amount.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I proposed the amendment as read so that they would conform with the amount heretofore agreed to by the House, because I did not feel authorized to propose a diminution in the amount. The only question at issue is this: The House provision appropriated the bulk sum of \$300,000, giving the Farm Loan Board discretion absolutely as to how it should be expended and what salary should be paid to its clerks and other employees. And I am told that they have employed some clerks at \$4,000, \$5,000, and \$6,000, money which more profitably ought to be expended in the field service than raising the pay of clerks for this board way above the pay of similar clerks in other boards. The same is true as to the private secretaries of the members of the board. The Senate specifically appropriated for the salaries of the board, the secretary of the board, publicity agent, private secretaries, and various clerks sufficient to man the office in Washington, putting in the salaries and taking that amount out of the lump-sum appropriation, leaving the lump-sum appropriation for service, I take it, in the field.

Now, I do not believe that we ought to start in with a new Federal Farm Loan Board by paying exorbitant salaries to secretaries and clerks and other officials in Washington under the board. Unless we specify the salaries these people are to receive, the Farm Loan Board, new at the business, wholly unfamiliar with administrative work under the Government, will be paying salaries that are out of sight. And then next year we will be asked to specifically appropriate for those salaries. Then every other board will have a request for the same salaries. Let these people have the same salaries that are paid in other similar departments of the Government.

Mr. BURNETT. I see the force of the suggestion, but I ask the gentleman if his amendment will reach that proposition?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. It seems to increase the amount.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. The Senate appropriated \$77,620 for salaries, specifically setting them forth, and then appropriated \$182,380 for work in the field, making a total of \$260,000. We had already passed a bill for a total of \$300,000. I did not care to cut it down, though I would be very glad to agree to the Senate amendment without an amendment, and I increased the amount so that it would reach a total of \$300,000.

Mr. GLASS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois this question: If the Farm Loan Board, after some observation, at least, although a limited observation, is incompetent to regulate the salaries of its employees, how may the Senate be more competent without any observation at all or without any knowledge of the work required to be done by the employees?

Mr. MANN. Why, Mr. Speaker, it has long been the duty of Congress, both in the House and in the Senate, to make appropriations for the salaries of officials in Washington. We do know something about the business. We do know something about the comparative salaries that should be paid, the amount that is paid in one department or one division of the Government and the amount that is paid in another, and we have to have something of uniformity. This new Farm Loan Board does not know a thing about the salaries paid in Washington.

Mr. GLASS. I understand when Congress undertakes to fix salaries it fixes them on the recommendation of the heads of the departments, having some knowledge of the duties to be performed.

Mr. MANN. Yes. And I notice that Congress usually refuses the recommendations of the heads of departments for increases of salary. They are always making them, and they seldom get them, and the men do not quit because the salaries are not increased.

Mr. GLASS. I quite agree with the gentleman that the gross amount of \$300,000 should be restored, but I dissent from the proposition that the Senate committee knows anything more about what is an adequate salary for these respective employees than the Farm Loan Board.

Mr. MANN. We know more about what is an adequate salary than the Farm Loan Board, and we know what salary the secretary of a board usually gets. We know what the private secretary of members of a board usually gets, and we know what the stenographer usually gets, and we know what the chief of the Bond Division usually gets.

Mr. GLASS. Well, some secretaries are worth more than other secretaries. The secretary of the Federal Reserve Board is receiving \$9,000 a year, but he is something more than a mere secretary. He is an expert.

Mr. MANN. We do not give \$6,000 a year to any private secretary, and we do not pay \$9,000 to the secretary of anything except of a department; or, if it is done, it is unknown to Congress and a gross piece of extravagance.

Mr. GLASS. I will say to the gentleman that it does not cost the United States Government a cent to pay the salary of the secretary of the Federal Reserve Board; neither does the Farm Loan Board pay \$6,000 for a private secretary.

Mr. MANN. They did propose to pay him \$6,000—

Mr. GOOD. For a \$3,000 job.

Mr. MANN. Yes; to fill a \$3,000 job.

Mr. GLASS. How does the gentleman know it is a \$3,000 job?

Mr. MANN. From long experience and observation in this body, and from a knowledge of what salaries are paid generally to officials in Washington.

Mr. GLASS. Does the gentleman know anything of the experience and observation of the members of the Farm Loan Board?

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

Mr. MANN. I know something about them individually, but I do not want to go into that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I think that the amendment suggested by the Senate is a very desirable and much-needed one. I have been very much interested in observing the workings of the Federal Farm Loan Board, and my observations have led me to believe this—and I say it without any personal feeling or prejudice toward anyone—that the gentlemen having in charge the organization of the Federal Farm Loan System seem more interested in traveling about the country and employing clerks at fat salaries and wasting time than they seem interested in getting down to business and establishing this system and putting it into operation.

There is nothing complex in the work of organization and establishment of the Federal Farm Loan System, and there is no real necessity in paying any big, fat salaries in that bureau any more than in any other bureau in the Government. I want to say here and now that I trust that all the members of the Federal Farm Loan Board in the next few weeks and in the next few months will give more time to the real work that they are employed to do than they have been giving and not depend so much upon the secretary of that board to do all the work.

Mr. McCracken. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow an interruption at that point?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. McCracken. Has the gentleman visited the office of the Farm Loan Board?

Mr. NORTON. Yes; I have visited the office of the Farm Loan Board.

Mr. McCracken. If the gentleman will take the trouble to inquire he will find that the members of that board are very busy. I say that in defense of them. The gentleman is not stating what is entirely true.

Mr. NORTON. I make the statement I have made on my own responsibility and on my own personal observations, and I repeat that it is a statement founded on fact, and the gentleman's kind view of the matter does not change the facts and condition that exist.

Mr. Cannon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. Cannon. I think I never met any member of the Farm Loan Board, but there was a hearing before the Committee on Appropriations, or a subcommittee, at which the secretary of the Farm Loan Board appeared, and he exhibited in that examination, as it seemed to me, more knowledge of the whole subject than anybody that we have met.

Mr. GLASS. That is so.

Mr. NORTON. Yes; Mr. Flannagan is a very able gentleman and well acquainted with the work of this bureau.

Mr. CANNON. It seemed to me so.
Mr. GLASS. And he is receiving the munificent salary of \$3,000.

Mr. MANN. What did he get before?
Mr. GOOD. Is it not perfectly natural that the secretary of the committee that formulated this bill should have a wider knowledge than some one outside, who did not know anything about it?

Mr. NORTON. That is very true, and I think the gentleman referred to has. But I want to say that neither Mr. Flannagan nor any other man is indispensable to the organization of the Federal Farm Loan System. Many men who are fully competent and able to do the work that a secretary of the Federal Farm Loan Board is required to do can be secured at a salary much less than the secretary is receiving at present. What I want now is to have some real work done down there by the Farm Loan Bureau and this farm-loan system put into operation without further delay, dillydallying, and idling.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to recede from the disagreement of the House to Senate amendment 22 and concur in the same with the amendment read by the Clerk.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LEVER. I ask for a division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the amendment reported again.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 43, by striking out in line 1, "\$182,380" and inserting "\$222,380," and in line 2, striking out "\$260,000" and inserting "\$300,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois. The gentleman from South Carolina demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 52, noes 55.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-two Members present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the motion to concur in Senate amendment 22 with an amendment will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 162, nays 189, not voting 82, as follows:

AYES—162.

- | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Anderson | Freeman | McCulloch | Siegel |
| Bacharach | Fuller | McFadden | Sinnott |
| Bennet | Gardner | McKinley | Slomp |
| Bowers | Garland | McLaughlin | Sloan |
| Britten | Glynn | Madden | Smith, Idaho |
| Browne | Good | Magee | Smith, Mich. |
| Browning | Gould | Mann | Smith, Minn. |
| Butler | Gray, N. J. | Mapes | Snell |
| Campbell | Green, Iowa | Meeker | Snyder |
| Cary | Greene, Mass. | Miller, Del. | Stafford |
| Chipfield | Greene, Vt. | Miller, Minn. | Steele, Iowa. |
| Clark, Fla. | Griest | Miller, Pa. | Steenerson |
| Coleman | Guernsey | Mondell | Sterling |
| Cooper, Ohio. | Hadley | Moore, Pa. | Stiness |
| Cooper, W. Va. | Hamilton, Mich. | Moore, Ind. | Sulloway |
| Cooper, Wis. | Hamilton, N. Y. | Morin | Sutherland |
| Copley | Haskell | Mott | Sweet |
| Crago | Haugen | Mudd | Swift |
| Cramton | Heaton | Nelson | Switzer |
| Dale, Vt. | Helgesen | Nichols, Mich. | Temple |
| Dallinger | Hernandez | North | Thomas |
| Danforth | Hollingsworth | Norton | Thompson |
| Darrow | Hopwood | Oakey | Tilson |
| Davis, Minn. | Howell | Paige, Mass. | Timberlake |
| Dempsey | Hull, Iowa | Parker, N. Y. | Tinkham |
| Denison | Hutchinson | Peters | Towner |
| Dillon | James | Platt | Treadway |
| Dowell | Johnson, S. Dak. | Powers | Volstead |
| Drukker | Kelster | Pratt | Walsh |
| Dunn | Kelley | Ramseyer | Ward |
| Dyer | Kennedy, Iowa | Ricketts | Wason |
| Ellsworth | Kiess, Pa. | Roberts, Mass. | Watson, Pa. |
| Emerson | Kinkaid | Roberts, Nev. | Wheeler |
| Esch | Kreider | Rodenberg | Williams, T. S. |
| Fairchild | La Follette | Rogers | Wilson, Ill. |
| Farr | Langley | Rowe | Wood, Ind. |
| Fess | Lenroot | Russell, Ohio | Woods, Iowa |
| Focht | Lindbergh | Sanford | Woodyard |
| Fordney | London | Schall | Young, N. Dak. |
| Foss | Loud | Scott, Mich. | |
| Frear | McArthur | Shackelford | |

NAYS—189.

- | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Abercrombie | Dooling | Igoe | Quin |
| Adair | Doolittle | Jacoway | Rainey |
| Adamson | Doughton | Johnson, Ky. | Raker |
| Alexander | Driscoll | Johnson, Wash. | Randall |
| Allen | Dupré | Kahn | Rauch |
| Almon | Eagan | Keating | Rayburn |
| Ashbrook | Eagle | Kent | Reavis |
| Aswell | Elston | Kettner | Reilly |
| Austin | Evans | Key, Ohio | Riordan |
| Ayres | Farley | Kincheloe | Rouse |
| Bailey | Ferris | King | Rube |
| Barkley | Fields | Konop | Rucker, Ga. |
| Barnhart | Fitzgerald | Lazaro | Russell, Mo. |
| Bell | Flood | Lee | Sears |
| Black | Foster | Leshner | Shallenberger |
| Blackmon | Gallagher | Lever | Shelley |
| Booher | Gallivan | Lewis | Sherwood |
| Borland | Gandy | Lieb | Sims |
| Bruckner | Garner | Liebel | Sisson |
| Burgess | Garrett | Linthicum | Small |
| Burke | Gillett | Littlepage | Smith, Tex. |
| Burnett | Glass | Lloyd | Stegall |
| Byrnes, S. C. | Godwin, N. C. | Lobeck | Stedman |
| Byrns, Tenn. | Goodwin, Ark. | McAndrews | Steels, Pa. |
| Caldwell | Gordon | McClintic | Stephens, Miss. |
| Callaway | Gray, Ala. | McCracken | Stephens, Tex. |
| Candler, Miss. | Gray, Ind. | McDermott | Stone |
| Cannon | Gregg | McKellar | Sumners |
| Caraway | Hamlin | McLemore | Taggart |
| Carew | Harrison, Miss. | Mays | Tague |
| Carlin | Harrison, Va. | Montague | Tabott |
| Carter, Okla. | Hastings | Moon | Tayner |
| Casey | Hawley | Morgan, La. | Taylor, Colo. |
| Church | Hayden | Morgan, Okla. | Tillman |
| Cline | Hayes | Morrison | Van Dyke |
| Coady | Heflin | Murray | Vinson |
| Collier | Helm | Neely | Walker |
| Connelly | Helvering | Oldfield | Watkins |
| Cox | Henry | Oliver | Watson, Va. |
| Crisp | Hensley | Oiney | Webb |
| Crosser | Hilliard | O'Shaunnessy | Williams, W. E. |
| Cullop | Holland | Overymyer | Wilson, La. |
| Dale, N. Y. | Hood | Padgett | Wingo |
| Davis, Tex. | Houston | Page, N. C. | Young |
| Dent | Howard | Park | Young, Tex. |
| Dies | Huddleston | Phelan | |
| Dill | Hull, Tenn. | Pou | |
| Dixon | Humphreys, Miss. | Price | |

NOT VOTING—82.

- | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Aiken | Dickinson | Kennedy, R. I. | Rucker, Mo. |
| Anthony | Doremus | Kitchin | Sabath |
| Barchfeld | Edmonds | Lafean | Saunders |
| Beakes | Edwards | Lehbach | Scott, Pa. |
| Beales | Estopinal | Loft | Senly |
| Benedict | Flynn | Longworth | Sells |
| Britt | Gard | McGillcuddy | Shouse |
| Brumbaugh | Graham | McKenzie | Slayden |
| Buchanan, Ill. | Griffin | Maher | Smith, N. Y. |
| Buchanan, Tex. | Hamill | Martin | Sparkman |
| Cantrill | Hardy | Matthews | Stephens, Nebr. |
| Capstick | Hart | Mooney | Stout |
| Carter, Mass. | Hicks | Moss | Taylor, Ark. |
| Chandler, N. Y. | Hill | Nicholls, S. C. | Vare |
| Charles | Hinds | Nolan | Venable |
| Conry | Hughes | Oglesby | Whaley |
| Costello | Hulbert | Parker, N. J. | Williams, Ohio |
| Curry | Humphrey, Wash. | Patten | Wilson, Fla. |
| Davenport | Husted | Porter | Winslow |
| Decker | Jones | Ragsdale | |
| Dewalt | Kearns | Rowland | |

So the motion to concur in Senate amendment 22 with an amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

- For to-day:
Mr. HARDY with Mr. PARKER of New Jersey.
Until further notice:
Mr. PATTEN with Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington.
Mr. CONRY with Mr. HILL.
Mr. RUCKER of Missouri with Mr. NOLAN.
Mr. BEAKES with Mr. CAPSTICK.
Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. MOORES of Indiana.
Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. ANTHONY.
Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. BARCHFELD.
Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois with Mr. BEALES.
Mr. BUCHANAN of Texas with Mr. BENEDICT.
Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. BRITT.
Mr. STOUT with Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts.
Mr. DECKER with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.
Mr. DEWALT with Mr. CHARLES.
Mr. DICKINSON with Mr. COSTELLO.
Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. CURRY.
Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas with Mr. EDMONDS.
Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. GRAHAM.
Mr. FLYNN with Mr. HICKS.
Mr. GARD with Mr. HINDS.
Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. HUSTED.
Mr. HAMILL with Mr. KEARNS.
Mr. WHALEY with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
Mr. SHOUSE with Mr. LAFEAN.

Mr. HULBERT with Mr. LEHLBACH.
 Mr. JONES with Mr. LONGWORTH.
 Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. MCKENZIE.
 Mr. LOFT with Mr. MATTHEWS.
 Mr. MCGILLICUDDY with Mr. MOONEY.
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. MARTIN.
 Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. PORTER.
 Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. ROWLAND.
 Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. SELLS.
 Mr. SABATH with Mr. VARE.
 Mr. SAUNDERS with Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. WINSLOW.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to further insist on the House disagreement to the Senate amendment 22. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The next amendment is No. 58, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That no part of the appropriations made for the Bureau of Education, whether for salaries or expenses or any other purpose connected therewith, shall be used in connection with any money contributed or tendered by the General Education Board or any corporate or other organization or individual in any way associated with it, either directly or indirectly, or contributed or tendered by any corporation or individual other than such as may be contributed by State, county, or municipal agencies; nor shall the Bureau of Education receive any moneys for salaries or any other purpose from the General Education Board or any corporate or other organization or individual in any way associated with it, either directly or indirectly, or contributed or tendered by any corporation or individual other than such as may be contributed by State, county, or municipal agencies, except by act of Congress authorizing the same, nor shall any person paid, in whole or in part, by any such corporation or individual for services rendered by him, be employed by the Government or become or remain an officer or employee of the Government. Any person violating any or either of the terms of this proviso shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not less than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment as the court may determine.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to insist on the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendment 58.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion. I move to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all of the Senate amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Provided, That hereafter no Government official or employee shall receive any salary in connection with his services as such an official or employee from any source other than the Government of the United States, except as may be contributed out of the treasury of any State, county, or municipality, unless otherwise authorized by law, and no person, association, or corporation shall make any contribution to, or in any way supplement the salary of, any Government official or employee for the services performed by him for the Government of the United States, unless otherwise authorized by law. Any person violating any of the terms of this proviso shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$1,000 or imprisonment for not less than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment as the court may determine."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment 58 with an amendment.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment, Senate amendment 62.

The Clerk read as follows:

(62) In order to promote economy in the distribution of supplies, and in auditing and accounting, the Postmaster General may designate districts and central offices in such districts through which supplies shall be distributed and accounts audited, but in no case shall the postmaster at the central station be given authority to abolish offices, to change officers or employees in offices included in such district.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion. I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 62 and agree to the same.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion. We have debated it for an hour or two.

Mr. MONDELL. I think I was on my feet.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But I had the floor.

Mr. AUSTIN. If the gentleman from Wyoming speaks in favor of his motion, some of us ought to have an opportunity to speak in opposition to it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say that we have discussed this, I think, until every Member of the House thoroughly understands it.

Mr. STEENERSON. But there has been something discovered since.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield me five minutes?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will yield to the gentleman from Wyoming five minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, Senate amendment 62, found on page 120 of the bill, is identical with the provision which the House adopted on this subject and placed on the Post Office appropriation bill, with the exception of one word. The change is not material. In the language adopted on the Post Office bill the words "accounts rendered" were used and in the Senate amendment the words "accounts audited." The effect is exactly the same. This is the language in relation to accounting. The House has agreed to provide a central accounting office, and if my motion prevails we will again have declared our purpose in the form that it was declared the other day, and we shall have declared our opposition to branch post offices.

Mr. STEENERSON. If the motion of the gentleman is adopted, will the language be the same as it is in the Post Office bill which is now in conference?

Mr. MONDELL. Except the word "audited."

Mr. STEENERSON. I hope Members all understand that. If the motion is carried it leaves the provision substantially as now in the Post Office bill which is in conference. That is what the House wants.

Mr. MANN. And it keeps out any possibility of putting in, in any form, the branch post offices?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming to recede from the disagreement to the Senate amendment 62 and concur in the same.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONDELL and Mr. Cox) there were 106 ayes and 12 noes.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington makes the point of no quorum, and the Chair will count.

Mr. DILL (during the count). Mr. Speaker, I was under a misapprehension, and I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington withdraws his point of no quorum. The motion is agreed to, and the Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 52, strike out all of section 7, beginning with line 3 and ending with line 18, and insert the following:

"Sec. 7. That to provide, during the fiscal year 1918, for increased compensation at the rate of 15 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate per annum of \$480 or less, and for increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate of more than \$480 per annum and not exceeding \$1,000 per annum, so much as may be necessary is appropriated: *Provided*, That this section shall only apply to employees who are appropriated for in this act specifically and under lump sums or whose employment is authorized herein: *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."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment 71.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard upon that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment. The other day the House agreed to the conference report upon the Indian appropriation bill, which carried the Appropriation Committee's provision in reference to increased compensation. The other day the Senate disagreed to the conference report upon the Agricultural bill, which carried a compromise between the Smoot amendment and the House Committee on Appropriations' proposition. Of course, it is not permissible to refer to the debates in the Senate, and, although I have read the debates, I shall not refer to them. But I want to say, so that others may hear and read, that the House can be just as stubborn as any other legislative body. [Applause.] The House passed this proposition. The Senate passed the Smoot amendment. The Senate has rejected a compromise, and apparently by its action sent to the House proposes to insist upon the original Smoot amendment. I am told by gentlemen that the Senate will never agree to anything but the Smoot amendment. I have told some gentlemen that, in my opinion, the House never would agree to the Smoot amendment. [Applause.] If gentlemen in the Senate of the United States want to take the

responsibility of shutting off the supplies of the Government for its continuance, let them assume that responsibility. I am not willing that the House shall write itself down as a mere annex, a vermiform appendix, to the Senate of the United States. [Applause.] Some gentlemen may think that the only legislative wisdom rests in the Senate of the United States. I do not. When we are met with a proposition that the House and the Senate conferees instead of compromising on a matter between them must give the Senate its way, and that the House shall be compelled under a threat to yield to the Senate I shall meet the threat and fight. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] for five minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, this is no time to be getting into a warlike mood. There should be an air of peace and calm over the House. Members should keep cool. The important thing for the House of Representatives to do is to transact the public business and to adjust the differences that may exist between the Houses and finish the work of this session by the 4th of March. I am willing to go as far as any Member of this House in insisting upon the provision that originated in the Committee on Appropriations, at my suggestion, for the increase in the compensation of the Federal employees, but I am not prepared to announce now that I intend to be so stubborn as to bring about a situation that will result in an extra session of Congress unless we can increase the compensation of Federal employees. For the first time in a service of 18 years the Senate of the United States has apparently taken a position against increasing the compensation of employees because of the very great burden it will place upon the Treasury of the United States, and I do not intend to act in such a way as forever to discourage the Senate from taking such a position again. [Laughter.] It may not take very much resistance upon our part to kill right in the beginning what promises to be the most hopeful sign of reform in the Federal Government in the last two decades, and while I am ready to do what may be possible, and while I hope that the managers representing the House on these various conferences may have such persuasive powers as will bring the managers of the Senate to see the light of reason and to harmonize our difference, I am unwilling to announce to the House, I am unwilling to have this side of the House assert, that it will insist upon having its way in the matter of omnibus increases of compensation to Federal employees at the risk of an extra session of Congress. Mr. Speaker, so that there may be no misunderstanding, if I am put to a choice between an extra session of Congress and increasing the compensation of Government employees, the Government employees will lose my support. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. I offer a preferential motion. I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment. I am not going to vote for my motion, but it is in order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes a preferential motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment No. 71.

The question was taken.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 61, nays 283, answered "present" 1, not voting 88, as follows:

YEAS—61.

Adamson	Fields	Johnson, Ky.	Rubey
Almon	Garner	Kincheloe	Shackleford
Barkley	Godwin, N. C.	Langley	Shallenberger
Barnhart	Gordon	Mays	Sherley
Bell	Gray, Ind.	Montague	Sisson
Borland	Hamlin	Morrison	Stephens, Miss.
Burgess	Hardy	Murray	Stephens, Tex.
Candler, Miss.	Harrison, Va.	Norton	Taylor, Colo.
Carter, Okla.	Hastings	Oliver	Thomas
Clark, Fla.	Hayden	Padgett	Tillman
Cline	Helm	Park	Wingo
Cox	Henry	Quin	Wise
Cullop	Hensley	Rainey	Young, Tex.
Dies	Hull, Tenn.	Rauch	
Dill	Jacoway	Rayburn	
Dixon	James	Rouse	

NAYS—283.

Abercrombie	Black	Byrnes, S. C.	Collier
Adair	Blackmon	Byrns, Tenn.	Connelly
Alken	Booher	Caldwell	Cooper, Ohio
Alexander	Bowers	Campbell	Cooper, W. Va.
Allen	Britt	Cannon	Copley
Anderson	Britten	Cantrill	Cramton
Anthony	Browne	Carew	Crisp
Ashbrook	Browning	Carlin	Crosser
Aswell	Bruckner	Cary	Dale, N. Y.
Austin	Brunbaugh	Chipperfield	Dale, Va.
Ayres	Burke	Church	Dallinger
Bacharach	Burnett	Coady	Darrow
Bennet	Butler	Coleman	Davis, Tex.

Decker	Haugen	McLaughlin	Siegel
Dempsey	Hawley	McLemore	Sims
Denison	Hayes	Madden	Sinnott
Dent	Heaton	Magee	Slemp
Dickinson	Heffin	Mann	Sloan
Dillon	Helgesen	Mapes	Small
Dooling	Helvering	Martin	Smith, Idaho
Doolittle	Hernandez	Meeker	Smith, Mich.
Doughton	Hilliard	Miller, Del.	Smith, Minn.
Dowell	Holland	Miller, Minn.	Smith, Tex.
Driscoll	Hollingsworth	Miller, Pa.	Snell
Dunn	Hood	Moon	Snyder
Dupré	Hopwood	Moore, Pa.	Sparkman
Dyer	Houston	Moore, Ind.	Stafford
Eagan	Howard	Morgan, Okla.	Stegall
Eagle	Howell	Morin	Stedman
Edmonds	Huddleston	Moss	Steele, Iowa
Ellsworth	Hull, Iowa	Mott	Stephens, Nebr.
Elston	Humphreys, Miss.	Mudd	Stirling
Emerson	Hutchinson	Neely	Stiness
Esch	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson	Stone
Evans	Johnson, Wash.	Nichols, Mich.	Sulloway
Fairchild	Kahn	North	Sumners
Farley	Keating	Oldfield	Sutherland
Ferris	Keister	Olney	Sweet
Fess	Kelley	O'Shaunessy	Swift
Fitzgerald	Kennedy, Iowa	Overmyer	Switzer
Flood	Kent	Page, N. C.	Taggart
Focht	Key, Ohio	Paige, Mass.	Tague
Fordney	Kless, Pa.	Parker, N. Y.	Talbott
Foss	King	Peters	Tavener
Foster	Kinkaid	Phelan	Taylor, Ark.
Frear	Kitchin	Platt	Temple
Freeman	Konop	Pou	Thompson
Fuller	Kreider	Powers	Tilson
Gallagher	La Follette	Pratt	Timberlake
Gallivan	Lazaro	Price	Tinkham
Gandy	Lee	Ragsdale	Towner
Gardner	Lenroot	Raker	Treadway
Garland	Leshner	Ramseyer	Van Dyke
Garrett	Lever	Randall	Venable
Gillett	Lieb	Reavis	Vinson
Glass	Liebel	Reilly	Walker
Glynn	Linthicum	Ricketts	Ward
Good	Littlepage	Riordan	Wason
Goodwin, Ark.	Lloyd	Roberts, Mass.	Watkins
Gray, Ala.	London	Roberts, Nev.	Watson, Pa.
Gray, N. J.	Longworth	Rodenberg	Watson, Va.
Green, Iowa	McAndrews	Rogers	Wheeler
Greene, Mass.	McArthur	Rowe	Williams, T. S.
Greene, Va.	McClintic	Russell, Mo.	Williams, W. E.
Gregg	McCracken	Russell, Ohio	Wilson, Ill.
Griest	McCulloch	Sanford	Wilson, La.
Guernsey	McDermott	Saunders	Wood, Ind.
Hadley	McFadden	Schall	Woods, Iowa
Hamilton, Mich.	McGuillcuddy	Scott, Mich.	Woodyard
Hamilton, N. Y.	McKellar	Sells	Young, N. Dak.
Haskell	McKinley	Sherwood	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Steenerson

NOT VOTING—88.

Bailey	Dewalt	Jones	Patten
Barchfeld	Doremus	Kearns	Porter
Beakes	Drukker	Kennedy, R. I.	Rowland
Beales	Edwards	Kettner	Rucker, Ga.
Benedict	Estopinal	Lafean	Rucker, Mo.
Buchanan, Ill.	Farr	Lelbach	Sabath
Buchanan, Tex.	Flynn	Lewis	Scott, Pa.
Callaway	Gard	Lindbergh	Scully
Capstick	Gould	Lobeck	Sears
Caraway	Graham	Loft	Shouse
Carter, Mass.	Griffin	Loud	Slayden
Casey	Hamill	McKenzie	Smith, N. Y.
Chandler, N. Y.	Harrison, Miss.	Maher	Steele, Pa.
Charles	Hart	Matthews	Stout
Conry	Hicks	Mondell	Vare
Cooper, Wis.	Hill	Mooney	Volstead
Costello	Hinds	Morgan, La.	Walsh
Crago	Hughes	Nicholls, S. C.	Webb
Curry	Hulbert	Nolan	Whaley
Danforth	Humphrey, Wash.	Oakey	Williams, Ohio
Davenport	Husted	Oglesby	Wilson, Fla.
Davis, Minn.	Igoe	Parker, N. J.	Winslow

So the motion to concur was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

- Mr. IGOE with Mr. WALSH.
- Mr. WEBB with Mr. DANFORTH.
- Mr. GARD with Mr. VOLSTEAD.
- Mr. SEARS with Mr. OAKEY.
- Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. BARCHFELD.
- Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.
- Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. COSTELLO.
- Mr. JONES with Mr. HINDS.
- Mr. MAHER with Mr. MCKENZIE.
- Mr. BAILEY with Mr. MOONEY.
- Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.
- Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio.
- Mr. CASEY with Mr. PARKER of New Jersey.
- Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. BEALES.
- Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin.
- Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi with Mr. CRAGO.
- Mr. KETTNER with Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota.
- Mr. LEWIS with Mr. DRUKKER.
- Mr. LOBECK with Mr. FARR.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana with Mr. GOULD.
 Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. HUSTED.
 Mr. OGLESBY with Mr. HOPWOOD.
 Mr. RUCKER of Georgia with Mr. LOUD.
 Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania with Mr. MONDELL.
 Mr. HART with Mr. ROWLAND.
 Mr. FARR. I desire to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening?

Mr. FARR. No; not within hearing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule, and he can not vote.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening?

Mr. CRAGO. No.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to be recorded as saying I voted twice. I misunderstood the name, which I think was FARLEY, and answered "Aye," and later when again my name was called I answered "Aye" also. I want to record it, so that if Mr. FARLEY is recorded as voting and is not here, that is the reason why.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman voted twice that is doing pretty well.

Mr. RUCKER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman listening when his name was called or should have been called?

Mr. RUCKER of Georgia. No, sir; I was trying to get here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not vote.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee to insist further on the disagreement to Senate amendment No. 71.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the other part of the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee to ask for a conference.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will announce the conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, Mr. SISSON, and Mr. GOOD.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR SUNDAY.

The SPEAKER. The Chair assigns Mr. LEVER, of South Carolina, to preside Sunday over the funeral services.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leaves of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CONRY, for to-day, on account of illness.

To Mr. PARKER of New Jersey, for to-day and to-morrow, on account of death in the family.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill (H. R. 19119) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to have the statement read in lieu of the report. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the statement.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1515).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19119) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 14, 30, 32, 43, 44, 46, 51, 54, 55, 62, 71, 85, 89, and 96.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 45, 47, 48, 52, 53, 56, 57, 58, 59, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 86, 90, 92, and 95, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"In connection with the item contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1917 providing for repaving with asphalt the roadway of Fourteenth Street NW. from Pennsylvania Avenue to F Street, 70 feet wide, the owners of the abutting property are hereby required to modify the roofs of the vaults now under the sidewalk on said street between the limits named, at their own expense, so as to permit the widening of the roadway of said street to 70 feet."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$30,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$82,415"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For matrons in the normal and high schools, including the following: Wilson Normal, Miner Normal, New Central High, Dunbar High, Business High, Western High, Eastern High, McKinley Manual Training, and Armstrong Manual Training, nine in all, at \$500 each, \$4,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "90 additional privates of class one, at \$900 each, to be employed on or after March 1, 1917, \$108,000, \$27,000 of which sum to be immediately available, and the provision in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1913 which provides 'After June 30, 1912, there shall be no appointments, except by promotion, to fill vacancies occurring in classes 1, 2, and 3 of privates in the Metropolitan police until the whole number of privates in all of said classes shall have been reduced to 640,' is hereby repealed"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,073,618.66"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "serologist, \$2,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$76,540"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Transpose the matter inserted by said amendment to follow the words "water service" on page 88 of the bill in line 14; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "continuously" and insert in lieu thereof the word "regularly," and in the same line strike out the word "thirty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fifteen"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 6 of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "Congress," insert the following: "Potomac Park"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee on conference have been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 16, 76, 87, 88, 97, and 98.

ROBERT N. PAGE,
JAS. McANDREWS,
C. R. DAVIS,

Managers on the part of the House.

JOHN WALTER SMITH,
JOS. T. ROBINSON,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19119) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of the said amendments, namely:

On Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7, relating to the assessor's office: Creates a license bureau, with a superintendent of licenses at \$2,000 a year, who shall also be secretary to the automobile board without additional compensation; transfers to the superintendent of licenses, on and after July 1, 1917, the authority, duties, discretion, and powers now vested by law in the assessor with respect to licenses; omits, as proposed by the Senate, the position of secretary or acting secretary of the automobile board at \$300; transfers from the assessor's office to the license bureau the following employees: One clerk, at \$1,400; one clerk, at \$1,200; one clerk, at \$1,000; one inspector of licenses, at \$1,200; and one assistant inspector of licenses, at \$1,000, and transfers a clerk, at \$900, from the office of the Engineer Commissioner; repeals, as proposed by the Senate, so much of existing law as provides that the assessor of the District of Columbia and members of the permanent board of assistant assessors shall not be removed except for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office; provides, as proposed by the Senate, for the transfer of records and accounts relating to the bookkeeping, accounting, and collection of taxes from the office of the assessor to the office of the collector of taxes.

On No. 5: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that no portion of the appropriation for the excise board shall be used to pay the salary of any member of the board whose nomination has been rejected by the Senate.

On Nos. 6 and 90: Provides for three members of the board of examiners of steam engineers at \$300 each, as proposed by the Senate, and strikes out the language, proposed by the House, requiring the master mechanic of the water department to act as a member of the board without additional compensation.

On No. 9: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that the property occupied by the Daughters of the American Revolution shall be exempt from taxation so long as it is so occupied and used, and appropriates \$99.19 to refund taxes paid upon the said property.

On Nos. 10 and 11, relating to the office of the recorder of deeds: Appropriates \$5,409, as proposed by the Senate, for the purchase and exchange of 25 book-bound recording typewriters and desks; and authorizes the recorder to increase the amounts, paid from the fees of his office, to the persons engaged in copying instruments filed for record.

On Nos. 12 and 13: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that the fee for licensing and registration of motor vehicles of more than 30 horsepower shall be \$10; inserts the paragraph for a reciprocal arrangement between the District of Columbia and the States concerning the registration of motor vehicles and the licensing of operators of motor vehicles, and provides, as proposed by the House, that after July 1, 1917, the commissioners shall have the power to make regulations governing the speed of motor vehicles in the District of Columbia.

On No. 14: Strikes out the appropriation of \$500, proposed by the Senate, for repairs to the Eastern and Western Markets.

On No. 15: The language, proposed by the Senate, relating to the appropriation of \$7,500 for repaving the roadway of Fourteenth Street NW. from Pennsylvania Avenue to F Street, 70 feet in width, is modified to require abutting property owners to change the roofs of the vaults under the sidewalks on said street between the limits named at their own expense so as to permit the widening of the roadway to 70 feet.

On Nos. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27 appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, for the construction of the following suburban roads: Longfellow Street from Fifth Street to Concord Avenue (formerly Oregon Avenue), Concord Avenue from Longfellow Street to Kennedy Street, and Kennedy Street from

Concord Avenue to First Street NE., \$25,800; Concord Avenue from First Place NW. to Blair Road NE., \$2,900; South Dakota Avenue, Bladensburg Road to Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, \$4,000; Vista Street, South Dakota Avenue to Franklin Street, \$5,100; Albemarle Street from Connecticut Avenue to Thirty-eighth Street, \$8,000; Wyoming Avenue between Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth Streets, \$3,600; Thirty-third Street, Rittenhouse Street to Pinehurst Circle, \$12,600; Sixty-first Street, East Capitol Street to Eastern Avenue, \$20,000; Belmont Street, Sixteenth Street to Crescent Place, \$7,500; Crescent Place, east of Belmont Street to end of pavement, \$2,400.

On No. 28: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that the District Commissioners shall suspend proceedings for the condemnation of lands for the widening of Woodley Road until further action by Congress.

On No. 29: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that hereafter in all proceedings for the opening, extension, widening, or straightening of alleys and minor streets, and for the establishment of building lines in the District of Columbia the condemnation jury shall not be restricted as to the assessment area.

On No. 30: Strikes out the appropriation of \$10,000, proposed by the Senate, for painting and repairing the Highway Bridge.

On No. 31: Inserts the appropriation of \$65,000, proposed by the Senate, for constructing a bridge on the line of South Dakota Avenue over the tracks of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

On No. 32: Strikes out the appropriation of \$35,000, proposed by the Senate, for a bathing beach at the Tidal Basin.

On Nos. 33 and 34: Appropriates \$30,000, instead of \$36,000 as proposed by the Senate, for the purchase of additional land for a playground site.

On Nos. 35, 36, and 37, relating to the electrical department: Appropriates \$4,700 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$4,000 as proposed by the House, for the purchase and installation of 20 fire-alarm boxes; appropriates \$9,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,500 as proposed by the House, for the erection of a storehouse; and inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, requiring the Potomac Electric Power Co. to remove the poles and overhead wires owned and used by it on Water Street, between Sixth and Fourteenth Streets SW., and to install an underground system.

On Nos. 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, and 48, relating to the public schools: Provides for matrons in the normal and high schools, 9 in number, at \$500 each, instead of 19 in number, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$1,000, as proposed by the Senate, for transportation of pupils attending schools for tubercular children; inserts the provision, proposed by the Senate, admitting children of officers and men of the Army and Navy stationed outside of the District of Columbia to the public schools without paying tuition; appropriates \$96,000, as proposed by the Senate, for additional ground and an eight-room addition to the Wheatley School; \$90,000 for an eight-room addition to the Takoma School; \$5,500 for toilet rooms on the site of the Woodburn School building; strikes out the appropriations, proposed by the Senate, of \$97,000 for additional land and an eight-room addition for the Buchanan School and \$12,000 for additional land at the Emery School; strikes out the provision, inserted by the Senate, authorizing the use of unexpended balances of appropriations for the purchase of sites for buildings for use in cleaning up, grading, etc., of such sites; modifies the paragraph relative to solicitation of subscriptions or donations from pupils, as proposed by the Senate, so as to require the board of education, upon recommendation of the superintendent of schools, to authorize the purposes for which such subscriptions may be solicited; and removes, as proposed by the Senate, the restriction limiting the appropriation for instruction of blind children to "indigent" blind children.

On Nos. 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, and 55, relating to the police department: Provides for 90 additional privates at \$900 each from March 1, 1917, instead of 100 as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the paragraph, inserted by the Senate, granting 30 days' annual and 30 days' sick leave, with pay, to employees of the police department; appropriates \$40,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$32,500 as proposed by the House, for a station house between the ninth and tenth precincts; strikes out the appropriation of \$2,000, proposed by the Senate, for a gasoline launch for the harbor patrol.

On Nos. 56, 57, 58, and 59, relating to the fire department: Increases the pay, as proposed by the Senate, of assistant engineers, assistant marine engineers, and assistant drivers.

On Nos. 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, and 67, relating to the health department: Appropriates \$2,500 for a serologist, as proposed by the Senate, and strikes out the provision for a scientific

assistant at \$1,200; strikes out the language, inserted by the Senate, making the appropriation of \$500 for a new refrigerating machine, immediately available; appropriates \$1,200, as proposed by the Senate, for apparatus, equipment, and supplies for the biological and serological diagnosis of disease; appropriates \$10,000 and \$6,500, respectively, for isolating wards, at Garfield and Providence Hospitals, instead of \$7,000 and \$5,000, respectively, as proposed by the House; appropriates \$4,000, as proposed by the Senate, for repairs and alterations of a building for use as a laboratory of the health department.

On Nos. 68 and 69: Increases the amount for contingent expenses of the probation system from \$500 to \$650 as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 70: Changes the designation of the "Government Hospital for the Insane" to "Saint Elizabeths Hospital" in the paragraph appropriating for "writs of lunacy."

On No. 71: Strikes out the language, inserted by the Senate, permitting surplus revenues of the District of Columbia to be credited to the interest and sinking fund for application to the funded debt.

On No. 72: Appropriates \$3,750, as proposed by the Senate, for additional expenses for the supreme court made necessary by the occupancy of temporary quarters during the reconstruction of the old courthouse.

On No. 73: Appropriates \$25,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20,000 as proposed by the House, for the care of indigent patients in the Columbia Hospital.

On No. 74: Appropriates \$17,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$16,000 as proposed by the House, for care of indigent patients in the Children's Hospital.

On No. 75: Appropriates \$26,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20,000 as proposed by the House, for care of indigent patients in the Emergency Hospital.

On Nos. 77, 78, 79, and 80, relating to the Board of Children's Guardians: Provides for an additional investigating and placing officer at \$1,200, and one additional at \$900, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 81: Requires, as proposed by the Senate, that the cottage authorized for the Industrial Home School for Colored Children shall accommodate 25 or more boys.

On Nos. 82 and 83: Appropriates \$5,000 and \$1,500, respectively, for the national library for the blind and the Columbia Polytechnic Institute, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 84: Appropriates \$21,200, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$16,900, as proposed by the House, for rent for the militia, and authorizes the commanding general to make a contract or contracts for the lease of suitable quarters.

On Nos. 85 and 86, relating to the Anacostia River and Flats: Appropriates \$300,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$400,000, as proposed by the Senate, and inserts the language, proposed by the Senate, for acquiring additional land for highway and park purposes, and authorizes the Secretary of War to adjust the boundaries and exchange lands with the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co.

On Nos. 89, 91, and 92, relating to the water service: Strikes out the language, proposed by the Senate, making the appropriation for water meters "immediately available and available until expended"; appropriates \$26,600, as proposed by the Senate, for 16-inch mains in Reservoir Street and New Cut Road to Conduit Road NW., to be payable half and half instead of from the water revenues; inserts the language, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the commissioners to deliver water from the mains of the District of Columbia to the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission.

On No. 93: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, granting leave of absence with pay to per diem employees on legal holidays, modified so that to receive pay for legal holidays such employees must have been regularly employed for 15 working days next preceding the legal holiday.

On No. 94: Inserts section 7, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the Chief of Engineers to grant permission to the Women's Titanic Memorial Association to erect a memorial on the public grounds of the United States, other than the grounds of the Capitol, the Library of Congress, Potomac Park, and the White House.

On No. 95: Inserts section 8, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the commissioners to revoke the licenses of junk dealers who receive piping or fixtures or secondhand goods, stolen and delivered to them, if in the judgment of the commissioners the dealer had reasonable ground to believe that the goods were stolen.

On No. 96: Strikes out section 9, inserted by the Senate, relative to the distribution of taxes and assessments upon tracts of land portions of which are sold or to be sold or subdivided.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the following amendments:

On No. 8: Appropriating \$2,400 for the enforcement of the child-labor law.

On No. 16: Appropriating \$3,820 to pay Thomas W. and Alice N. Keller.

On No. 76: Relating to the Gallinger Municipal Hospital.

On No. 87: Appropriating \$87,000 for a park in Klingie Valley.

On No. 88: Appropriating \$2,000 for plans for a bridge across Klingie Valley on Connecticut Avenue.

On No. 97: Relating to the tax on intangible personal property.

On No. 98: Providing for additional compensation during the fiscal year 1918 to all of the employees provided for in the bill.

ROBERT N. PAGE,
JAS. MCANDREWS,
C. R. DAVIS,

Managers on the part of the House.

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I desire to get a chance to make a motion to concur in Senate amendment numbered 8. Will I have that chance after this vote has been taken?

The SPEAKER. Not if the vote is taken; no.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will say to the gentleman that amendment No. 8 is not included in the report. It is in disagreement and will come up after the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like to ask in regard to amendment No. 16.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That is in disagreement also.

Mr. LINTHICUM. And I will have a chance to move to concur in that?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. I want to ask the same question in regard to amendment No. 97.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I desire to ask the gentleman with reference to amendment No. 76.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. If the gentleman will allow me, amendment No. 76 is in disagreement and is not included in the report.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And the same privilege will be recorded in reference to that?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. And amendment No. 97 also?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. What is that?

Mr. AUSTIN. Amendment No. 97 in reference to intangible property?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Amendment 97 is also in disagreement.

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

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further disagree to Senate amendment No. 8.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves that the House further disagree to Senate amendment No. 8.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendment No. 76 be considered first.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand a word the gentleman said.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask that Senate amendment No. 76 may be considered first.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask this simply as a favor as I am compelled to go away.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to consider amendment 76 first. Is there objection?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina objects, and the question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] desires to be heard on his motion to concur in Senate amendment No. 8. I yield to him five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] is recognized to make some remarks, and all other gentlemen will please refrain from them.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 8 has to do with the enforcement of the child-labor laws in the District of Columbia. At the present time the task of enforcing these laws is assigned to two privates from the Washington police force, and the Senate has inserted an amendment providing that two inspectors shall be appointed at salaries of \$1,200 a year. An effort to secure this amendment has been made on a number of occasions, and the House conferees have persistently refused to concur.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Do not these policemen act as truant officers?

Mr. KEATING. I do not know, but I do know that two privates from the Washington police force are expected to enforce the child-labor laws in the District of Columbia. The Senate amendment has been urged by various civic organizations and others interested in this work, including, as I understand it, the judge of the juvenile court. Now, my contention is that if these police officers are good men they are needed on the police force to perform the duties of policemen. If we are to keep the child-labor laws of this District on the statute books we should do here what they have done in most of the States, provide a proper system of inspection and proper methods of enforcement. I hope the House will insist on concurring in the Senate amendment, which provides for the appointment of inspectors.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back three minutes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, referring to what the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] has said, since this child-labor law in the District of Columbia was placed on the statute books it has been enforced by two privates from the Metropolitan police force. These men have now been for three or four years in this employment, and the result of the adoption of the Senate amendment would lead to the employment of two additional persons. The statement made by the gentleman from Colorado that these privates were needed back on the force of the Metropolitan police can hardly be borne out in face of the fact that the House has just adopted the conference report that adds to the Metropolitan police force 90 privates.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman has no desire to misquote me, and perhaps I was unfortunate in the way I expressed myself. What I endeavored to say was this, that if these men are policemen, if they are good policemen, put them back to the work which they were intended to perform, and let us have inspectors who are especially fitted to enforce the child-labor law.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Up to four years ago these gentlemen were on the Metropolitan police force, but whether as privates or otherwise, I do not know. But their employment for the last four years has been in the enforcement of the child-labor law on the statute books, and now that is their employment, and I think they ought to be continued and that we ought not to make two additional employments. I have no more to say.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Now, is there complaint that this law is not well enforced?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I have heard no complaint except from certain sources that possibly are interested in the two new employments that would be given if this amendment is adopted.

Mr. KEATING. I assume responsibility for it, and say, yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it necessary to increase the force in order to enforce the provisions of this child-labor law? I want to see it well enforced.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It would give employment to two people who might be selected outside of the classified service if this amendment is agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these men who have been doing this work for six years especially detailed to this work?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. They have done nothing else, and I should say they have been trained and that they are perfectly familiar with the law and its enforcement.

Mr. FOSTER. They do not change them about, and let them act as policemen for a while and then go back?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The same people have been assigned to the enforcement of this law since it was passed, which, I am informed by the clerk, was six years ago, and they have been in that employ constantly for six years.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HARDY. Did I understand the gentleman from North Carolina to say that practically these are inspectors, who also have the authority to make an arrest in case it is needed?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Certainly. They have the authority that is conferred in the child-labor law, and they are also members of the Metropolitan police force.

Mr. HARDY. And their work has been this inspection work?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. For six years, since the law was put on the statute books.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] to concur in Senate amendment No. 8.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. KEATING. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 13, noes 71.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count.

[The Speaker proceeded to count.]

Mr. KEATING (during the count). Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The yeas are 13, noes 71. So the amendment to concur is rejected.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 16.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 16.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from West Virginia rise?

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. To move that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 16.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. LITTLEPAGE] moves that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 16.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the amendment numbered 16 reads as follows:

Damages and payment for ground on account of condemnation proceedings: To pay Thomas W. and Alice N. Keller for ground taken and damages on account of condemnation proceedings in square No. 2338, in the city of Washington, \$3,820.

Mr. Speaker, this item has occurred in every District of Columbia appropriation bill for the last four years. It grows out of proceedings in condemnation by a jury appointed under the law in the District of Columbia for the establishment of a building line in Thirteenth Street, adjoining Park Road. The persons mentioned here were a part of those against whom damages were assessed and in whose behalf benefits were allowed, the jury returning this verdict. Some of those who were involved in the property against which damages were placed appealed to the court, to the proper court of the District of Columbia, from the verdict of the jury. The case was heard in due course in court, and the verdict of the jury was confirmed. These defendants accepted the verdict of the court, certainly by not taking an appeal, as they had a right, to a higher court.

The evidence also shows that they accepted the verdict of this court by paying one of the three annual assessments that had been made against them without complaint. But time elapsed; several years have elapsed; and, instead of paying the two additional assessments, having lost and not having taken advantage of the opportunity to appeal to a higher court from the verdict of this jury, they undertake in an appropriation bill to collect a claim, if it is anything, against the District of Columbia.

Now, I want to say to the membership of this House that it will not be my lot to handle this District of Columbia appropriation any more, but somebody else will handle it, and there are claims, not less than a thousand of them, on the same basis as this, and if this is allowed on an appropriation bill, repealing a judicial decision of a court in the District of Columbia, then you will have a thousand, if you deal out equity—a thousand claims that will find their way into this bill—and you will be confronted with them.

I know that there is not a Member of this House, certainly not a Member on this side of the House, who has not had a personal appeal made to him by somebody at the other end of the Capitol because this man happened to be an employee of that body. Those are the facts. If the membership of this House, or of this side of the House, want to vote merely upon

a personal appeal on the part of men at the other end of the Capitol and repeal a decision and open a Pandora's box, very well.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not a fact that in the same suit, on a lot adjoining this, the jury assessed damages and then made an award, but in this case it took the man's land and then assessed damages against him?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. They did not take any of his land. They took title from him, but every foot of the land is in his front yard.

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

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. The question is whether the gentleman thinks this Congress more able to determine equity than that jury?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes; that is the question.

Mr. RAKER. May I answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. RAKER. About five minutes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Oh, I can not yield to the gentleman now. The gentleman can do that later. That will take too long.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will yield to the gentleman from Maryland five minutes.

Mr. LEWIS. I would like to have five minutes, too.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Very well.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] said that the District took no land from Mr. Keller; that they merely took the title from him. The truth is that Mr. Keller's land went right down to the street, and he had a right to that land along the sidewalk. The District took this property from him and set him back 30 feet. They changed those lots from commercial uses, being on the sidewalk, for which it could be sold, to a residential basis, 30 feet back from the sidewalk and parked in front.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Does the gentleman know of any other lot except one on that whole block where the line was not set back in the same way?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not know that there are any other lots except that lot on the corner; and the District took that and Keller's two lots. All the balance of that property is set back 30 feet, and now the Government has taken title to that property and set it back 30 feet, destroying its use as store property. I do not know whether the gentleman can see this little plat that I have in my hand; but this explains the situation.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Has the gentleman ever been on those premises?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not know that I have; but I have seen them very often.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I have been on them several times.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have not had the pleasure that the gentleman has had.

Mr. EAGLE. Pleasure or punishment?

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

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman say who made the plat?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I will say the gentleman from Alabama did not make the plat. He has been too busy on the immigration bill.

Mr. BURNETT. The jury of this man's neighbors said he was not entitled to anything.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have often found, as the gentleman perhaps has found in Alabama, that assessment juries do not always do justice to values; they are not infallible.

Mr. BURNETT. It is pretty apt to.

Mr. LINTHICUM. In this case, 30 feet was cut off the front of this man's property. Fifteen hundred square feet of his property was taken. He was assessed damages of \$1,125 and benefits \$1,605. In other words, 30 feet of the front was taken off the property there, and he was assessed \$562.50 benefits more than damages. From the property right adjoining, which was located right alongside of his, they took only 1,344 square feet and they allowed the owner \$6,000. Both properties were side by side, and no charge for benefits on the latter whatever

was made. It had only a small building valued at \$1,500, leaving for the ground \$4,500.

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

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Were all these facts given to a jury?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I presume they were. The jury ought to have gone there and inspected the property. I presume they did, but that does not make it right. Now, this man was charged for benefits when he got absolutely no benefit, while his property, as I say, was set 30 feet back, 1,500 square feet having been taken from him. He has to pay benefits, while the man on the corner, right alongside of him, is given \$6,000 damages, with no charge whatever for benefits. Now, what the amendment proposes is to allow this man the value of his property and take off what would have been a reasonable benefit, \$320, leaving \$3,820 for his property. There is nothing unfair about this proposition. The man who was corporation counsel at the time, Mr. Edward H. Thomas, says:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 25, 1914.

HON. JOHN WALTER SMITH,
United States Senate.

Sir: On June 13, 1910, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia filed their petition in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, holding a district court in cause No. 880, to establish a building line on the west side of Thirteenth Street N.W., between Park Road and Monroe Street, under the authority of an act of Congress approved June 21, 1906, entitled "An act providing for the establishment of a uniform building line on streets in the District of Columbia less than 90 feet wide." Under the provisions of this law the assessment jury is required to assess benefits equal to the amount of damages, including all expenses of the proceeding. Among the parcels of property to be taken, and which were taken, under this proceeding, in square 2838, were part of lot 11, being the east 25 feet by full width of said lot, containing 750 square feet, owner Thomas W. Keller, and part of lot 12, being the east 25 feet by the full width of said lot, containing 750 square feet, owners Thomas W. and Alice N. Keller.

The building line sought to be established is less than a block in length, and appears to be intended as a continuation of a building line established by subdivision on the west side of Thirteenth Street, running about two-thirds of the block. It appears that there were two jury verdicts and that the cost of the first verdict, which was set aside, was \$421.55, the total expenses being \$721.55, and this sum was ultimately added to the damages found, making the total damages awarded \$7,896.88. The total benefits assessed were also \$7,896.88.

As to said part of lots 11 and 12, the jury found damages of \$562.50 each, or \$1,125, and assessed \$750 benefits against lot 11 and \$855 benefits against lot 12, being a total of \$1,605, creating an obligation on part of the owners, after the taking of their property, of \$480.

The lot immediately north of the Keller property, which fronts about 54 feet on Thirteenth Street and is on the corner of that street and Park Road, was allowed \$6,000 as damages for the part taken and assessed no benefits.

While I held the office of corporation counsel, Mr. Keller personally protested to me against the taking of his property and the assessment against it of more than the award as benefits, but I could not help him, being obliged in the performance of my duty to insist upon the verdict. Assessment of benefits is, I think, merely a matter of opinion, a guess, and this case I thought a hard one. I should be glad to see relief granted Mr. Keller, particularly in view of the fact, as shown by the verdict, that the taking in said square embraced only the corner lot and his lots.

Very truly, yours,

E. H. THOMAS.

That is what the former corporation counsel says. He felt himself that it was unfair and unjust, but he could not help it under the conditions.

Now, Mr. Keller did not take an appeal, because Mr. Conrad H. Syme, corporation counsel later, advised him not to take an appeal, as his letter, which I insert, states:

AUGUST 23, 1916.

HON. ROBERT N. PAGE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

My DEAR Mr. PAGE: In accordance with your verbal request of this morning that I should advise you as to any information I had relative to the proceedings to establish a building line on Thirteenth Street near Park Road, in which the property of Thomas W. and Alice Keller was involved.

In this proceeding, which took place some years ago, I was then in private practice and represented Thomas W. and Alice Keller. They owned lots 11 and 12 in square 2838. One of these lots was partly occupied by a brick dwelling, the front of which conformed with a building line which had been previously established by restrictions in the deed of the holders. Their lots were under no such restriction and they would have had the right to build to the inner curb. As their property immediately abutted the corner property, it would have been available for commercial purposes and would, in connection with the corner property, have made an admirable site for an apartment house. As the property on the same side of the street and immediately north of Keller was held under a restriction privately establishing a uniform building line, the restriction being in the nature of a covenant that ran with the land, it will be at once seen that their situation was entirely different from Keller's, who was under no contractual or governmental restriction as to the uses to which he might have put his property in the absence of an established building line.

The usual proceedings were instituted by the District of Columbia to establish a uniform building line on the west side of Thirteenth Street, which involved the taking not only of all of that portion of the Keller property which fronted on Thirteenth Street for the depth of the proposed parking but also the taking of the corner property which was occupied by a small grocery store. The result of the proceedings was that the building line was established, but the jury, in awarding damages and assessing benefits, not only took all of Keller's property between the established building line and the curb but assessed benefits against him of, I think, about \$700 as to each lot, and for the purpose of this

public improvement Keller not only lost the property I have indicated but was compelled to pay a large sum in addition. He lost his property and the opportunity to make it available and valuable for business purposes, and I was not then and am not now able to see that any corresponding benefit accrued to him. I am satisfied the verdict was a very unjust one, and I believe Mr. Thomas, who was then corporation counsel, was of the same opinion.

I discussed with Mr. Keller the question of taking an appeal to the court of appeals from the award in this case. I advised against it, not because I did not think it was unjust and inequitable, but because my observation and experience had been that where many different interests were involved in the proceeding, the court of appeals would be reluctant, because of individual injustices done to one party, to reverse the entire proceeding, and I was unwilling to risk the heavy cost attendant upon failure to sustain the appeal. I believe I was correct as to this. One of the parties owning property on Park Road appealed, but was unsuccessful.

The above statement is my present recollection of the circumstances of this case. While considerable time has elapsed since it was tried, I believe my memory is substantially accurate.

In my judgment, the situation of the Keller property is anomalous, and the probabilities are that if relief was granted by Congress in his case a precedent would not be established which would occasion annoyance to Congress by the importunities of other disgruntled owners, as I doubt that any other piece of property in the city presents an exactly similar aspect.

In closing permit me to say that in my judgment the present method of assessing damages and benefits in the District of Columbia works many hardships. I believe it is unjust to say that the benefits accruing in taking property for public use must equal the damage or a fixed part thereof as matter of law. I believe both are facts which should be judicially ascertained, and that the proportion of benefits to damages should be governed by the particular facts in each particular case. I have never understood how the Supreme Court sustained the constitutionality of a law which arbitrarily assessed total benefits in a certain proportion to damages, regardless of whether benefits in fact exist. I think the convenience of this method is no justification for the injustice it frequently occasions in individual cases.

This letter is not of a confidential nature, and you are at liberty to use it in any way you may deem proper.

With kind regards, believe me,

Sincerely, yours,

CONRAD H. SYME,
Corporation Counsel, District of Columbia.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I ask two minutes additional.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. There are a number of gentlemen here who want to speak on this.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want only two minutes longer.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield two minutes, or not?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield two additional minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I can not yield any part of that two minutes, unless I can get more time.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The gentleman must understand that there are a number of gentlemen here who desire to speak on this, and I can not do it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for two minutes, and the time is running.

Mr. LINTHICUM. This letter of the corporation counsel says he advised him not to take an appeal, because a number of people in that block had the same interest, and so on, and he was satisfied that the court would ratify the verdict and he would likewise be fought by the corner-lot owner receiving the \$6,000. He paid his first assessment, but why did he pay it? Because if he did not pay his assessment they would have sold his property, and he had to pay the assessment to hold on to his property until he could finally make an appeal to Congress. I want to say to the gentlemen of this House that I have talked to Mr. Keller personally about this matter. I have known him for a long time, and he is a man who would not ask this redress unless it was fair and just. I have looked into this case, and I think Congress ought to grant him this amount, \$3,820, and ought to concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate looked into the matter thoroughly, and they concluded he was entitled to it and inserted it in the bill, and we ask that the amendment be concurred in.

[Senate Rept. No. 921, 64th Cong., 2d sess.]

Mr. SMITH of Maryland, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, submitted the following report:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. SMITH of Maryland to the bill (H. R. 19119) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, viz, to pay Thomas W. and Alice N. Keller for ground taken and damaged on account of condemnation proceedings, \$4,140, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it pass.

The subcommittee to which was referred the amendment of Senator SMITH of Maryland to the District appropriation bill report that they examined Thomas W. Keller and considered the letters and tables of assessment of damages and benefits affecting the proceedings of condemnation of which he complains.

Our conclusion is that Thomas W. and Alice N. Keller have substantial grounds for complaint in the premises, and the manifest injustice done them should be rectified.

We think, however, that the amount of this claim should be reduced by the sum of \$320, which apparently would be the amount of assess-

ment of benefits they would have been called on to pay had suitable recompense been made for their land taken in the condemnation proceedings in proper proportion to the amount paid to the adjoining owner.

With this deduction in the amount named in the proposed amendment, we recommend the appropriation proposed to the amount of \$3,820.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, if you could have time to understand this case, you would realize that it is one of marked peculiarities. Here was a block in the city of Washington, known as a square, as to which, except with reference to lots 11, 12, and 13, all of the other lots were back to a desirable building line. Some agitation began to force the other three lots back to this building line. As to lot 13, a jury sat on the case, took down the house, and awarded damages of \$6,000, the house being worth about \$1,500 out of the \$6,000. As to lots 11 and 12, now in controversy here, the result of the jury's verdict was the imposition of a so-called technical benefit as a burden on the owners, Mr. and Mrs. Keller. Under the law the jury were not free to act otherwise. They were not exercising the equitable discretion that we might suppose a jury would exercise. They were obliged under the statute to impose a "benefit" tax upon this man, because all of his land was not taken.

The remaining facts are these: The land in lot 13 which was taken consisted of 1,344 feet. The land taken from lots 11 and 12 consists of 1,500 feet. The owner of lot 13 got \$6,000, of which \$4,500 was for his land alone. The owner of lots 11 and 12 got nothing, but was subjected to the burden of an alleged benefit besides. His lots have become so shortened that uses to which he might have put them are now denied. He could have put an apartment building upon them, and I believe that was in his mind. By reason of this litigation one of these lots is now only some 58 feet in length and is incapable of being put to commercial or apartment building use. It is very well for the chairman of this committee to argue this case on the presumptions of law. That is a very good argument to make upon grounds of general policy and will appeal to a body like this, but I think if the Members of the House could make an individual study of this matter they would find an anomaly presented, resulting in an absolute injustice to a proprietor in this city who is entitled to protection of law rather than the unpaid damages imposed upon him.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. LEWIS. No; I do not. If this were a criminal case, some opportunity of appeal would exist. If a man were convicted by forces of the law, without regard to the justice of his conviction, without regard to the justice of the application of the law in a given instance, an appeal might be made to the governor or executive to remit the fine or to pardon the offense itself. In a case of this sort, involving a property right, the only appeal the individual can make is to a body like this. It is being made by this gentleman to-day, and in my opinion is being justly made. He ought to be given damages for the property that has been taken away from him, just as the other property owner has been given damages, and he ought to be given whatever amount may be determined by the committees of this House.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, one of the difficulties involved in this case is that all the parties were in the same suit. Being in the same suit, after the award by the jury it went to the court for approval, and, of course, this one man was responsible for the costs if he went further and then lost. This attorney, who is now attorney for the District of Columbia advised him not to appeal for fear that the others, having such a large award, having got \$6,000 for land adjoining, while this man Keller had to pay \$480—if he went further he might have to pay the whole expense. The jury allowed an award or found that he was damaged for this land adjoining \$6,000, and this man Keller had property just as useful for business purposes. The Committee of the Senate on Claims have examined this matter and reported it out favorably for \$3,820. The Committee on the District of Columbia have gone over the same thing and reported favorably, and we now find it in this bill.

I can not conceive, when you talk about the judgment of a jury in this case, the district attorney, heretofore and the present district attorney, when that was tried advised him not to appeal. He stated that the award was in the judgment of the jury; that no testimony as to value of different pieces of property is heard, but the jury looks at the property and fixes the value of the property. It can be shown how unjust it is in this case. There were two pieces of property lying side by side, and one man is awarded damages for \$6,000 while the other man's

property is taken from him and he is assessed as to benefits for the remaining part of his property \$480. Then the gentlemen say he must yield to this assessment because he paid the benefits assessed. Why, surely he had to pay the benefits assessed, because they were a lien on the balance of his land.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I can not yield just now. If he had not paid the \$480 benefits assessed for the land taken he would have lost not only the land that was taken but the balance of his land.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The gentleman assumes that he made in one payment the assessment for the purpose of removing the lien on his property. There are two assessments still unpaid.

Mr. RAKER. Then they will have to be paid, because having assessed him \$480 they may take his land. The only thing to do was to pay the assessment and save the rest of his home, and then come to this body that can give him relief. After this body looks into the matter, sees that they have the justice and the equity on their side, and, although there has been an award by the jury—not exactly a jury, but of men who went out there and gave their own personal judgment—then let this body do justice to Keller. You gentlemen would not want a case adjudicated by men who would take two pieces of property lying side by side and give one man \$6,000 and assess benefits amounting to \$480 on the other when the property was in the same condition. That being the case, they appealed to this Congress, notwithstanding the award of the jury in this case; notwithstanding the fact that judgment has become final; notwithstanding that there is no chance to appeal. This is a question of equity here. There is a question of justice here, and there is a question of right. These people ought to be paid for their land in proportion to the amount awarded to the other party.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Does it not look to the gentleman like this, that the cases being all one they did not want to appeal it for fear that it would be reversed as to the fellow who got the \$6,000 damages?

Mr. RAKER. No.

Mr. HARDY. Did not the gentleman say that this man's attorney advised him not to appeal for fear they might reverse the whole judgment?

Mr. RAKER. No; just the reverse of that. For fear the judgment might not be reversed, and all the expenses would have to be paid by this man Keller and his wife. The other party had received an award of \$6,000, and if they could convince the court that the whole award was proper it would be maintained, notwithstanding it might be wrong as to the Kellers. Kellers could no doubt apply to the court to have the award set aside upon questions of law. The jury's award having settled the facts under the peculiar statute in the District applicable to this class of cases, and not having a question of law which would authorize the court to set aside the award, the attorney for Kellers advised them that it would be useless to appeal. In this there may have been an error of judgment. At any rate, an injustice has been done, and it can and should be remedied. That injustice can be righted by adopting this Senate amendment.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] would not yield for a question. I asked both of them to yield at the time they were speaking of one party getting \$6,000 and the other getting only \$600. I wished to ask the two gentlemen if it is not a fact that the award to the person who received \$6,000 was made because his was a short lot and had upon it a storehouse of value that had to be included in the award, while to Mr. Keller was awarded damages resulting from the taking of the portion of the front of his lot and benefits assessed to the other portion of the lot that was of value, while what remained of the Johnson lot was of no value whatever.

Here are the facts of the case: There is a law providing the method by which the Government takes property under the right of eminent domain and by which the compensation to be paid is determined. We have a definite procedure which must be followed, and it was followed in this case. This man was given an award for damages and assessed for benefits. The attorney advised him not to appeal the case, because his case was such that he feared the expenses of the appeal would be added to the assessment for benefits. He acquiesced in the judgment of the

jury. He could have taken an appeal to the court and had his rights determined. There has been no similar case in the history of the District of Columbia brought into the Congress of the United States. The only reason this case is brought here year after year is the fact that this man is an employee of the Senate of the United States. The Senate of the United States has attempted to override the law and to give this man a special advantage because he is a favorite employee of the Senate. The House of Representatives for six years has resisted this action, which is an attempt to loot the Treasury of the United States for the benefit of a favored employee of a branch of the Federal Government. It is time we so manifested our opposition that nobody will ever again have the effrontery to press this claim or to have it stated with the suppression of some of the essential facts necessary properly to understand it.

If the House believes that when the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia proceeds to take property, title to which is in an employee of the Senate, and that person is dissatisfied with what is awarded to him in the orderly process of law, he can appeal to Congress and get redress or relief that another citizen or property owner in the District could not obtain, then we ought to vote this money. He is a nice, popular, respectable man, and if we believe we ought to give him something out of the Treasury without any excuse, this is the opportunity to do it.

Mr. BUTLER. Did the personal qualities of the man appear before the jury?

Mr. FITZGERALD. But if we believe that the law is made for all, that everyone should be treated alike, that a man when he pursues his remedy in court and acquiesces in what is done without an appeal to the proper authorities—

Mr. TALBOTT. That is what he is complaining about. It is too late to appeal.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Of course it is too late now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But it was not too late when the time within which to make his appeal was still running. He had his opportunity, he had his day in court, and there are still some men in Congress who know the facts, and it is not yet too late to have them recalled, and to have Members of this House reminded of them. Some day there may be no one here who will recall them, and then it will not be too late to make this appeal; but I am afraid that day has not come yet, and that this individual is not to be placed above the law and given money out of the Treasury, to which under the law it has been found he is not entitled.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. LITTLEPAGE].

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Speaker, I would not have said anything about this case but for the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] about an effort to loot the Treasury, even though a jury of 12 men in a condemnation proceeding regularly instituted, trial regularly had, have decided that these claimants are not entitled to any compensation for the land taken by the city, and even though under that finding not only did they disallow them for the value of the land, but in the way of improvements, of benefits, assessed them \$480, which they have had to pay in order to hold on to the residue of their little estate. But we are told by the distinguished chairman of this committee that there are two more assessments that the owners of this property still have to pay. Neither am I in favor of the recall of judicial decisions except where they are palpably wrong, but God knows I am in favor of justice. I have tried a number of condemnation suits, I have tried some jury cases, and there is not a lawyer within the sound of my voice who does not know that at some time, somewhere, somehow, the verdicts of the jury do not respond to the sentiments of justice.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Yes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Does the gentleman seriously think that this body would come nearer reaching a verdict that was just than 12 men who had seen the whole layout of the land?

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's question, I have yet to forego the impression I have of this House and think that there is a single man in it who will sit by and see an outrageous injustice done. Take their land upon which they pay taxes, that they have paid for, and penalize them to benefit the city—take all they have, leave them stripped, helpless, and not be willing to pay something for it? I do not

believe the true sentiment of justice in this House will stand for that.

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

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. In the numerous cases where the juries have done wrongs in the gentleman's State, did the injured party appeal to the legislature to get redress?

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. That is hardly an analogous case. This case is in the city of Washington, and the city after taking three big swallows and a cow mouthful now wants to take the residue by assessments, and these old people only ask you to give them a little something for their land, but distinguished men of this House get up and say, "No; we will kick you out." It is an absolute injustice, wherever it comes from, to take the land that this man intended to build an important building on and give it to the city, to the public, and not pay him one single cent for it. If it was a mudhole, it was his land, it did not belong to the Government, it did not belong to the city, and it does not belong to this House. Whether this case has been here for 4 years or 40 years, I do not care, this is the first time that I have heard of it.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not a matter of fact that, this being the District of Columbia, this is the only remedy the man has if the jury has improperly taken his property from him and no appeal was taken?

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. I should think so, since the statute of limitations put an end to it and puts him in a fix so that he can not go to the court. I do not know what in the world could have happened, I do not know who the lawyer was.

Mr. BUTLER. He had better sue the lawyer.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Go to the lawyer for redress when Congress takes the man's property?

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

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman certainly would not advise Congress—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Let me have three minutes more.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman would not advise us to settle claims like this simply on a report on an appropriation bill?

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. If it strikes you between the eyes as being a matter of justice, ought you not settle it?

Mr. BUTLER. I can not understand; I do not know. I want the facts. The jury held otherwise.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. The city has taken the land, the city has it, and they have ruined the lot, and they have assessed \$480 on it more to hold on to the tail of the lot.

Mr. BUTLER. It looks hard.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. It does look hard, and is it not an injustice, if these men have stated the truth, and ought not this House to rise and say that we will not let it go further?

Why, gentlemen, sincerely, I think they should not allow one man \$6,000 right in the immediate vicinity for damages to his lot, the value of the building only being \$1,500, giving him \$4,500, and give his claimant nothing. Now, I have not talked to anybody in the United States Senate. There is no one who has strings on me. This old gentleman told me about the injustice and I agreed with him about it. If every Member in this House would say we ought not to pay the man something for his land I would still believe he ought to be paid for the land taken. The counsel who represented the city at that time says he ought to be paid something; the counsel who represents the city now says he ought to have something. The report coming from the Senate says he ought to have something. I am not one of those men—

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

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. I am not one of the Members of this House who thinks the House is the only body of this Government that has all the sense. The Senate has some sense as well.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. What?

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. I am not here to impugn the motives of Members of the Senate or other public men.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from West Virginia to recede from the disagreement of the House to Senate amendment No. 16 and concur in the same.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—yeas 39, noes 69.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to make the point of no quorum in the House.

The SPEAKER. Well, it would have been too late, anyhow. So the motion was rejected.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Senate amendment No. 76 I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment 76 and concur in the same with an amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 76: Page 92, line 12, amend the amendment, after the word "located," strike out the words "on reservation No. 13 in the District of Columbia" and insert "on land owned by the District of Columbia at Fourteenth and Upshur Street NW."

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. How much time?

Mr. MONDELL. I want to ask the gentleman a question in regard to the amendment. The only change that the gentleman makes in the Senate amendment is in regard to the description of the location of the hospital?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That is all.

Mr. MONDELL. Does not the gentleman want to strike out the proviso at the end of the Senate amendment?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for the suggestion; I had overlooked it. I ask unanimous consent to include in my amendment striking out that part of the Senate amendment beginning with the word "Provided," in line 22, the remainder of the section.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified amendment: On page 92, line 12, after the word "located," strike out "on reservation No. 13 in the District of Columbia" and insert "on land owned by the District of Columbia at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets NW." and in line 22, after the word "Avenue," strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves to recede from the disagreement on the part of the House to amendment 76 and agree to the same with the amendment just reported by the Clerk.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Does the gentleman desire some time?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I made the motion, Mr. Speaker, that we concur in the Senate amendment; therefore I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina. The proposition as I understand it—

Mr. MANN. Was that amendment reported?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I rise to concur in the amendment. I do not know whether it was reported or not.

Mr. MANN. A motion to concur would take precedence over the other motion.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I stated to the gentleman from North Carolina that I would ask—

Mr. MANN. But a gentleman can not make a motion by addressing the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Virginia want to move to concur?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do, Mr. Speaker; I make the motion now that the House concur in the Senate amendment. Now, if I may have the attention of the House for a moment, I will state the proposition. The question of the location of this hospital seems to have agitated this Congress and the last one. The extension and enlargement of the hospital I will not now go into. I am not sufficiently apprised of the detail facts to make an intelligent discussion of that aspect of the case. The question of the location of the hospital is very plain and obvious upon slight consideration. The Government owns the property upon which the hospital now is located. It has been located there 70 years, and now the desire is to move it to another place, to another section of the town, according to the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE], upon land which has been owned by the Government for some 16 years.

The character of the patients and inmates of this hospital necessarily injures the personal, the pecuniary, and social interests of any people who live in close proximity to such an institution. It depresses the value of all real estate, makes living most distasteful, and in every way detracts from any community in which such a hospital may be located. In a distant

section of the city a lot of people of moderate means are to have their property destroyed by the movement and location of a hospital that has already done all the damage it can do in a community in which it has been located for 70 years. There is not a town council in America that would undertake so to treat the citizenship of its own community by moving such a hospital from an old and established location, where it had adjusted itself to the surrounding community, necessarily resulting in the depreciation of property values and the rights and benefits resulting from thrift and proper ambitions.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The gentleman, of course, is aware that on this site, purchased by the District of Columbia for the hospital some 16 years ago, there is already one unit of this municipal hospital, to wit, the Tuberculosis Hospital.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is very true, and that ought to be removed. In this hospital there are about 3,000 inmates a year. And I ask the House to listen to the character of some of the patients admitted into it:

Acute alcoholism, 437; delirium tremens, 80; chronic alcoholism, 62; morphinism, 51; scabies, 11; syphilis and other venereal diseases, 165; pellagra, 9; and mental diseases, 580.

Mr. Speaker, the hospital is now located in the section of the town most convenient for the reception of this particular character of people. Now, to take it from this community and set it down into one of the most growing and developing sections of Washington is unnecessary, unwise, and unjust.

May I say to the House that the Piney Branch Citizens' Association, the Brightwood Citizens' Association, the Brightwood Park Citizens' Association, the Columbia Heights Citizens' Association, the Petworth Citizens' Association, the Park View Citizens' Association, the Takoma Park Citizens' Association, the Woodburn and Chillum Castle Heights Citizens' Association, the board of trade, the chamber of commerce, and the Federation of Citizens' Associations protest against the moving of this hospital into this new community. There is far more land in the present site. There are houses on it now that can be easily improved or altered. The Senate has agreed that the old place is the proper location. I think it is a wise conclusion, and I ask that the House concur in that position. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have not been in favor of erecting this municipal hospital. To my mind the indigent poor and sick have been well taken care of, and at much less expense to the people of the District of Columbia than they can be by the building of a municipal hospital. I think there is no place in the United States where they have better hospital facilities than they have in the city of Washington. You take the municipally-owned hospital out here at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets, where it is now proposed to locate this hospital, and it costs the Government much more to maintain that hospital and treat the patients that are confined there than it does to treat patients in the other hospitals in the city. Cases of that kind require more attention and are naturally more expensive to take care of than these tubercular patients. As I have said before in this House, we have two large buildings which cost the Government some \$300,000 and \$500,000, now located on Reservation No. 13, where it was proposed to place this hospital. These buildings for a sum not to exceed \$75,000 could be fitted up to care for all the patients that are confined in that section that is now called the Washington Asylum. There is no doubt about that, and yet we are asked to appropriate \$500,000 to build a hospital, and then to maintain it at a large expense to the people of the District of Columbia and to the Federal Government. I think it is unwise.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman, my colleague, have any idea at all that they can build this hospital for \$500,000, although that is the limit of cost?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I do not.

Mr. MANN. It is likely to be \$2,000,000, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. As suggested by my colleague, it is likely to be \$2,000,000; and we all know what it requires to maintain a hospital of that character.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Do we not have to pay for taking care of patients?

Mr. FOSTER. We do.

Mr. SHERLEY. Do we get a bargain, or do we not?

Mr. FOSTER. We do.

Mr. SHERLEY. Do you think it is fair to impose that burden on the private hospitals?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the hospitals of the District of Columbia are complaining of that.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have heard the contrary within three days. What is the difference, so far as the Treasury is concerned, if we pay the upkeep ourselves?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that the sick and poor are better taken care of in the hospitals now established, and at much less expense, than they can possibly be maintained for in a municipal hospital.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does the gentleman know of any city of 200,000 people that does not have a municipal hospital?

Mr. FOSTER. That may be true. I do not know whether they have or not. But I know of no city in the United States where they take such good care of their sick as they do in the city of Washington in these hospitals.

Mr. SHERLEY. I would like to take you to my city and show you the municipal hospital that cost over \$1,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know anything about Louisville, Ky., but I know what they are in the city of Washington. I have visited these hospitals in the city not only once but many times. I have visited the Washington Asylum, and I know what it is. I know what these buildings are out there. I have seen them. I believe that this House makes a mistake when it starts in to expend a large amount of money for a municipal hospital. It is unnecessary, and it is simply putting a burden upon the Federal Treasury that ought not to be placed there.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS. Is it or is it not a fact that this old hospital, when it was originally located, was not in a territory built up by the homes of the people? And is it not a fact that any man who built his home there had notice in advance that he was building in proximity to a hospital?

Mr. FOSTER. I think so. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit one question?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Is it not also true that the new Eastern High School has been built on this reservation No. 13, almost in front of where the Senate proposes to build this hospital?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know as to that.

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

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman one minute more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I think with the gentleman from North Carolina that if we are to build this hospital it ought to be built at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets, but I am opposed to building this hospital. I think it is an unnecessary expense to the Government, and it is going to be so for all time to come.

Now, this idea that we are neglecting these poor people in the city of Washington is not correct. We are taking the best care of these people, and they are cared for here in the best hospitals that you can find anywhere in the United States.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. Assuming that the hospital is to be built, where, in the gentleman's opinion, should it be built?

Mr. FOSTER. I have no hesitation in saying that it should be built at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets.

Mr. FIELDS. I just wanted to get the gentleman's opinion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in order that the House may not vote on these motions under any misapprehension, there are a few facts in connection with this item that I want to place fairly before the membership of the House.

First of all, as to the location of this hospital, and apparently the only controverted point now in the two motions pending before the House is as to where this hospital is to be located. Two years ago, in the appropriation bill that was passed making appropriation for the District of Columbia, a provision was carried authorizing the expenditure of \$15,000 for the preparation of plans for the construction of a hospital on a site owned by the District of Columbia at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets NW., within a limit of cost not exceeding \$500,000. Those plans were prepared and were submitted to Congress before the last session of Congress. For various reasons this item went out of the last bill, postponing its location anywhere. In the meantime a great agitation arose among the citizenship of the District of Columbia in various localities as to where this hospital should be built, or whether it should be built at all.

The facts as to these two locations are these, as I have been able to see them: Reservation No. 13, at the point at which it is proposed to build the hospital, by the Senate amendment—the amendment in which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] moves that the House concur—is on the extreme edge of the city of Washington and immediately on the Anacostia flats, now in process of reclamation for park purposes. The old hospital consists of a number of detached wooden buildings that are ready to fall down. Those buildings are used for the purposes of a municipal hospital. There is no value in them. So far as that loss is concerned, it would be a distinct advantage to the city if they were burned up, provided the unfortunate inmates were out of them when burned. On this same reservation No. 13 is located the jail of the District of Columbia, a building that nobody expects to move and which can not be moved. On the other corner is the Congressional Cemetery. On the same lot, reservation 13, is the smallpox pesthouse. On the same reservation is the place of refuge for the leper that we have had on our hands for a number of years. If the membership of this House want to place a hospital costing \$500,000 for the care of the unfortunate indigent and sick in such surroundings as those, in a swamp and on the edge of this city—

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As to one fact that the gentleman stated. A recent bill passed by Congress established a leprosarium. That would take care of the leper?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes; it would take care of the leper; but would not take care of the pesthouse, or the jail, or the Congressional Cemetery.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not refer to that.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Another thing. The gentleman speaks of this being a place out in the residential section. Immediately facing this present reservation No. 13, the Congress has appropriated \$750,000 for the construction of a high school for eastern Washington, placing it within a stone's throw of where this Senate amendment proposes to have this hospital. In the northwest, 16 years ago, the District of Columbia acquired 16 acres of land with the distinct purpose in the legislation for the construction of a municipal hospital. Nobody was deceived by it. On that land, eight years ago, the first unit of a municipal hospital was constructed, to wit, the tuberculosis hospital. No resident of that section of the city raised any objection at that time to the construction of this unit of this city hospital. It has been there all these years. There the city has 16 or more acres of land on which to construct this hospital. It would be no detriment to property in that vicinity to have buildings costing \$500,000 constructed upon that land. There is no detriment to the property of any man in that part of the city by the building of this character of an improvement, but a distinct enhancement of the value of that property.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will.

Mr. FIELDS. This land was purchased about 16 years ago, with the understanding that a hospital was to be built upon it?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Certainly. The provision was carried in the bill.

Mr. FIELDS. Were the residences which are now in that vicinity built there before or after that time?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. A few of them were there then, but those who went there since went with the full knowledge that the District owned that piece of property, and secured it for the purpose of constructing there a municipal hospital.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understood the gentleman to say that he did not think the location of this hospital there would be at all injurious to the surrounding property.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. On the contrary, I think it will enhance it in value.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Why did the gentleman think the present location of this hospital would injure a public high school?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I did not take that position. I was merely answering the gentleman that there was nothing from his viewpoint to interfere with.

Mr. HOWARD. The truth is that with this high school located there the noise of children playing would be an objection.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It might interfere with the hospital, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. HOWARD. Sure.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Now, in answer to the gentleman from Illinois, Dr. FOSTER, who is against the construction of any municipal hospital at all, I am amazed at him. He is a physician. He ought to know, and does know, that this city is not caring properly for its indigent sick. I make the statement as a layman in contradiction of what he says about it. If he will go to this place where we have to-day crowded conditions of the indigent sick, with men suffering from rheumatism placed on cots as thickly as they can be placed, in the basement of the building below the level of the ground, I know he will not approve that sort of care for the indigent sick of this District. I say my observation leads me to believe and to make the statement that there is not another city of this size in the United States of America that has such deplorable lack of accommodations for caring for its sick. There is not one that has ever fallen under my observation.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. To whom does this reservation 13 belong?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. To the United States of America, and not to the District of Columbia.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. And the other land at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets does belong to the District of Columbia?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It does belong to the District of Columbia, and it was bought for the distinct purpose of building a municipal hospital upon it. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], interrupting his colleague, Dr. FOSTER, talked about the cost of this hospital. I do not know why these gentlemen suppose it will cost an amount in excess of the amount which we have placed as the limit. We have tried to work this out so that we can take care of 500 indigent sick people. The number may increase in some future years; and if does, this Congress ought to enlarge the hospital to take care of every indigent sick person in the city of Washington and to do so properly. It may cost that. Other municipalities of less population than this have expended vastly more money even than that suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] for this purpose, and we owe it to these indigent sick people to take care of them. I say it is a disgrace, and I have said it before on the floor of this House, that we allow conditions such as now exist in this city to continue.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me five minutes?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] five minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the city of Washington ought to have a municipal hospital. Practically all the cities of the Union of any size have such institutions. A number of cities of the Union of much less population than Washington have larger and more expensive municipal hospitals than is proposed in this Senate amendment.

It is true that there are some very excellent private hospitals in this city where the indigent sick are receiving very good care. But the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] has called attention to the fact that the accommodations in these hospitals are now inadequate, and they are growing and will grow increasingly inadequate with the passing of the years. It will require several years to complete an institution such as is proposed, and when it is completed we will find the necessity for it, and there will still remain the need of the present privately owned hospitals. They will still have all they can possibly do, and they will continue to do their good work, and the building of the municipal hospital will not interfere with or curtail that good work.

Some gentlemen are very tender about some people who have bought property up in the vicinity of Fourteenth and Upshur Streets since the site was acquired there for hospital purposes. But, curiously enough, they are not anything like as tender with regard to the indigent poor who would be compelled to go to a hospital, if they had their way about it, located on the swamps of the Anacostia River between the pesthouse and the jail. I am not much disturbed about these people on Fourteenth Street. In the first place, I think they are largely the victims of a groundless fear they themselves have created. Some real-estate dealers in that locality imagine that the building of this hospital might have some effect on the value of their property. I doubt it having a seriously injurious effect.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question and preface it with a brief statement?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Washington Board of Trade in 1900, in alluding to the reservation 13, used these words:

A subcommittee of the Washington Board of Trade reported in 1900 that the institutions located on reservation 13 "blocked the way to improvement and growth in that direction of our city" and "that the extent of the present obstruction to the natural growth of our city in the eastward direction can be shown."

Now, they say there that reservation 13 had blocked the development and growth of the city.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, the gentleman knows how these statements by a board of trade are procured. Some gentleman goes to the office of the board of trade and gets the secretary to sign such a statement as they desire.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman contend for an instant that with lunatics, mental suspects, human derelicts, morphine and alcoholic patients, housed in a hospital of this sort it will result otherwise than a serious injury to a residential community?

Mr. MONDELL. I doubt whether the location of the hospital would have any very considerable unfortunate effect upon the value of property. But, in any event, the ground at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets was acquired for hospital purposes years ago, and the people purchased there with the understanding that the hospital would be built there. It is possible that some real-estate speculator may have made more money and secured better prices by promising people that he had influence enough to prevent the building of a hospital. They knew that we proposed to start a hospital a number of years ago. It is a splendid location for a hospital; it is easily accessible; it is high and dry and a cool location, and the hospital will be built in grounds large enough so that the presence of the hospital should not have an unfortunate effect on the surroundings, and I believe it will not. Whether we build the hospital there or not, if you have any regard for these unfortunates who are to be cared for, it ought not to be built in the swamps of Anacostia, next to that most gruesome of places, the Congressional Cemetery, between the pesthouse and the jail.

I have some regard for the poor people who in years to come will be cared for in this institution. I feel that it would be little less than a crime to locate the hospital in the place where the Senate proposes to locate it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understood the gentleman to say that the ground at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets was purchased 16 years ago for this purpose.

Mr. MONDELL. I did not say 16 years ago. I said years ago.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But that is the fact; I know little about it. Does not the gentleman think that if the Government has slept on its purpose for 16 years, the citizens who purchased the property in that vicinity had reason to believe that the Government had abandoned its purpose?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think that the Government has slept on its purpose. It has been continually agitated in Congress from that time to this. I will ask the gentleman from North Carolina if that is not a fact?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That is exactly true, and we have given one unit there; we have built a tuberculosis hospital.

Mr. MONDELL. A tuberculosis hospital is already there, and it will not be moved. No one who does not feel comfortable in the vicinity of a hospital will be any more comfortable in the vicinity of a tuberculosis hospital than he will in the vicinity of a municipal hospital. If we listened to speculators who are trying to get us to move the institution to an improper place, the next thing they will want us to do will be to abandon the property entirely and tear down the tuberculosis hospital.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The gentleman does not mean to intimate that I represent any speculators in land?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, certainly not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not own a foot of real estate in Washington, and do not expect to.

Mr. MONDELL. I would not for anything in the world suggest such a motive on the part of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am sure the gentleman did not, but his language was unfortunate.

Mr. MONDELL. I shall be glad to modify the language if I said anything that will bear any such construction. I understand that the motives of the gentleman from Virginia are the best in the world. He is in this case, as always, actuated by the best of motives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia to recede from the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendment 76, and concur therein.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the substitute be read—that the House recede from the disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, 76, and concur in the same with the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lines 3 and 4 of said amendment strike out the words "on reservation 13 in District of Columbia," and insert in lieu thereof the words "on land owned by the District of Columbia at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets NW," and to strike out the remainder of said amendment beginning with the word "and," line 11.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment 76 and concur therein with the amendment just read.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment 87.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 87.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 88.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 97. In that connection I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that that is the intangible-tax amendment. The present law enacted in the last District of Columbia appropriation bill carries a tax of four-tenths of 1 per cent upon intangible personal property in the District of Columbia. The amendment to this intangible-tax law now carried and on which we are about to act, reduces that to three-tenths of 1 per cent. It also makes certain exceptions to the operation of that law. I do not mean by making this motion to say to the House that your conferees will not try to work out in conference these disagreements. I have brought this back because certain gentlemen in the House before it went to conference at all demanded of me that I should. If there is any Member of the House who has a motion to make in connection with it, I shall expect him to make that motion now; otherwise I give notice to the House that the conferees will try to work this out on as equitable a basis as possible.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 121, line 14, after the word "section," in line 13, strike out the balance of page 121, all of page 122, and down to line 17, section 11, on page 123, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That moneys loaned and invested, bonds and shares of stock (except the stock issued by banks and other corporations within the District of Columbia the taxation of which banks and corporations is herein provided for) of any person, firm, association, or corporation resident or engaged in business within said District shall be scheduled and appraised in the manner provided by paragraph 1 of said section 6 for listing and appraisal of tangible personal property and assessed at their fair cash value, and there shall be paid thereon to the tax collector of said District three-tenths of 1 per cent of the value thereof: *Provided further*, That any such tax shall not apply to bank notes or notes discounted or negotiated by any bank or banking institution, savings institution, or trust company, nor to savings institutions having no capital stock, building associations, firemen's relief associations, secret and beneficial societies, labor unions, and labor-union relief associations, nor to beneficial organizations paying sick or death benefits, or either or both, from funds received from voluntary contributions or assessments upon members of such associations, societies, or unions; nor shall the provisions of this act apply to life or fire insurance companies having no capital stock, nor to the shares of stock of business companies which by reason of or in addition to incorporation receive no special franchise or privilege, but all such corporations shall be rated, assessed, and taxed as individuals conducting business in similar lines are rated, assessed, and taxed: *Provided, however*, That corporations, limited partnerships, and joint-stock associations within said District liable to tax under the laws of said District on earnings or capital stock shall not be required to make any report or pay any further tax under this section on the moneys, credits, mortgages, bonds, and other securities owned by them in their own right, but such corporations, partnerships, and associations holding securities as trustees, executors, administrators, guardians, or in any other manner shall return and pay the tax imposed by this section upon all such securities so held by them as in the case of individuals: *And provided further*, That a joint committee consisting of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate and the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives is hereby appointed to make, by subcommittee or otherwise, a careful and exhaustive study of the tax laws of the District of Columbia, including license taxes, with a view of recommending such changes in the laws as the joint committee may deem fair and equitable, report to be made to the Congress during the next session."

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman desire any time?

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a statement.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the object of this amendment is to exempt bank deposits from taxation in the District of Columbia. I simply want to present a few arguments in regard to the proposed amendment.

During the first session of the present Congress Senator STERLING introduced an amendment to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was then under consideration in the Senate, the purpose of which is to impose a tax of four-tenths of 1 per cent on all intangible property owned by individuals, firms, and corporations resident and doing business in the District of Columbia. That amendment was adopted by the Senate, agreed to by the conferees, and it is now a law. It will become operative July 1, 1917, unless it be repealed, and if it is not modified at this session of Congress it will bear heavily and unjustly upon the banks and trust companies in the District of Columbia.

On February 6, 1917, Senator STERLING introduced an amendment to H. R. 19119—the District of Columbia appropriation bill—which is intended to modify his original amendment, which is now a law, in the following manner:

- (1) Reduce the tax from four-tenths of 1 per cent to three-tenths of 1 per cent.
- (2) Exempt the mortgages, bonds, and other securities owned by corporations, limited partnerships, and joint-stock associations that are required by existing laws to pay a tax based on their gross earnings or capital stock.
- (3) Exempt the shares of stock of business corporations organized to carry on a private business and which receive no special franchise or privilege by reason of incorporation.

The amendments are just and reasonable and they have been adopted by the Senate as an amendment to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which is now being considered by the conference committee.

The intention to tax moneys and credits, under the head of which is included bank deposits, has led many large business concerns to declare their intention to transfer their bank deposits to other near-by cities, namely, Baltimore and New York, where bank deposits are not taxed as intangible property.

Banks and trust companies in the District of Columbia are required, under the terms of a law passed in 1902, to pay a heavy tax based on their gross earnings, as follows: National banks and trust companies, 6 per cent; savings banks, 4 per cent.

If the mortgages, bonds, and other securities owned by banks and trust companies are taxed, the burden will be so heavy that some banks will be forced out of business and the dividend payments of others will be seriously curtailed. The result will be that the banking business will tend to be absorbed by a few large and powerful institutions and some sections of the city left without banking facilities.

In many States which have an intangible-tax law they do not thus doubly tax corporations which pay a heavy tax to the State upon earnings or capital stock, and where a bank is thus heavily taxed for the right to do business it is released from the payment of further taxes of any kind except upon the realty owned by it.

Banks in the District of Columbia now pay the following mentioned taxes:

- (1) On real estate owned by them, to the District of Columbia.
- (2) On gross earnings, to the District of Columbia.
- (3) On net profits (income tax, 2 per cent), to the District of Columbia.
- (4) On capital invested, 50 cents per \$1,000, to the Federal Government.
- (5) National banks on circulating notes, to the Federal Government.
- (6) Proposed excess profits tax of 8 per cent, to the Federal Government.

If the tax on their assets is permitted to remain, as practically all the assets of a bank are in the form of notes, mortgages, and bonds, there will be seven taxes to be met yearly, and the seventh will be the one that will absorb the remainder of the profit that some small banks are able to make, and it will seriously impair the net earning power for dividend purposes of others.

There is great apprehension among the banks and their customers as to the effect of this tax. Deposits in local banks on December 27, 1916, were \$99,172,520, just under the \$100,000,000 mark. Of these deposits, roundly, \$50,000,000 were in national banks, \$14,000,000 in savings banks, and \$35,347,000 in trust companies.

It is feared a large percentage of these deposits will be transferred to other cities. Local bankers estimate the shrinkage from \$15,000,000 to \$25,000,000.

The impairment of the banking strength of the Capital to any such extent as is forecasted will be felt throughout the entire business life of the city. It is known that many withdrawals of deposits are in contemplation, and banks have already been advised by customers of their intention to transfer funds elsewhere.

In May and June citizens of the District of Columbia pay their taxes to the District government. The banks provide the money for this purpose to the extent of \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000. It is foreseen that while this heavy seasonal drain is being made on the banks, there will also be encountered large withdrawals on account of the tax on deposits. A serious situation will be created, forcing banks to sell securities, call loans, and refrain from extending new credits.

Our neighbor, the State of Maryland, although it has an intangible tax law, does not tax bank deposits; nor do many other States which have intangible tax laws.

It is reported by local bankers that the enforcement of a tax on deposits in Ohio banks resulted in the transferring to New York of from \$40,000,000 to \$50,000,000.

If the law should stand, the banks must pay the tax in order to hold deposits or many of the depositors would leave. The banks can not afford to pay the tax. They are already heavily taxed. They pay 6 per cent on their gross earnings to the District government, 2 per cent on their net earnings to the United States Government, real-estate taxes on their banking property, in the case of national banks a tax on their circulating notes; and if the pending revenue bill becomes a law a tax of 8 per cent on all business profits above 8 per cent earned on the capital employed in their business.

If the banking power of the city should be impaired, as is feared, to the extent of 15 to 25 per cent by the proposed tax of 8 per cent on each \$1,000 of deposits, the gross earnings of the banks may be expected to be impaired also to the extent of 15 to 25 per cent, with consequent loss to the District government of that part of the revenue derived from the 6 per cent on gross earnings.

As the last clause of the pending measure provides for a full investigation of all tax matters in the District of Columbia by joint committee of Congress, "with a view of recommending such changes in the laws as the joint committee may deem fair and equitable, report to be made to the Congress at the next session," it is urged that no harm could result from deferring the tax on bank deposits at this time until the contemplated full investigation of all tax matters could be made.

In presenting this amendment I do so in the interest of the financial institutions of the city of Washington and the District of Columbia.

Unfortunately for the District, on matters affecting its own welfare, it has no direct representation on the floor of this House, and in presenting the arguments and explanations which I am here and now presenting I do so in the interest of the banks, trust companies, and their depositors, who will be affected by this law. In this connection these people have never had a hearing on this subject, except brief interviews as they have been granted by members of the conference committee, and they are therefore quite helpless to present their arguments against legislation which is of vital interest to their future welfare.

I fully realize that it is not the desire nor the purpose of this Congress to impair the efficiency of the banks of the District of Columbia or drive the lifeblood of trade and commerce into other channels to the detriment of the Nation's Capital, and I therefore hope that the amendment which I have proposed will be adopted.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania be adopted it means a repeal of the intangible-tax law now on the statute books. The gentleman has read the brief that came from the banking associations in the city of Washington to every Member of the House in the mail this morning. That is the brief of the banking associations of the city of Washington who want to escape taxation on money on deposit. If you adopt his amendment you repeal the intangible-tax law for the District of Columbia, and I hope it will be voted down. I move the previous question on the gentleman's amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 97 and agree with the amendment just read.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McFADDEN) there were—ayes 11, noes 54.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the question now recurs upon my motion to further insist.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves to further insist upon the House disagreement to Senate amendment No. 97.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on amendment No. 98 I move that the House further insist upon the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

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

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. 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. 20967, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

PENSIONS.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from New York to withhold that for a moment until I can make a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Very well.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate pension bills now on the Private Calendar be in order to be taken up at the end of the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill, provided that they shall not interfere with appropriation bills or conference reports.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that at the end of the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill Senate pension bills on the Private Calendar be in order, not to interfere with conference reports and appropriation bills. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri and those interested in these pension bills that I have no objection to the passage of them or the consideration of them. It does occur to me that at this stage of the proceedings of Congress we ought not to enter into unanimous-consent agreements that are likely to come betwixt us and the opportunity to adjourn on the 4th of March. Now, nobody is going to object to the consideration of these bills when the opportune time is reached, but I do not see the necessity of entering into this sort of an agreement.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. GARNER. I object for the present; yes.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman from New York withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit a question? I take it we will run on the sundry civil bill until about 10 o'clock to-night, probably not later than that, and it is quite possible, this being Friday and pension day, and these are Senate bills—

Mr. LANGLEY. There are no amendments offered by the House committee to the Senate bills.

Mr. MANN. It might be possible after we get through to-night to consider these Senate pension bills.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I take it unless we can get a unanimous-consent agreement now it is possible we might never get it.

Mr. MANN. These are pension bills.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Yes; pension bills.

Mr. MANN. It would be in order to-night after we got through.

The SPEAKER. This procedure is out of order.

Mr. MANN. We all know it, but it is by unanimous consent.

Mr. LANGLEY. The only trouble is in getting the bills enrolled, as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. If we pass them to-night we can get them enrolled if somebody on the Pension Committee stays here.

Mr. LANGLEY. We will all stay here. There is no trouble about that.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that these bills be considered to-night, this being pension day.

The SPEAKER. What time to-night?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. At 10 o'clock to-night.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that at 10 o'clock to-night we will consider these pension bills on the Private Calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hate to give up that hour.

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

SECTION 10 OF THE CLAYTON ANTITRUST ACT.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman from New York to withhold his motion for the present and he agreed to do so. I ask to take from the Speaker's table Senate joint

resolution 206, and ask that the same be considered and passed. There will be no debate and it can be done in a minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution 206 and consider it now. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let it be reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution. The Clerk read as follows:

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.

Resolved, etc., That the effective date on and after which the provisions 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, shall become and be effective is hereby deferred and extended to January 8, 1918.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Virginia explain this?

Mr. CARLIN. The effect of the joint resolution is to extend the operation of section 10 of the Clayton Act until the report is made by the Adamson committee. It has been reported favorably from the Judiciary Committee of the House, and I have been authorized to call it up. It has been reported favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NORTON. It refers to section 10 of the Clayton Act?

Mr. CARLIN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is section 10?

Mr. CARLIN. Section 10 of the Clayton Act refers to the issue of securities, purchase of supplies, interlocking directorates of railroad transportation companies and their auxiliaries.

Mr. WINGO. What does the gentleman propose to do by this resolution?

Mr. CARLIN. To extend its operation until the Adamson committee report comes in, which is the 4th of March one year.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman wants to suspend—

Mr. CARLIN. It will suspend its operation from becoming effective. It is not effective until March 4 of this year, and we want to suspend its operation for a year.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. What is the reason for wanting to put it off?

Mr. CARLIN. Because it is part of the matter under consideration by the Adamson committee.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, for the present I will have to object.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

H. R. 16855. An act for the relief of Riverside Military Academy; and

H. R. 18894. An act to amend the public-building act approved March 4, 1913, authorizing the acquisition of a suitable site for a public building at Pittston, Pa.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, pending the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

SUNDRY CIVIL BILL.

The motion to go into Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union 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. 20967, with Mr. GARNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20967) making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CONSTRUCTION, SITES, AND RENT.

For sites, commencement, continuation, or completion of public buildings within the respective limits of cost authorized by law, rent and removal expenses in cities pending extension and remodeling of buildings, severally, as follows:

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

A CURE FOR TUBERCULOSIS.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I desire to submit to this House a few facts in support of the resolution I introduced in this House to provide for a laboratory to discover a cure for consumption. I have been aided in this matter by Lamar T. Beman, of Cleveland, Ohio.

Tuberculosis is a disease that comes into almost everyone's life at some time. It is no respecter of persons. It attacks the rich and the poor. Few households escape it entirely. Perhaps no immediate member of your family has fallen victim to the great destroyer, but few among us have not seen some relative or friend snatched from a life of usefulness by this grim disease so aptly described by Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes as "The Great White Plague of the North."

Tuberculosis kills 160,000 persons each year in the United States, and their average age at death is about 34 years. It kills from one-tenth to one-seventh of all our people. Every third person between 15 and 60 dies of it, or every fourth person between 20 and 50. It disables and renders useless those who have it and is often the means of beggaring their families. It costs in dollars and cents over \$500,000,000 a year in loss of life and labor in the United States. Not less than 1,000,000, it is estimated, in this country of ours are suffering from the disease. In my own State of Ohio it kills about 7,000 citizens each year. In the past four years in Ohio it has caused twice as many deaths as typhoid fever, diphtheria, whooping cough, measles, scarlet fever, and smallpox combined.

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

Mr. EMERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. DYER. Where does the gentleman's resolution propose to locate this sanitarium?

Mr. EMERSON. The city of Cleveland, in my State, has offered to furnish the ground free if the Government will erect the hospital.

Mr. FARR. Has the city any free sanitariums?

Mr. EMERSON. The city of Cleveland has a free sanitarium. But what we want is a large laboratory erected to discover, if possible, a cure for this disease which has affected so many people.

Mr. FARR. But the State itself has not provided a place for the care of these patients?

Mr. EMERSON. Oh, yes. We have a sanitarium at Mount Vernon, Ohio, for the treatment of patients.

Mr. FARR. I suggest to the gentleman that if he wanted a model for that work they could go to Pennsylvania and see what that great State has done and is doing for the study and eradication of this dread disease and the care and attention it is giving to those suffering from it. Pennsylvania was among the first States, if not the first, to deal in a practical way with tuberculosis and has spent large sums of money for sanitariums, one of which, at Mount Alto, that State, cares for a thousand patients. Another large institution for tubercular patients is located at Cresson, Pa., and one at Hamburg, Pa. In addition to these many local institutions for the treatment of other diseases are aided by the State, and a hundred and fifteen or more dispensaries for tuberculosis are located at different points and maintained entirely by the State. Pennsylvania is appropriating nearly \$2,000,000 a year in this valuable service to humanity. Splendid results have been achieved. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy in permitting me to embody this statement in his interesting, instructive, and forceful remarks for greater thought and effort to discover the cause of the white plague and save humanity from its fearful inroads. What Pennsylvania is doing other States can do.

Mr. EMERSON. I am glad to hear that. I intend at the next session of Congress to introduce a bill to provide for the location of a sanitarium in some of the Western States, where the climate is agreeable, in order that persons suffering with this dreaded disease may be treated in the open under the clear sky. I believe that is the best way to cure the disease that is now known. [Applause.]

Tuberculosis is a disease of antiquity. It was known in the earliest recorded history. The origin of the disease is understood thoroughly. But the advancement of medical science has not brought a specific therapeutic cure. Instead tuberculosis has increased with the progress of civilization. It is almost always a house or indoor infection, rarely or never caught out of doors. The tuberculosis question is one of the greatest that confronts our large cities, with their complex problems of health

and sanitation. It has grown harder with the increase in workshops and factories and in dark, damp, dirty, or illy ventilated homes.

We know that tuberculosis can be prevented. The great work of the national and local antituberculosis societies and our State and city health agencies have taught us that the disease can be arrested and in many cases cured by fresh air, cleanliness, rest, wholesome food, and a determination to get well. [Applause.]

We know how the disease is spread. We know that the germ, which is a microscopic rod, invisible to the unaided human eye, is found in millions in the spit of the careless consumptive, and that it is through this spit almost alone that it reaches others. We know that if we could collect and destroy all the spit of such patients and make them cover their mouths when they cough we could almost wipe out the disease.

We have built sanatoria and established open-air schools and dispensaries to combat the disease. The life work of such noble men as Edward L. Trudeau has been devoted to the study of tuberculosis. The disease has been shorn of some of its secrets, stripped of much of its mystery, but this invisible foe still marches on. It is less of a terror to mankind than it was a century ago. The unselfish workers who dedicated their lives to a fight against the disease have made it so. They taught us that tuberculosis is not hereditary; that a person who contracts the disease is not doomed. But no therapeutic drug, no certain specific has been discovered.

Dread diphtheria has its antitoxin. The discoveries of Ehrlich and others have robbed syphilis of some of its life-destroying effects. Research of Pasteur led to the discovery of a preventive of rabies. Serums are used in the treatment of spinal meningitis. In the laboratories of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research a serum for the treatment of certain types of pneumonia has recently been perfected. We have practically wiped out yellow fever through scientific investigation. The malaria-bearing mosquito is being exterminated. Smallpox is no longer the dread scourge it once was, since vaccination became general. It is now possible to immunize against typhoid. But a specific cure for tuberculosis still baffles scientists.

Tuberculosis is not like typhoid fever or smallpox or measles or scarlet fever, which diseases are easily and quickly taken if you come in contact with those who have them, and which develop in from one to two weeks. It is caught much less easily, takes a long time to develop after it is caught. When we consider the great strides that have been made by the medical profession, the discovery of a specific tuberculosis cure does not seem beyond the bounds of possibility.

Again and again the quack and charlatan has announced that he has discovered a cure. At intervals the report of some specific has flashed across the medical sky; a false signal, alas! To the drowning man a stick or straw looks like a help to save himself from death. So to the consumptive any kind of a flimsy statement or brand of manufactured medicine appears to offer a hope of cure and a chance of life.

Profiting by this ever-living hope of the consumptive, more than 500 varieties of so-called cures for tuberculosis are sold to the American people, bringing an income of more than \$15,000,000 annually, so officials of the National Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis declare.

The time has come for the Government of the United States to call together the best medical experts and the best bacteriologists in the world in an effort to solve a world problem and find a real cure for tuberculosis. We must build a vast laboratory for the study of the disease. The Federal Government must take the lead. It must, if possible, discover a drug, vaccine, serum, or combination which will destroy the germs of tuberculosis in the body, heal and restore the body tissues that have been destroyed or injured by the germs, and do these things without serious injury to any organ or parts of the body not affected by the disease.

I have said before that tuberculosis was no respecter of persons; that it attacked both rich and poor. But more poor people than rich people have the disease, and more rich people recover from it. That is because the wealthy are better able to protect themselves against it, better able to undergo rest and other essentials of the treatment which is now the only remedy for the disease. Overwork; dissipation; dark, dirty homes or working places; bad or scanty food; late hours; and certain sicknesses, such as grippe, measles, whooping cough, pneumonia, and typhoid fever, weaken the body, give the germ the opportunity it needs, and enable it to develop.

It is also among the great middle class that the disease makes heavy inroads. Thirty-three per cent of all farmers dying die from tuberculosis. Forty-six per cent of all clerks dying are carried off by tuberculosis. In a number of other trades the percentage is still higher. Forty-seven per cent of

the deaths among textile workers are due to this source; 48 per cent of the deaths among glass workers, and 49 per cent of the deaths among printers.

Who knows how many geniuses have been lost to the country through an untimely death from tuberculosis? We know that tuberculosis has been the conqueror of some of the world's greatest men.

Among the countless victims was Robert Louis Stevenson, who might have left many more volumes of matchless prose and exquisite verse, if he had not fallen a victim to this scourge. John Paul Jones, the great naval hero, had not the power or strategy to resist man's insidious foe. Chopin, Weber, Mendelssohn, whose music charm the world, met the same pathetic fate. Stephen Crane, John Keats, Artemus Ward, and Henry David Thoreau are among the other brilliant men of letters who were victims of the white plague. To these names can be added name after name, taken from the world of music, literature, art, science, and philosophy.

I do not want to paint a gloomy picture. Since 1882, when Dr. Robert Koch, of Berlin, first discovered the germ of the disease, we have made real progress in combatting it. But in spite of our knowledge, in spite of the great educational propaganda that is being conducted, there is much misinformation and misunderstanding about tuberculosis. This misinformation and misunderstanding has led to many bad results. It causes sufferers from the disease to live unwisely and to do things that are harmful to them. It causes the public to be unnecessarily afraid of infection and to look upon persons suffering from the disease with needless fear.

Tuberculosis is the people's disease, and the people's agents must take the lead in combating it. There must be no let up in the educational propaganda, no relaxation in the rules of hygienic living. We must readjust and improve the housing, living, and working conditions of our working classes, and of our very poor. People must be taught to choose healthy homes and keep them clean when they get them. Landlords must be taught to supply cheap but satisfactory lodging places, and not the miserable rookeries which yield such good income in dollars and such a terrible toll in human life. The poor must have available the best possible food at the cheapest possible price. Shorter hours of work and better hours of pay; healthier, better ventilated, less dusty working places are needed.

But these things, in so far as they affect the disease of tuberculosis, are in the nature of relief rather than a cure. We must diligently seek a real cure for the disease. Tuberculosis, the sneak, the gourmand, has slain too many victims. Too many frail little children who never had a fair chance have been carried off.

At the Cleveland Sanatorium there are 240 tuberculosis patients, of whom one-third are 21 years of age or under. The world has been robbed of too many priceless lives. The Federal Government must act. [Applause.]

The city of Cleveland, through resolution adopted by its city council and approved by the mayor, has indorsed and recommended the passage of House joint resolution 355, which proposes the appropriation of \$1,000,000 for the purpose of organizing a Government laboratory, calling together the best experts in the world for the purpose of seeking a cure for tuberculosis. The city of Cleveland in this resolution has offered to give to the Federal Government 50 or 100 acres of land on the great city farm at Warrensville. Here the city of Cleveland owns over 2,000 acres, and has a tuberculosis sanitarium which would make a very appropriate place for the location of a laboratory.

The figures and data in these few remarks were furnished me by Lamar T. Beman, director of public welfare of Cleveland, and he is entitled to all the credit for the information herein contained. [Applause.]

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the bill, and read to line 19, page 30.

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

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

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, the question of electing a President and Vice President in presidential-election years by electoral votes and through the Electoral College has given rise to a discussion of the propriety of amending paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, Article II, and Article XII of the Constitution of the United States, but these discussions have not resulted in an effort on the part of Members of Congress to agree upon any particular amendment that should be made to the Constitution so that the people of the United States might vote directly for President and Vice President. I have introduced such a resolution, and the resolution which I have introduced in the House proposes to amend the

Constitution of the United States so that the President and Vice President may be elected by the direct vote of the people without the intervention of the Electoral College, and still retain the electoral votes of the States.

An elector has, in reality, no funtion to perform. It is true that the electors of a State meet and cast their votes for President, but, notwithstanding this fact, the voters who elected these electors had already and prior thereto expressed their choice for President in the election previously held. This action of the electors of the State is a mere formal matter, without any real significance except that the electors might betray the trust and confidence which were reposed in them and vote for another candidate not the choice of their party. This action on their part has never occurred, so far as political history discloses, except that in 1872 one Liberal Republican elector in Missouri voted for David Davis, an Independent, and it is not impossible that such action might again occur in close elections.

Washington, the Father of his Country, is also the father of the Electoral College. He had hoped that political parties would never come into existence, but his wish in the premises has not been realized.

Many voters go to the polls with their minds made up as to who they shall support for President and Vice President, but when they secure a ballot and go into the secret booth they are confronted with a long list of names of electors and are immediately confused. This they do not appreciate, and in many instances go away from the polls somewhat in doubt as to whether they have expressed their choice for President and Vice President.

Besides, if this amendment should be adopted, and I sincerely believe it will be, there would be no such thing in the election of President as a divided electoral vote from any State in the Union. Four years ago the electoral vote of California was divided. This year the electoral vote of West Virginia was divided. And since 1872 the electoral vote of 11 States has been divided in presidential elections, and anyone knows that it was not the intent and purpose of the voters of these States to have a divided electoral vote.

This amendment will shorten the ballot and give the voter an opportunity to vote directly for President and Vice President, and not only so, but will be a great saving to the States in the expense of holding elections. The printing bill will be much less, and the clerical and executive duties of clerks and judges, respectively, will be greatly lightened, and the result of the election will be more promptly announced and absolute certainty as to the result of the election will be secured, for the reason that the election will be conducted by officials, under oath and bond, who make up the election machinery, while under the present system of presidential elections no oath or bond is required of the electors, but they are trusted upon their honor by the party who selected them to carry out the wishes of that party.

Under this amendment the candidates for President and Vice President receiving the highest number of votes in each State for each office shall be entitled to receive the electoral vote of such State for such office, which electoral vote shall be equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State is entitled in the Congress of the United States. This system simplifies the whole process of presidential elections and insures to the voter the privilege of voting for the candidate of his choice in a direct manner.

Now, should this amendment be adopted the State as a political unit will still be retained, as originally contemplated by the framers of the Constitution.

This subject has been somewhat discussed by the Senate, but no definite action has been taken, nor has any amendment been agreed upon. I think it will be conceded by at least most Members of Congress that such an amendment as I have proposed will correct the objectionable features of the present presidential election system, and thereby eliminate the necessity for the selection of electors and the convention of the Electoral College in States in each presidential election year.

I have had in mind for some time the introduction of this joint resolution, and to that end have given this subject that degree of research and sincere consideration which such an important subject so well deserves. [Applause.]

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

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes: For expenses incurred under the authority or with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury in detecting, arresting, and delivering into the custody of the United States marshal having jurisdiction dealers and pretended dealers in counterfeit money and persons engaged in counterfeiting Treasury notes, bonds, national-bank notes, and other securities of the United States and of foreign Governments, as well as the coins of the United States and of foreign Governments, and other felonies committed against the laws of the United States relating to the pay and bounty laws, hire and operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary, per diem in lieu of subsistence, when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and for no other purpose whatever, except in the protection of the person of the President and of the person chosen to be President of the United States, \$225,000: *Provided*, That no part of this amount be used in defraying the expenses of any person subpoenaed by the United States courts to attend any trial before United States court or preliminary examination before any United States commissioner, which expenses shall be paid from the appropriation for "Fees of witnesses, United States courts": *Provided further*, That until June 30, 1918, the President is authorized to direct, without reference to existing limitations, the use of the persons employed hereunder if, in his judgment, an emergency exists which requires such action.

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

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

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not think we should pass the proviso that has just been read without having attention called to it. This paragraph provides for what is known as the Secret Service of the Treasury Department. In times past it has been claimed or charged that the officers of this service were used for purposes not contemplated by the law. In fact, it was charged at one time that an attempt was being made to utilize this force in the manner in which the secret-service forces of monarchical countries are used—for purposes of espionage. It was charged that secret-service men were used for the purpose of shadowing Members of Congress, and that in various and divers and sundry ways this force was being utilized in a manner that, if allowed to go on unchecked, might develop a system of terrorism such as existed in times past under monarchical governments.

Just how much ground there was for these claims, these charges, I do not know. At any rate, Congress felt that the use of this secret-service force should be carefully guarded. We have now added a proviso to the paragraph to the effect "That until June 30, 1918, the President is authorized to direct, without reference to existing limitations, the use of the persons employed hereunder if, in his judgment, an emergency exists which requires such action."

We are passing through trying times. There are all sorts of rumors of plots, of conspiracies. A very extravagant statement was made in another body the other day, as I recall it, that there were 100,000 spies in the country. Some people are seeing spies all around, and are confident that there is need at this time of this force, or that there may be need to use members of this force for the purpose of preventing unlawful acts arising out of the partisanship of individuals for one or the other of the warring powers in Europe. In that condition of affairs it was deemed wise to give the President the power, the authority, to use the officials of the secret service without reference to the existing limitations when, in his judgment, an emergency exists which requires such action.

I never was as greatly alarmed over the dangers of using this force in an improper way as some people were, and yet I believe that such a danger to a greater or less extent always exists. There is always a temptation, in the presence of unlimited power to do so, to spy upon those with whom one in official position does not agree. There is always a temptation to imagine that there is a necessity for such spying. Therefore I think we have been wise in guarding the use of this force as we have guarded it. The only justification now for this extension of authority is the unusual condition of the country and the possibility of a more trying situation in the future; and under those circumstances I believe the proviso is justified.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, last evening I was unavoidably detained from the House and did not have an opportunity to entertain the committee with a few remarks I desire to make in general debate. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if he has any objection to my proceeding now for about 20 minutes?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; not just now. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that he may address the House for 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, at one time or another we have heard a great deal about a budget system. A number of Members of the House have given a good deal of attention to the subject of a budget. We have developed in the House two distinct theories or ideas with regard to a budget. One of those ideas has been at one time and another discussed in detail by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], and the other by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. FITZGERALD], and others. In connection with that sort of discussion it is interesting and instructive to examine this sundry civil bill as it is reported.

I think all of those who have had much to do with appropriations in the House hope for a time when we shall be able to adopt some system under which there shall be a more responsible control over appropriations.

There is a great deal of difference of opinion as to how that can be accomplished. Most people out of Congress who talk about a budget have in mind the budget system of European countries, and they insist that such a budget system should be provided in the interest of economy. While we have a budget system that in some respects is similar to the budget systems of European countries, in that our estimates all come through a department of the Government, in that they are all examined, or they are all transmitted by a single official, and in the case of supplemental estimates they must under the law all be examined by the President and in a way vouched for by him—

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

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. That is not a requirement of the law, is it?

Mr. MONDELL. Come to think of it it is not a law but a regulation or Executive order.

Mr. MANN. There is no such provision of law. The present President issued an order, I believe, that supplemental estimates should be submitted to him.

Mr. MONDELL. I was under the impression that there was a provision of law on that subject.

Mr. MANN. I think not.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Illinois generally knows more about these things than most of us, and I will accept his view of it.

Mr. MANN. I do not claim to know about this, but I am quite sure there is no provision of law requiring that supplemental estimates shall be submitted to the President.

Mr. MONDELL. At any rate that is the practice under an Executive order.

Mr. MANN. Sometimes.

Mr. MONDELL. It is the practice that supplemental estimates shall be submitted to the President. If there is anything in the contention of those who talk budget from the viewpoint of a European budget system that it will result in economy, this bill as reported casts a very illuminating light on that proposition.

The estimates of the executive departments for the items carried in this bill amounted to \$171,417,759.30. The committee recommended \$138,306,963.77, a reduction of over \$33,000,000, or almost exactly 20 per cent below the estimates of the Executive. I do not pretend to say that all of those reductions below the estimates are justified. In my opinion they are not. Before we conclude the bill I expect to call attention to some reductions that, in my opinion, should not have been made. Some items have been unduly cut, some requests which were made have been entirely ignored; but in the main we have provided for the business of the country, for the departments, for the bureaus, and for the widely extended and numerous classes of public work, research, and inquiry. Some of the amounts carried in the bill as reported by the committee will not care for the services proposed to be provided for for the entire year. It is expected that deficiency estimates will be transmitted to Congress in connection with a number of public services; but in the main we have, I think, fairly well cared for the public business, public departments, public activities under this bill, and in doing so we have reduced by many millions of dollars the amounts which the executive departments apparently believed were necessary for these services.

Now, unless the judgment of the Executive was sound in every case and our judgment after due and careful consideration is faulty, then it is not true that an Executive budget system, so far as estimates are concerned, is an economical system. If the committee, discharging its duty under this bill, has reduced by 20 per cent the amount which the Executive believed was

needed for the Government activities provided for under this bill, then the estimates of the Executive were extravagant. And as it is in this bill, so it has been for years through all of the services in the departments of the Government. I can not think of any system that would be more wasteful than a system under which our executive departments as now organized were authorized to submit the estimates with the expectation that the Congress would allow them practically as submitted. I know of nothing under the sun easier—except the passage of some bill in another body under senatorial courtesy—than the securing of an estimate by a bureau, if it becomes actively interested in and is infatuated with some line of endeavor, and desires to have its line of work extended and its activities enlarged and its opportunities increased. The estimate may start with the fourth or fifth Secretary—

Mr. MANN. Or his clerk.

Mr. MONDELL. Or the clerk of the Fourth Assistant Secretary; but if it can get one or two indorsements on its way, it is sure to have easy sledding as it reaches the height of executive authority, and comes skidding to the Speaker's desk with all of the prestige that should attach to a carefully considered, solemnly proposed estimate sent forward by the executive department to a legislative body, just any old sum you want, for any old purpose that you may think of; and if the Congress was not constantly paring and chipping and reducing and putting a crimp in the ambition of these gentlemen, in a short time there would not be money enough under the flag to pay for the running of the Federal Government. If we are to have a good budget system, it must be a system very, very different, so far as the origination of estimates is concerned, from the present system of making estimates.

I have no budget system to propose or suggest; but that some change is needed is apparent to us all, particularly in times like these, when the country is in the throes of an agitation for preparedness too long delayed, it is said, for defenses on land and sea which are said to be absolutely essential, and which have behind them so much of public sentiment that one can not well resist them even though they do not appeal to our best judgment in all cases. Under such circumstances, legislating as we sometimes do here, we throw good money to the birds, under stress of especial popular interest or excitement. We add twenty, thirty, or forty million dollars to a naval bill without ever batting an eye. And what somewhat piques and tries the souls of those who sit on appropriation committees that are not appropriating for these preparedness services that just for the moment are so tremendously popular, is the fact that while the House may, after five minutes of debate, add ten millions to a preparedness bill which may or may not be needed, we are expected to sit in the committee room day after day, denying, paring down, trying to save here and there, denying increases that appeal to our sympathy, denying increases that if they did not, with all the other increases desired, too greatly increase the public expenditures, we would like to approve.

What a wonderful bill the sundry civil bill is. It embraces almost every activity in the Government. It touches the Government service here and there and everywhere. An acquaintance with its items, and of the reason for them, and the history of them, is a liberal education in governmental expenditure and governmental activity. There are not many men who have that knowledge. There is not anyone who knows all about this sundry civil bill, and no one man who can. The present chairman of the committee [Mr. FITZGERALD], like the former chairman of the committee [Mr. CANNON], comes as near knowing all about its items as any one man can, and yet it is utterly impossible for anyone serving on the committee to know—and I think no one claims to know—even the important details of all of the items carried in this bill, the reasons for them and their purpose, and least of all the way in which the money is used. That is the most difficult thing to discover in connection with legislation of this kind.

We appropriate lump sums. Men in charge of the bureaus have a great deal of discretion in connection with the expenditure of the money. It is the most difficult thing in the world within the time that a committee may be expected to have and the time that the committee has to become fully informed as to just how advantageously and how economically all of the moneys are expended. The curious thing about governmental expenditures is that the best men in the Government service, the best-equipped men in the Government service, the most useful men in the Government service, the men who do the most good, are the men who must be watched the closest, and whose estimates must frequently be trimmed the most. A department or bureau of the Government service, the head of which and the

employees of which are not very enthusiastic about their work and their line of endeavor, may be content to go along from year to year in the same groove and with the same appropriation; but the man who has force, who is active, earnest, faithful, and believes in his work, believes it is the most important thing under the sun, if he is really an enthusiast of the right sort, can almost convince anyone except a member of the Appropriations Committee with the responsibility upon him, that the increase he asks for is the most essential thing under the Government.

[The time of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] having expired, his time was extended 10 minutes.]

Mr. MONDELL. Therefore that sort of a man is the type of a man whose appropriation you are least inclined to cut down, and whose estimates you must very frequently trim the most if the total of expenditures is to be kept in bounds.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman was discussing the budget system. Suppose we had what they call the budget system, which is the preparation of the appropriation bill by the Executive, transmitted to the legislative body without any power of the legislative body to make increases or put in any item except those which the Executive submits, thereby giving to the administration officers the right to make up the appropriation bill. Does the gentleman doubt that the amount of the appropriation bills would be nearly doubled under such a system, where we have no responsible ministry?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know that they would be immediately doubled, and I imagine that the gentleman from Illinois himself would not think that would be the immediate result; but I do think that it would not be long when the expenses of the Government would be doubled.

Mr. MANN. We are in a position now, for instance, under the present excitement, where we practically take the opinion of the administrative officers, in the main, on the Army and the naval bill. Have not they been doubled?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, yes; more than doubled so far as the naval bill is concerned in recent years.

Mr. MANN. Would not that be the result almost at once in nearly everything? If the administrative officers made up the appropriation bill without being responsible, without any power to turn them out of office, as may be done wherever there is a responsible ministry, will not the inevitable result be in time that anybody who wanted anything in the administrative department would get it in the bill?

Mr. MONDELL. That is undoubtedly true. What the gentleman has just said is the answer to these foolish people—and unfortunately there are many in the country—who imagine that in a country without a responsible ministry you can have the sort of budget system that is in vogue in a country with a responsible ministry.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit me further. Recently one of the most active and influential and well-informed men connected with the chamber of commerce stated that he favored a budget system, and said that he did not believe that Congress or anyone else in connection with any appropriation, either public or private, ought to make appropriations without a knowledge of the amount of estimated revenues and the estimated appropriations. When I told him that Congress had estimates of appropriations submitted in detail, and always had before them the estimated revenues by the Secretary of the Treasury, he seemed to be very much astonished that we knew anything or had any information.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, well, that is in line, as the gentleman realizes, with a lot of misinformation that is prevalent throughout the country.

These people recommend budget systems and they recommend this, that, and the other thing without any knowledge that is really valuable of the facts with regard to the thing they are discussing. Further, there is this unfortunate and regrettable disposition and tendency in the country to hold that whoever else may be right the Congress is wrong. It is unfortunate that there is that thought abroad in the country; it is for that reason unfortunate that the country can not know, for instance, of the profound knowledge of the business of this House and the Government held by and in the possession of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and the profound knowledge of appropriations carried in this and other bills in the possession of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. Those men are the best examples, perhaps—undoubtedly so, in my opinion—in the House of general knowledge of the public business, because of their peculiar ability, and they know so much more about governmental affairs than most executive officers that I come in con-

tact with that there is no comparison. Yet we are told that if we are to run things just right to secure the best results the power of the Executive should be increased over appropriations and in other ways. If I had time, which I have not, because I shall conclude in just a moment, I would like to branch out from this question of executive budgets to another question very closely related to it, although having nothing directly to do with appropriations, the question of the Executive control over the genesis and promulgation of legislative proposals.

We are moving toward a real executive system in this country by securing our suggestions or proposals of legislation from the departments. That is becoming increasingly true in connection with all our legislation, and it is a very unfortunate thing, in my opinion, because I still think that Congress can initiate legislation and legislate better than the executive departments can.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY. In a few States in recent years the State constitutions have been changed to permit the governor of the State to veto specific items in appropriation bills. What is the gentleman's opinion of that proposition, and whether or not it would be wise to extend that to the President?

Mr. MONDELL. I shall not express any opinion as to the wisdom of that sort of thing in a State. I have conflicting emotions and views upon that matter and I do not feel under any obligation to decide that question, but, so far as legislation by Congress is concerned, I can think of nothing that would be more harmful to the country.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I did not know that I was going to be led into these remarks, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Heaven knows, the power of the Executive grows fast enough as it is, grows fast, very largely, I regret to say, by reason of the attitude of Congress, the failure of Congress to assert its right, grows fast enough without giving the President, no matter whom he may be, no matter how wise he may be, the power to go through a bill like this and pick out items here and there and veto them. I can not think of anything that would do more to rob Congress of that independence which I regret to say Congress has already too far surrendered, I can not think of anything that would be more harmful to the rights of the people as represented in Congress than to give the Executive the right to veto items in an appropriation bill. Congress can not be robbed of the right to control the purse without infinite harm.

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, is the pending motion to strike out the last word?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands.

Mr. MANN. I desire to resist that motion. I do not want to destroy this paragraph, but I would like to ask a question. I notice the appropriation for the secret service is increased from \$200,000, which is the current law, to \$225,000. I have noticed in the press statements indicating apparently that the administrative officers were having a case of hysterics and proposed to put on great numbers of additional secret service men, and I have noticed in my correspondence quite a number of letters from different gentlemen who desire to obtain some of these positions.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman, I hope, will not give them all away, for I have had some requests myself.

Mr. MANN. What I would like to ascertain is how far this appropriation goes in connection with the requests from the administrative officers or whether the hysterics have mainly been in the newspapers instead of the Secret Service Division?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think they are employing some men out of other appropriations. The Department of Justice is employing some additional special agents, and they have a request for \$50,000 as a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. MANN. That would not employ more than 50 men; but that is a deficiency appropriation?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. That is until the 30th of June.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is for the Department of Justice. Then I heard in an indirect way—I doubt if I could locate the source of my information—that there are some additional persons being employed, to be paid out of the emergency fund of the State Department, in connection with some matters where the State Department would be particularly interested. There

have been some guards appointed, I think, at the assay office in New York, 14, owing to the rather peculiar conditions that exist there.

Mr. MANN. I notice according to the papers that they had a large number of additional guards there, and I think possibly that is one case where they may have some additional guards. I have noticed that the governor of New York has a lot of men on duty to prevent something being blown up, and the War Department asks for additional men to prevent the aqueduct from being blown up.

In the House and Senate they have employed a lot of additional policemen to prevent the Capitol being blown up, and you can not get in or out of the Capitol now except by one or two of the main entrances—on the House side one of the main entrances. I do not know. It has not affected me, it may have the gentlemen—

Mr. FITZGERALD. It has; I noticed it here.

Mr. MANN. No, I am not in hysterics. I have not the slightest fear of being blown up. I think it is all moonshine. Of course most of it is directed against the possibility of Germany just blowing up something in the United States, but I dare say that if there is any place in the world where they are hoping and praying that nothing of that sort will happen in the United States it is in Germany. That will be the last thing the German Government would want, I should assume.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, I am not in touch with the German Government.

Mr. MANN. I have been divided in opinion as to whether the hysterics were merely a matter of hysteria or partially connected with the desire to give jobs. It is perfectly certain that unless there is an insane man these things will not happen, and if there is an insane man the precaution will not prevent it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, so far as the matter has come officially before the Congress the only requests thus far have been, as I have already stated, \$50,000 for special agents for the Department of Justice, due to conditions which I think probably justify it—

Mr. MANN. I think the Department of Justice in its effort to prevent something is entitled to some additional help. That is not a matter of hysteria and fear of things being blown up.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And at the assay office in New York the superintendent appeared before the committee and stated that he is employing 14 guards at \$3 a day. It is due to a peculiar condition. Construction work is going on there and an unusual amount of gold has to be watched. It was believed to be a justifiable precaution to have some additional men on guard, both within and without the building.

Mr. MANN. That is because of the large amount of gold.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The other item, which we have not figured on yet, is a request of the War Department for \$10,000 to patrol the Aqueduct Road.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. That would be the only request so far made that would be of a character which the gentleman from Illinois has in mind. Whether there is any necessity for it, I do not know.

Mr. MANN. If there is necessity for it, why does not some of the Army patrol it? What is the Army for—just to drill over at Fort Myer? The Aqueduct Road is under the control of the Chief of Engineers of the Army. What is the Army for?

Mr. FITZGERALD. To fight.

Mr. MANN. I know that is where they want to go, if they think there is a fight.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That request was made, but we have not reached it yet in the consideration of the deficiency bill. I think it is unfortunate, at least for Members of Congress, that this statement has been made public—that large hordes of additional men are being employed in the Secret Service. I think we could recruit the Army from the applications I have received, and my experience thus far has been that it does not look as if there is much prospect for any of those men being employed.

Mr. MANN. Well, my advice to the gentleman from New York, and it is free—

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman from Illinois has had any better success, I would like to know.

Mr. MANN. My advice to the gentleman from New York—and it is free advice; there is no charge for it—if the gentleman expects to secure any of these places he had better do so before the appropriation becomes a law. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Maybe.

Mr. MANN. I doubt whether the cordial relations which exist between the gentleman and—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have tried that plan on other occasions, but I have not had much success. Maybe I will try a new one this year.

The Clerk read as follows:

Appropriations in this act shall not be used in payment of compensation or expenses of any person detailed or transferred, except to the Department of State, from the Secret Service Division of the Treasury Department, or who may at any time during the fiscal year 1918 have been employed by or under said Secret Service Division.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Is it the intention to transfer to the State Department large numbers of men now connected with the Secret Service?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That exception was put in for this reason: During the past year the State Department requested the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish men to be detailed with representatives of other governments and with some of the consuls general in various parts of the country. Some of these men have been employed upon work which was thought desirable, and they should be given the detail.

Now, under the provision that has been carried from time to time with reference to these men detailed to the State Department and paid by the State Department, as soon as the necessity for that detail would cease they could not be brought back into the Secret Service, and the committee thought, under the very peculiar conditions which exist, that there is some justification for permitting the use of these men to be paid by the State Department.

Mr. MANN. I notice that this provision relates to employment during the fiscal year 1918. That is the fiscal year for which this appropriation is made. Was that an error, or is that an error in the current law?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Error in the current law, where the change had not been made, and we have corrected it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lands and other property of the United States: For custody, care, protection, and expenses of sales of lands and other property of the United States, acquired and held under sections 3749 and 3750 of the Revised Statutes, the examination of titles, recording of deeds, advertising, and auctioneers' fees in connection therewith, \$300.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What are the lands and other property held under sections 3749 and 3750 of the Revised Statutes? At this moment I do not recall the provisions of those sections.

Mr. FITZGERALD. My recollection is, where we acquire property for sites for buildings—

Mr. MANN. I should think it would take more than \$300 to examine titles for public buildings.

Mr. FOSTER. I will say the examination of titles is done by the district attorneys.

Mr. MANN. Then why do we carry an appropriation for it?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it is public buildings.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not remember. I will read the sections in a minute.

Mr. MANN. All the gentleman needs to do is to say he does not remember. I do not accuse him of being obliged to remember everything of the sort. I thought possibly he did.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will extend my time so as to answer the question.

Mr. MANN. I can find out in less than five minutes by sending to the Library.

The Clerk read as follows:

CUSTOMS SERVICE.

For collecting the revenue from customs, including not exceeding \$200,000 for the detection and prevention of frauds upon the customs revenue, \$9,850,000.

Scales for customs service: The unexpended balances of the appropriations heretofore made for construction and installation of special automatic and recording scales for weighing merchandise, etc., in connection with imports at the various ports of entry under direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, are continued and made available for expenditure during the fiscal year 1918, together with the further sum of \$75,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The two sections of the Revised Statutes referred to are property acquired by the United States under judicial process. It is to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to take care of them.

Mr. MANN. Of course, I knew the other explanation could not be correct. I accept this one in perfect faith.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I thought that was it, but I did not want to say so without investigation.

Mr. MANN. Last year we made an appropriation of \$25,000 for scales for the customs service. This paragraph contemplates that the whole of that \$25,000 will not be expended during the

present year. Therefore you propose to expend an addition to the unexpended balance, of \$75,000. If we can not spend during the current year \$25,000, why do we need more than \$75,000 the next year?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The reason is that they have finally perfected these scales, and they cost a definite sum, and it is now expected to purchase a definite number of scales for installation at different ports. Some of them are desired because of the reenactment of the duty on sugar, and some of them are very large scales for general merchandise. The appropriation has been carried for some years. In order that they may have the money available to buy a certain number of scales we wanted to give them not only what they had but this appropriation, so that they could make a contract for the scales.

Mr. MANN. If they have perfected the scales this year, after all these years, why do they not spend the \$25,000 appropriated for this year in purchasing scales?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They have expended, my recollection is, all that they can expend for a certain number of scales. There will be some balance, but not enough with which to buy scales. They want to use that and \$75,000 in buying some more scales.

Mr. MANN. What do these scales cost?

Mr. FITZGERALD. About \$4,000 each.

Mr. MANN. That is a good sum of money to pay for this perfected scale. Who perfected it? Did the Bureau of Standards perfect them?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No.

Mr. MANN. Is it a patented article?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Just perfected, I suppose, because they wanted to buy that particular patented article?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. These scales were developed as the result of the very extensive sugar frauds.

Mr. MANN. They developed as the result of somebody's ingenuity.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; the occasion for it resulted from the very extensive sugar frauds.

Mr. MANN. The occasion for it is that the man wants to get a patent and sell the scales.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not suppose they want to give them to us.

Mr. MANN. That is the occasion for all inventions.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They are very remarkable scales. They are fraud proof.

Mr. MANN. It is in advance that they say they are fraud proof. Of course, a scale that is just perfected, until it has been tried—

Mr. FITZGERALD. This has been perfected for several years, but they stopped buying the scales when the Underwood tariff bill went into effect, under which it was anticipated that sugar would be on the free list. It was not believed so many scales as originally anticipated would be required. Afterwards, when the provision placing sugar on the free list was repealed, the necessity for a number of them arose, and in the meantime the success they had had with the larger scales with which they weighed the general merchandise was so marked that they decided to install some additional ones at some of the ports. With the larger scales they weigh the truck and merchandise, and in certain merchandise that comes in bulk it has effected a very great saving in time, money, and efficiency.

Mr. MANN. I know. Like everything else, you have to pay money in order to get economy.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. Economy is very expensive.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay, allowance, and commutation of quarters for commissioned medical officers and pharmacists, \$745,000.

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

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

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I understand that there has been a health officer stationed at the Panama Canal Zone as part of this Public Health force.

Mr. MANN. There is one stationed at Colon.

Mr. BORLAND. An officer of the Public Health force has been stationed at Panama, only one officer. The employees down there are civil-service employees, but the officer is a part of the Public Health force. Within the last fiscal year the Comptroller of the Treasury has ruled that this man could not be paid out of the Panama Canal funds the compensation that was due him in addition to his pay as an Army officer, and for the last month he has been unpaid.

Mr. MANN. He is not an Army officer.

Mr. BORLAND. I understand he is an Army officer.

Mr. MANN. He can not be in the Public Health Service then.

Mr. BORLAND. Under the law he gets extra compensation for services on the Canal Zone. It is that extra compensation that has been denied him under this ruling of the Comptroller of the Treasury. That extra compensation, the chairman of the committee assures me, can be provided for not under this item but under the item of the Panama Canal, so that it will not be necessary to make the amendment at this point.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Under the Panama Canal item it is the intention to offer an amendment to correct that condition.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rural sanitation: For special studies of, and demonstration work in, rural sanitation, including personal service, \$150,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for demonstration work in rural sanitation in any community unless the State, county, or municipality in which the community is located agrees to pay one-half the expenses of such demonstration work.

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

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

Mr. MANN. I was otherwise engaged when the item headed "Field investigations" came up, where the appropriation is reduced from the current appropriation of \$250,000 to \$200,000. What was the estimate on that? Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] remember? It is the item for the investigation of diseases of man, and so forth.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The estimate was \$250,000. Part of the current and previous appropriations has been used in the rural sanitation work, and as we have raised the appropriation for rural sanitation from \$25,000 to \$150,000, we have deducted the amount that had been expended for rural sanitation out of this particular fund.

Mr. MANN. So that as a matter of fact there is no actual reduction? Was there any increase in the estimate? Was it the intention to give all that was asked for?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was the intention to give all that was asked for, but to increase the rural sanitation item.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the proviso at the bottom of page 48.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the proviso.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this proviso reads:

That no part of this appropriation shall be available for demonstration work in rural sanitation in any community unless the State, county, or municipality in which the community is located agrees to pay one-half the expense of such demonstration work.

This limitation was placed on the appropriation by the committee for the following reasons: Probably the most important thing to be done in order to improve sanitation in a rural community is to so awaken public interest that legislation which is very essential shall be enacted, and that certain necessary health regulations shall be enforced by proper health officers.

The lack of proper health officers and proper sanitary legislation is the greatest handicap to proper sanitation. Now, the committee believed that if these various communities in which the Public Health Service undertook demonstration work were required, either through the State or county or the municipality, to contribute to the work to be done, it would result in the organization of the proper agency required to continue the work after it had been initiated. If the Public Health Service makes a survey of a certain county or State and does certain work in cleaning up the situation and then leaves, and no provision is made for the enactment of proper laws or the adoption of proper regulations for the continuance of the improved situation brought about, and nothing is done toward the establishment of the proper agencies to enforce the regulations, the efforts and the money, to a large extent, will have been wasted.

It was believed that by this method of cooperation there would be developed not only a desirable public sentiment but that there would result the adoption of regulations and the establishment of agencies that would make this work permanent and of real value.

If nothing of this character is to be done the very desirable work that the Public Health Service is engaged in will not have the permanent effect that is desired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. This rural sanitation work is a new work, comparatively?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, they have been engaged on it for two or three years now.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman from New York think that the time has come in the development of this work when the communities ought to be called upon to cooperate in the manner suggested in the bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, the members of the committee in whose States this work has been done to some extent thought so.

Mr. LEVER. I have serious doubts about it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], in whose States some of this work has been done, were very strongly of the opinion that it was desirable to attempt to bring it about now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this is comparatively new work. I have given some study to it, partly because I have had more or less to do with the legislation relating to the Public Health Service. In the main this work is most needed where it is least desired. In other words, those portions of the country are most backward in reference to rural sanitation where they are the least informed. That is almost a trite statement, proved by the making of it. In certain portions of the country people are living happily, in the main, just as their fathers, grandfathers, and possibly their great-grandfathers lived.

They do not know anything about what we call sanitation. They are not to be blamed for that. They simply do not know. Now, it is idle to suppose that those people are going to get together and get the State to appropriate money to teach them sanitation. It is almost as idle to suppose that the county is going to do it. There are no municipalities in the sense that we know a municipality. It is in the country. There may be a village or hamlet scattered here and there, but it is in the country, and the only way they could get any of this help at all would be by having the county authorities appropriate as much money as the Government was to expend there. Well, in the course of time some counties might do that, but the counties where they most need the service are not likely to do it very soon, and if this item goes in this bill the appropriation might as well be stricken out of it for the next fiscal year. Everyone here knows that it will not be possible in the next fiscal year for the State to make any such appropriation. There is not the time for the State to make the appropriation. It is not likely that the county will make the appropriation. Counties are now called upon to make appropriations for demonstration work in the Agricultural Department, and they are, in the main, much more interested in making a small appropriation to get demonstration work in the Agricultural Department for the farmers than they will be to make an appropriation to get public-health demonstration work for sanitation. They do not know what sanitation is. Now, the Public Health Service has made a number of surveys along these lines in certain portions of Kentucky, I believe, and in North Carolina. I did not know they had gone into Missouri to any extent, though they are asked to go into various States. In some places they get cooperation. As far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing to insert in this bill a provision similar to the one that we carry in the Agricultural bill, permitting cooperation, permitting States, counties, municipalities, or individuals, corporations, or associations to contribute toward the expense. When you say no portion of this money can be expended until after the municipality or the county has made an appropriation for that purpose, as far as the next fiscal year is concerned you might as well throw this paper carrying the appropriation into the wastebasket, because it will not be done.

These public-health people are doing a splendid service. I will not say we all know, but most of us believe that such diseases as typhoid fever and typhus fever come in the main through lack of sanitation, come largely through contamination with sewage, and that various other ailments of the human body, such as hook worm, come partly through lack of sanitation, possibly partly through lack of knowledge as to the method of dressing to prevent them. These people in the Public Health Service are endeavoring to teach these things, and when they go into the field and make the demonstration and acquire the information they try to disseminate that information through all the public-health officials in the country. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] said they could not do this work unless they had public-health officials. Where they have public-health officials they do not need it so much as where they have not got public-health officials. I am not willing voluntarily to consent to any proposition which will forbid the Government teaching through sanitation how to prevent disease.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the work carried on under this item is, to my mind, one of the most important lines of work

now being engaged in by the Government at all. It was my pleasure and privilege to see some of it during last fall in my own State. I believe that with proper encouragement and appropriations we can bring about almost a revolution in the sanitary conditions of this country, which, after all, means a revolution in the health conditions of the country. I am delighted that the committee has seen fit to make a substantial increase in the amount available for this work during the next fiscal year, but I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who has just taken his seat, that the proviso at this time is probably ill advised. This is a new work. The people do not know it as they know farm-demonstration work or marketing and things of that kind. It is a new field of undertaking, and the people must be shown. The demonstration must be made in different States and communities before the people can be aroused to the importance of this work.

In my own State, for example, consisting of 45 or 46 counties, we have had only one of these health surveys, in the extreme northern part of the State. I do not think there could be a better work than that has proven to be; and yet the people in my own part of the State, the central part, are not acquainted with that work except as they have learned of it through the press. Now, I believe that until this work has been placed in communities sufficiently large in number to bring the people in contact with it, educating them to a thorough understanding of what it means and what it undertakes to do, we had better go on and make the demonstration regardless of cooperation upon the part of the community, the county, or the State.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I do believe, however, if my friend from Ohio will permit me for just a moment, that this work must gradually grow into a great cooperative work between the Government of the United States and the State governments and local authorities. I believe the time is coming more and more in the functions of State and Federal government when they must cooperate. The health of this country is not wholly a State proposition. It is not entirely a national proposition. It is a proposition that involves both the State and the Nation, and to my mind each has a very direct and vital interest in it, and I believe that in time, when we can impress upon the people by these ocular demonstrations within the State the value of this work, we can then call upon them for proper cooperation upon their part. But until then I think it would be unwise to insert this kind of prohibitive provision in this law.

Mr. HAWLEY. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAWLEY. I ask that the gentleman may have one more minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from South Carolina be extended one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWLEY. The gentleman, as chairman of the Agricultural Committee, knows that the Agricultural Department is doing a great deal of work in rural sanitation. He spoke about the work now being carried on in his own State in the public health service. Is there a cooperative arrangement between the Department of Agriculture and the United States Public Health Service in this work?

Mr. LEVER. I understand that in this particular work in South Carolina there is no such cooperation as the gentleman suggests. I think myself that the time is also coming when the functions of the Public Health Service and the Department of Agriculture in this work must be more clearly defined. I do not know that that time has yet come.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I know a little about this work at first hand, because the only county in Missouri selected by the public health authorities for this demonstration work is Clay County, which adjoins my district on the north. It lies directly across the Missouri River from Kansas City, and contains what we call North Kansas City and several good-sized towns, one of which, Excelsior Springs, is a suburb and resort. Last fall, as these public health officers were concluding their work in Clay County, I spent two half days over there, one in Excelsior Springs and the other in driving over the county with the public health officer.

Mr. MANN. Before the election?

Mr. BORLAND. No; this was after the election. I was not canvassing the county, either. So that I saw the work, both in the smaller town of Excelsior Springs and in the rural district. It may interest the committee to know what these gentlemen are doing. It impressed me as one of the most useful and remarkable activities that is being carried on by the Government. They put seven men into that county for four

months, young physicians, health officers. Out of the seven six were employed by the Federal Government. One of them was furnished by the State. I think the only reason why one was furnished by the State was because that county happens to be the residence of the chairman of the State board of health. It so happened, therefore, that the State had a representative present.

The cost of that work was about \$7,000 for that county. There was only \$25,000 in the current year's appropriation. The officers go from house to house, inspect the water supply, inspect the disposal of foul refuse and sewage matter of all kinds. They test the relation between the outhouses, the barns, and the chicken coops, and the water supply. They look at the condition of vermin and rats as applying to the cellar and outhouses, and the connection between them and the kitchen and the pantry and places where human food is kept, and particularly in connection with the water supply, if it be a cistern. They find frequently that the surface water drains from the outhouse toward the water supply.

In one neighborhood, in Excelsior Springs, there was a rambling street running down a creek bottom almost wholly occupied by colored people. They had very neat houses and chicken yards, and it was very attractive for colored people. The creek valley ran up a limestone hillside, and the houses were on the banks of the creek, with the back yard higher than the level of the house. In almost every case the outhouse and the outside toilet was located at the back end of the lot, higher than the house, and the wash of these outhouses went toward the well or cistern located near the kitchen door. The cistern boxes were old and rotten, and had started to fall away. Vermin of all kinds could get in and drink the water.

The health officers analyzed the water to see whether there was contamination in the supply and where it came from. They tell the resident how he is to dispose of the foul matter in a way that will keep from contaminating the soil in the water supply. They require a movable type of box inclosing a screened apartment under the toilet building, so that it can be removed at stated intervals.

Where a city is incorporated they expect the authorities, after public sentiment is aroused, to pass ordinances requiring separate receptacles in outside toilets and regulations to prevent contamination in water supplies. They usually get that kind of ordinance.

Now, in the country districts they go to the farmer—in this particular county I think there were about 2,200 separate homes—and on the first visit they make a survey to determine the location of the outhouses, the water supply, and so on, and then they instruct the farmer or the householder as to how he can guard against the dangers they ascertain to exist. They show him how to put iron screens to prevent the rats getting into the outhouses, how to dispose of the manure in such a way as to prevent the propagation of flies and insects, and how to drain ponds that create a supply of mosquitoes, and so on. Then they go back after a certain period, after making out a list of suggestions, to see how many he has carried out, and what difficulty he is having in carrying them out. You would be surprised to see that 85 to 95 per cent of the farmers will, when approached in the right way and shown the purposes of the survey, cooperate with them.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FESS. What authority have these health officers?

Mr. BORLAND. Absolutely none. They go there only by invitation of the health authorities. When they go they say, "We are not here to police you or arrest you or inspect you, we are simply here to advise you. The health authorities of your State have given us this letter. We have no authority except to advise you and tell you what to do, but you will find that a case of typhoid fever costs about \$400 in expense and that is the minimum cost. You can probably recall, Mr. Farmer, whether there has been a case in your family or the church or the neighborhood." And he will recollect some splendid young person who had been taken off by typhoid fever. They say "We will guarantee an insurance on your health"; and then they proceed to show him, and in nine cases out of ten they will appeal to the reason of the farmer and he will respond. The only persons that do not respond are the tenant farmers.

Mr. FESS. Would not information lead to good results?

Mr. BORLAND. No; information is all right for the time being, but there is no way of guaranteeing a perpetuation. They may have a State official along with them, but he may go out of office next year. There is only one way that I know of to secure it. There are 114 counties in my State, and I do not think that the Government will clean up all of the counties within a reasonable time. The only way that you can get permanent

results is to say that the State itself shall furnish at least half of the men engaged in the survey work. Every farm the Government health officer goes on he shall be accompanied side by side by a State officer and let the investigation go hand in hand.

Mr. FESS. Will it be sufficiently welcomed by the community so that they would invite it to the extent that they would be willing to make a contribution?

Mr. BORLAND. If it is not sufficiently welcome to that extent, then it would not be sufficiently welcome for the community to follow it without any invitation. The Government has proceeded upon the theory that if they can clean up Clay County all of the other counties in Missouri would hear of it and begin to adopt these methods. Assuming they heard of it, which is rather improbable, and assuming that they knew what they wanted to adopt, which is still more improbable, that they should still go ahead and adopt it without anybody to show them is entirely improbable. I can not see how we are going to spread this work any more rapidly, make it any more beneficial to the State than to see that the State has a partnership interest in the work as it goes along. It is to be left eventually in the hands of State officials. It is not possible for our Government officials to go back to Clay County within the next 10 years, and I am certain that within the next 5 years 75 to 80 per cent of the benefits from the survey will disappear.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill a question. The Department of Agriculture, under some appropriations, is making investigations regarding rural sanitation, sewage disposal, and provisions for the general health of the rural communities. Does the work of the Public Health Service occupy a field entirely apart from that occupied by the activities of the Department of Agriculture, or do the two traverse the same ground to any extent?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know what they are doing in the Department of Agriculture. They are apt to do anything there.

Mr. HAWLEY. They are doing many wise things for the benefit of the rural population.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not familiar with the Department of Agriculture.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. LEVER. As I understand the difference, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture is doing this rural sanitary work with the idea of determining the minimum effect of bad health or bad sanitation upon a community, while the Bureau of Public Health is undertaking to prevent sickness, and the like of that.

Mr. HAWLEY. The gentleman knows, as the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, that they also make recommendations, draw plans of sanitary outhouses and plans for the installation of sewage disposal, for the installation of sanitary water supply, for disposing of various things around the farm that would be deleterious to the health of the people or the animals on the farm, and I wondered if the two departments had a working agreement to keep to certain lines of work, each in its own department, and if they have not, if it would not be advisable that they do have such an agreement?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Only one department ought to do rural sanitation work.

Mr. LEVER. There is no question that there ought to be a working agreement.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There ought to be one department to do it, and that department ought to be the Public Health Service, which is the health department of the Government. Of course, I know many gentlemen think that the Department of Agriculture ought to do everything, but really they should confine themselves to agriculture.

Mr. HAWLEY. It is my opinion the Department of Agriculture should have authority to undertake the solution of all questions affecting agriculture and the welfare of the rural population. I wished also to ask this question. In the hearings before the gentleman's committee did the Public Health Service state the exact lines along which they work?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, yes. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has outlined it. He has described the course they follow. They make a complete survey of every county, examine every farm and outhouse, every residence and barn, and the general situation in reference to the sanitary arrangements and get a statistical sheet showing every disease that everybody in the family ever had, and make suggestions as to changes that should be made in the sanitary arrangements.

Mr. HAWLEY. In examining a number of the appropriation bills reported at this session, it has seemed to me that there is

considerable overlapping of work between the various departments, and that if some arrangement could be had by which each department would have a specific line of work and keep out of the work of the others it would be an excellent arrangement, and where it is advisable for similar lines of work to be undertaken by two or more departments there should be a co-operative working arrangement to prevent duplication.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Every department seems to proceed upon the theory that they can do everything better than every other department, and they are all constantly striving to enhance their own powers and enlarge their own activities, and some of them are more successful than others.

Mr. HAWLEY. It is in the hands of Congress, of course, in making the appropriation, to define the fields of departmental activity. I do not wish to be understood as in any way minimizing the value of the work of the Public Health Service.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is not in the hands of Congress at all. We imagine that it is in our hands, but when a gentleman is confronted with the suggestion that the particular service which he thinks is the very best service in all the Government is encroaching upon some other service that he does not look on with such a favoring eye, and some one suggests that he help to curtail his favorites, he turns a deaf ear and helps the service that he favors to do the things that it should not do.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I come from a rural community. I represent a rural State. I believe in rural sanitation, and I am very much in favor of the limitation contained in this item. I am in favor of it because, for one thing, I doubt very much whether you can in the long run make people better, more cleanly, more sanitary in their habits by investigations with which they have nothing to do, in which they have no part, that do not cost them anything. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has told us about the work in Clay County. I hope it has done much good, I hope that its benefit will be lasting, but I doubt very much whether it is a good policy for the Federal Government to start out proposing, out of the Federal funds raised by taxes, to spend the approximately \$30,000,000 that it will require to conduct in each county of the Union the kind of rural sanitary survey that was carried on in Clay County, Mo.

Mr. McCracken. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. McCracken. Does not the gentleman in his own State think it would take practically all of the \$30,000,000 to make a survey of all the counties in Wyoming, even though it is not necessary to enforce sanitation?

Mr. MONDELL. Of course, it would cost something to cover our very great extent of territory; but, on the other hand, it would cost comparatively little, because our sanitary conditions are most excellent as the matter now stands.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. What is the population per square mile in Wyoming?

Mr. MONDELL. Wyoming; oh, it is about two and a half— plenty of room.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not think they need any great sanitation lessons either in the Desert of Sahara or any other place where the population is so sparse?

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Now, I think the gentleman from Illinois would not want to convey the impression that I am not interested in this sanitary work because it may not be needed in my State.

Mr. MANN. No. And I do not so imply.

Mr. MONDELL. I would not suggest he was interested in the work because it was needed in his State.

Mr. MANN. It is; it is needed in every State in the Union except Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. I think it a good work in every State in the Union, including Wyoming; but I believe that to accomplish the best results, in fact to accomplish any permanent beneficial result by a work of this kind, the local people must be directly interested, and the only certain and sure way to directly interest them is to ask them to pay a part of the cost.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. SLOAN. I want to suggest that the fact that Wyoming is populating so fast and the constituency of the gentleman, following his illustrious example, is rapidly increasing the number per square mile, I want to ask whether or not sanitation is to be applied to the two metropolitan places of the two States— Sun Dance, Wyo., and Chicago, Ill.—or entirely in the rural part of it?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, take and put them together and average them and I should say that they would then both be rural. Therefore this sanitation might apply. But, seriously, this is a serious matter, because it is a matter in which the department has been doing excellent work. It has not done a great amount of work. The work is new, the appropriations heretofore have been small—\$25,000 a year; \$150,000 this year—we are increasing it; it is going to grow; it must grow more if we are to carry on this work all over the Union generally, and carry it on with any degree of rapidity, but in my opinion it will not be useful or helpful unless you invite the people to participate in it. I am of the opinion that the value of the farm-demonstration work would be comparatively small if it were not for the very wise provision under which the community contributes toward that work.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield in that connection?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. And yet the gentleman knows that the farm demonstration was going on for perhaps 20 years before any such cooperation was required. It was only after the farm demonstration work began to be permanently something in the community that the cooperation was required and was easily had.

Mr. MANN. Is it required now by law?

Mr. MONDELL. Cooperation.

Mr. MANN. By law.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, it is required under the rules of the department, and also—

Mr. MANN. Yes; but it—

Mr. LEVER. It is required under the agricultural extension act.

Mr. MANN. That simply limits you; but under the Agricultural appropriation it was never required by law.

Mr. MONDELL. We do not get any assistance in our country in the farm demonstration work unless—

Mr. MANN. That is because you can afford to pay for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask to proceed for five minutes more.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Now, the gentleman suggests that it might be well to put this restriction on this appropriation after we get it going. I think the time to put the restriction on this appropriation is now, and then, if there is a county in the gentleman's district or a county in my State that is sufficiently interested in this work to contribute toward it, they will have a survey that will be valuable, that the people will be interested in, and which will be permanently useful and helpful.

I am afraid all these blessings from on high, from the Federal Government, give the impression to the people of the communities that Uncle Sam gathers his dollars from the bushes, pulls them out of the air, that there is no limit to the depth and breadth and capacity of the Federal Treasury, and that Uncle Sam is the daddy of us all, and can do all things needful for us. That is not a good spirit to cultivate in a Republic. It is unfortunate. And, furthermore, no people were ever made or ever will be made permanently careful and thoughtful of their sanitary conditions and surroundings by reason of aid from the outside. That is not the way in which human conditions are progressively and permanently improved. They are improved by the effort of the people locally in the main. We should encourage this work. We should help it. But, in my opinion, we will be doing our duty in the best possible way if we ask the people to participate.

Now, after we have tried this a year, if we find it does not work at all, if we find the people can not meet the conditions, I for one would be perfectly willing to go on for a time without this plan of cooperation. And I think this is a wise thing to do.

Mr. KELLEY. So far as the gentleman knows, is there any State which does not have a State medical board, or a State health board, with subdivisions in the counties and smaller municipalities?

Mr. MONDELL. I imagine all States have such organizations.

Mr. LEVER. Let me ask the gentleman from Wyoming if he does not realize this appropriation here is the beginning of a great cooperative work between the Federal Government and the States to carry on this line of work, but that the time has not come when it is wise to demand of the States the cooperation which you require in this item?

Mr. MONDELL. The only difference of opinion there is between the gentleman and myself is that I believe this is the time to begin this work in a cooperative way. The gentleman evidently does not. I believe that we will under this cooperative plan this year get the best work and accomplish the best results we have ever accomplished.

Mr. LEVER. On the general principle the gentleman and I are in absolute agreement. I believe there ought to be this cooperation. The only difference is I do not believe it wise in the very incipency of this work to require it at this time. I think it would have the result of retarding the work rather than encouraging and promoting it.

Mr. MONDELL. Though the aid may retard the expenditure of some money, even though the effect would be to prevent the expenditure of this entire \$150,000, we shall at least be laying the foundation on sound, sane, and sensible lines. We will be saying to the people of the country, "Through this cooperative agreement Uncle Sam, the Federal Government, stands ready to assist you in this matter, to give you the benefit of the advice and cooperation of the best talent that can be secured, and to start you on the way of better living, the establishment of better conditions. But before the Federal Government can be really effective in permanently improving the situation, you must have become sufficiently interested in the matter that you will be willing to make some contribution to it."

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit, I believe if we had made this limitation put in here in 1904, begun in Texas, instead of the system which has developed into the nation-wide system we now have, we would not now have that system at all.

Mr. MONDELL. I would not deny that, because the gentleman is an authority on the subject; but I do believe that this is the best way to carry on this work.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to agree upon some time in which to close debate. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and pending amendments close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. Does the gentleman wish the time to be controlled by the Chair?

Mr. FITZGERALD. By the Chair.

Mr. MANN. Divided up into two-minute propositions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] a question or two, having been called out of the Chamber for a moment and having thus missed a part of his very illuminating speech. I wish to inquire in regard to the spread of typhoid fever. I understood the gentleman to say that a portion of this demonstration and instruction work was to prevent the spread of typhoid fever in rural communities. I wish to ask the gentleman if this work goes as far as recommending or actually giving the prophylactic for typhoid fever?

Mr. BORLAND. No. It was only the sanitation. It only went to the examination of the water supply and the disposition of human offal, and so forth, that would produce typhoid fever.

Mr. TILSON. Did the instructors and demonstrators go so far as to give information to the people that typhoid fever has been practically eliminated so far as the Army is concerned, by means of the prophylactic, which every man who enters the Army must take and which has been absolutely effective for the prevention of typhoid fever?

Mr. BORLAND. No. Their instruction related wholly to the sanitation of the premises in which the people live. It did not deal with the subject itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I consider this movement as one of the most vital in the whole process of government. The experience of mankind has shown that it is very little trouble to propagate a race, but it is an immense question to take care of the young and develop them after they are born. There is no doubt about the necessity of sanitation. Look at the fell destroyer that sweeps down the infant's life in our country and you will realize the distress. And I want to say that it is not all in the larger cities, notwithstanding the fact that our larger cities are becoming absolute sinkholes into which human life is poured by the millions. Our rural communities are suffering likewise for want of a proper knowledge of sanitation and health protection. The scientific world has found that it is far better and more economical, and that it conserves the race far better, to prevent disease than to undertake to cure disease.

Now, I have lived a great deal of my active life out among the farmers. I have slept in farmhouses perhaps half my time in all the States south of Washington and west of the Alleghanies to the Pacific Ocean for nearly nine years. I find this,

my friends, that when a farmer locates a home he will usually pick out a nice promontory on which to put his barn and feed pens, and then he will find another promontory on which he will put his house; and when he digs his well he goes down into the lowlands, and hence the offal and effete matter, the excrement of human and animal life, strikes down to the level of the well and percolates into the well, and necessarily diseases follow.

I have found, also, that all over the earth the people who stand by the Abrahamic theory of the resurrection, when they plant a town or a village, usually go out to the highest spot on the outskirts of the little village in its infancy and pick out a place for a graveyard. That graveyard increases as the city increases. But the water supplies are usually found in the lower lands, and therefore every disease that is in that city is buried in that high point, and assimilation and percolation take it down to the level of the water supply, and disease contaminates and destroys human life all over the country.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. While we admit the necessity of some work being done along the line which the gentleman has suggested, I would like to know why it is, if he so believes, that the Federal Government should do the work? Why not have the great State of Texas do its own sanitary work and the State of Minnesota do its sanitary work? What does the gentleman say along that line?

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. I thank the gentleman. We might have the State of Texas run our Post Office Department and everything else with the same propriety. The conservation of the human race is the conservation of all power, and to take care of the human family is the prime object of all government. The second law book that ever I tried to pass an examination on told me on about the fortieth page, as I recollect now, that the prime object of all government is to restrain the strong and vicious, assist the weak and helpless, establish and maintain that which is right, and condemn and prohibit that which is wrong.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Surely.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. The gentleman has intimated that inasmuch as the Post Office Department is run under the Federal Government, therefore sanitation should be taken care of by the Federal Government.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. We are proposing a species of cooperation. There is no destruction of the proper relation between the Federal and State Governments.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. The gentleman seems to think there is no distinction between the Federal Government carrying on the activities of the post office and carrying on these health activities. In the case of the post office there is a constitutional provision that requires the Federal Government to run it, and in the other it is a question of cooperation by the Federal Government without being required so to do with the States. Does the gentleman think this necessary?

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. I am not responsible for the distorted vision that the gentleman has. [Laughter.] I am talking about my own condition. [Laughter.] I feel that it would be a misfortune to hamper or in any way impede the progress of this demonstration work in regard to the health of the people. As the gentleman from Illinois said about the gentleman from Wyoming, it is not so interesting where there is only one man to a section or one home to a section. The great atmospheric doctor of the universe keeps that atmosphere pure. But the question will become more and more important as this Republic finally becomes settled.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] will be recognized for two minutes.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I think the proviso to this legislation is a very good one, and should be retained in the bill. But I differ with my friend from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] in this, that I believe better results will be obtained by having the State and the county contribute a part of the amount to be paid for the work done under this appropriation. If that is done, the community where the work is carried out will take more of a real interest in the work. I do not believe in the Federal Government distributing with a free hand funds of this kind. I find that where the local people, either in matters of sanitation or in education, contribute a part of the expense, they are more interested in the work, they more appreciate the work, and the work is more successful. In the farm-extension work throughout the Northwest that work has de-

veloped to a very wide extent, and I believe that has been due mainly to the fact that it was paid for largely by the people who were benefited by it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman believe that is true about the appropriation for the eradication of dourine?

Mr. NORTON. Well, I will say to the gentleman that those who were benefited by that appropriation contributed in large part to meeting the expense that was occasioned by the prevalence of that disease.

Mr. MANN. Did they contribute any part toward meeting the Federal expenditure of \$75,000 in the gentleman's part of the country?

Mr. NORTON. Yes; they contributed a large part to meet the expense that was caused by the disease.

Mr. LEVER. No such requirement was made by law.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman would not apply his principle to that.

Mr. NORTON. I think those two cases are not altogether analogous. As far as that is concerned, where there is a loss now through the disease to which the gentleman refers, and where there is an attempt made to eradicate the disease, the owner of the live stock stands much more of the loss occasioned by the disease than the Federal Government or than the local community. Under regulations of the Bureau of Animal Industry, the State or county in which the work of eradication is carried on is required to defray part of the expense. I trust that no large part of this appropriation will be used here in Washington, but that it will be used mainly out in the rural districts. Last year there was an appropriation of \$25,000 under this item, but practically all of it, as I understand, was used here in the city of Washington.

Mr. MANN. None of it was used here.

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

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, there are two considerations that have appealed to me with a great deal of force in favor of striking out this provision. One is that the place needing it the most would not know it, and therefore the Government ought not to expect the States to cooperate. The other is that where habits are to be changed, the change will likely be very unwelcome. Those two considerations weigh something with me. But, on the other hand, it seems to me that the Government ought to require cooperation in the relationship of all work where the Government aids the State. That was the principle of the vocational education bill, and I think it was soundly based. It is the principle also of other activities, and I am told that those activities are growing more popular every day with cooperative rather than simply Federal aid.

I realize the force of what the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] said, and also what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said; but it seems to me a wise provision that what is done by the Federal Government in any State or county ought to be met by at least a portion of assistance by communities in a cooperative way. It is so easy to ask the Federal Government for money. It is so common for us to come here and demand help for our own locality. That is the source of all the bad odor of what we call pork-barrel legislation, much of which is unfounded but which the public believes to be well founded. And it seems to me it would be a very wise provision to keep this proviso of cooperation in the bill, because you all admit that you will put it in later on. It is wise to start well, in the belief that what we are going to do later on had better be done when we start.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, there are quite a number of Members here who were not here when I spoke before. We are making an appropriation for rural sanitation, and have been making one for two or three years. For the current year about \$75,000 is being expended, though the appropriation for that purpose was only about \$25,000, the other coming out of another appropriation. This year the committee have recommended an appropriation of \$150,000 and put into the bill with it the proviso that no part of this appropriation shall be available—I am not reading it verbatim—unless the State, county, or municipality shall pay one-half the expense of the work.

It is perfectly patent to everyone here, as I stated before, that during the next fiscal year the States can not contribute any of this money. There is no machinery by which they will be able to do so. It is perfectly patent to anyone here that the municipality can not contribute one-half the money, because in

the main this work is not in any municipality. There is no municipality there. It is rural sanitation. There may be a hamlet community. It is perfectly patent that the county probably will not contribute one-half of this expense. There are too many other things for the county to do. Now, whether we can ever educate the people so that they will be obliged to contribute some of this I do not know. I am perfectly willing that they should be permitted to contribute. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] said he did not believe the Government ought to do these things without the States contributing. Well, let us see what we do. This appropriation is more for the protection of the lives of the children and the women than the men. It is to teach them how to dispose of sewage very largely, to get a healthful water supply and to prevent vermin which will carry disease. We appropriate for this year \$532,000 for the eradication of scabies in sheep and cattle, out in the gentleman's country, and not a dollar of it is contributed by the State. We appropriate \$632,000 for the eradication of the southern tick, which is paid by the General Government.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman—

Mr. MANN. I do not yield. We appropriate \$277,000 in reference to butter factories and dairies, paid from the General Treasury. We appropriate millions of dollars out in the territory represented by the gentleman from Wyoming, and the State does not contribute a red cent, and part of it is expended to find out how prairie dogs scatter disease among animals. We appropriate \$250,000 for the citrus canker. We appropriate money in every direction for the protection of forest products, for the protection of hogs and cattle and sheep, for the protection of wheat and corn and grain and cotton, for the investigation of diseases of potatoes. Why can we not as well give a little bit of money to save the health of the people in the country districts, without saying they must put up half the money? [Applause.] Is it not just as valuable for the Government to help protect a baby as it is a young pig? We spend money to tell people how to protect wheat that has built up Minneapolis with her flour mills, yet the gentleman from Minneapolis objects to this. Can we not just as well protect the babies? Is human life less valuable than that of hogs? I believe if we do one without requiring contributions, we can do the other. If this proviso remains in the bill, this appropriation is dead, and the work will cease.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I have heard the statement here a good many times—possibly I have made it myself, until I found out better—that the gentleman speaks of in reference to the care and treatment of animals and the destruction of those animals that ought to be destroyed on account of their danger to human life. But we appropriate hundreds of thousands of dollars, yes, more than that, for the health of this country. The impression ought not to be made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that we appropriate only this small amount for the health of human beings. I think I have always voted for every bill and every provision looking to the betterment of the health of the people. I dare say there is no man in this House who sends out more bulletins to the people generally upon the subject of sanitation and health than I do. I try to watch every one of them issued by the Government, because I think they are a splendid thing. I believe I am for rural sanitation just as strong as any man in this House, but I do believe that the people living throughout this country ought to have enough interest in it to be able to contribute something for this work, and I think it is no reflection upon any Member of this House when he stands for this provision in the bill, and he ought not and can not be rightfully charged with a lack of desire to stand for sanitation and for the betterment of the condition of the health of the people of rural communities when he says that some contribution should be made by the local authorities.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this provision in the bill is in the interest of rural sanitation. What is most necessary at present are proper sanitary regulations and proper sanitary agencies to enforce these regulations. That is the statement of the public-health officials. The object of requiring the cooperation is to so develop public sentiment that when a county has been surveyed these essential regulations will be adopted to continue the conditions that are created and arranged for the enforcement of those regulations. If that be not done, every dollar expended in this work will be wasted. Health regulations do not come into being of their own motion, and they are not enforced in communities in which there is no agency to enforce them.

This provision will not prevent the expenditure of money. This limitation will be an incentive to the Public Health Service of the United States, by reason of its connection with the health departments of the various States, to obtain the cooperation that is desired. All of this work is now done after consultation with the health officials of the State. Certain complaints are made by the Public Health Service that the failure to organize the proper agencies to carry on the work by the States is a very serious defect in the whole situation.

We have already surveyed and worked in 15 counties in 15 different States, and we are now working in the sixteenth county. This money will enable the work to be done in every State in the Union if it is done by cooperation. This work ought to be done now, so that we will not only contribute the money necessary but at the same time we will develop that proper healthy public sentiment for the adoption of proper regulations and organization of agencies that will enable them to be enforced. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be again reported.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to strike out the proviso.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN and Mr. LEVER) there were 19 ayes and 39 noes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The Chair appointed as tellers the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 29 ayes and 40 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Biologic products: To regulate the propagation and sale of viruses, serums, toxins, and analogous products, including personal service, \$20,000.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I received a letter from a health official a year ago saying that he doubted if there was any serum that would prevent typhoid fever. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] made some remarks to the contrary a few minutes ago, and I would like to know upon what he based his statement.

Mr. MANN. Knowledge.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I spoke of the typhoid prophylactic, especially its use in the Army. At the time of the first border mobilization in Texas, in 1911, I served a tour of duty as a student officer and took the typhoid prophylactic. Since that time I have been interested in the use and results of the use of it. Last summer as soon as called into the service I took the prophylactic again and saw thousands of others taking it. I witnessed results at first hand and have no doubts in regard to them. I have also conversed with medical men in the Army and out of the Army as to the effect of the use of it. Therefore I spoke upon what I thought was good authority in saying that typhoid had been practically eliminated, so far as the Army was concerned.

I recall that in the 1911 mobilization there were more than 20,000 Regular officers and men who took the prophylactic, with the result that there was not a single case of typhoid, except one, and that a very mild case, among the twenty-odd thousand who took it. Even this case was said to be a man who had contracted the disease before he took the prophylactic.

In the recent mobilization on the Mexican border the first thing ordered was that every man brought into the service be given the prophylactic, and this was done. So far as I know, there was absolutely no typhoid fever in that Army of 150,000.

I would say further, in answer to the gentleman's inquiry, that so certain is the medical profession as to the efficacy of this prophylactic that it is extensively used in private practice. This is especially true in cases of local outbreaks of typhoid, where the use of the prophylactic among private patients by civilian physicians has been very effective.

The Clerk read as follows:

For observation of the total eclipse of the sun of June 8, 1918, including purchase of necessary apparatus and supplies, transportation of equipment to and from observing station, hire of temporary assistance, transportation and subsistence of observers, and miscellaneous expenses, \$2,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to make some inquiry regarding this item—as to the total eclipse of the sun in 1918. I have a slight impression that the legislative subcommittee considered this proposal, but I am not certain whether the committee appropriated for it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The legislative bill carried an appropriation to enable the Naval Observatory to send an expedition.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was for the same purpose—to make the observation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The same purpose; but this expedition goes to a different place. In case conditions should be such at one place that they could not make observation we might make it at the other.

Mr. STAFFORD. If I recollect the testimony of the Superintendent of the Naval Observatory, he explained that it was the purpose to send an expedition to different places to study the eclipse, so that in case the conditions are not favorable at one place they might be at the other.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The practice has been to send separate expeditions for the Naval Observatory and for the Astrophysical Observatory. The opportunities to acquire this information are so rare, so valuable for scientific purposes, that it would be a great mistake for the very slight sum involved to forego the opportunity.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I recall, some years ago we made an appropriation to the Smithsonian Institution to bear expenses of some observations down in Mexico. Has this any relation to that character of work?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; that was for certain studies they wished to make of the sun.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was it not in connection with an eclipse of the sun?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not recall whether it was an eclipse or not.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was about 8 or 10 years ago when that appropriation was made.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The last eclipse of this character was in 1900. That may be the one that the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman's information shows that it is not supplementary to the Naval Observatory?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That was the Naval Observatory expedition. This is for the Astrophysical Observatory.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

National Zoological Park: For roads, walks, bridges, water supply, sewerage, and drainage; grading, planting, and otherwise improving the grounds; erecting and repairing buildings and inclosures; care, subsistence, purchase, and transportation of animals; necessary employees; incidental expenses not otherwise provided for, including purchase, maintenance, and driving of horses and vehicles required for official purposes, not exceeding \$100 for the purchase of necessary books and periodicals, and exclusive of architect's fees or compensation, \$100,000; one-half of which sum shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia and the other half from the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not know whether any of the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution are present here to-night or not. I would like to know why the road at the entrance to the park has been closed all winter?

Mr. MONDELL. It is not closed now, is it?

Mr. MANN. When has it been opened?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The entrance to the Zoo Park?

Mr. MANN. To Rock Creek Park.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And the gentleman asks why it is closed?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They were repairing the road the last time I was out there.

Mr. MANN. They do not repair these roads in the middle of winter, do they? If they do, they exhibit abominable taste.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They were repairing the road the last time I was out there. That was one day during this session of Congress. The road was then closed.

Mr. MONDELL. Perhaps the road was closed because of the unusually high water in the ford.

Mr. MANN. It has been closed regardless of high water or any other kind of water.

Mr. STAFFORD. The drought and the dry law has not had any effect on Rock Creek, has it?

Mr. MANN. They have a habit of doing those things out there without any regard to the interest or wishes of the public.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I was through the park on Sunday.

Mr. MANN. The Zoo or Rock Creek Park?

Mr. FITZGERALD. And to my surprise I found a considerable amount of snow there, and some of the roads impassible on that account. It may be due to that condition.

Mr. MANN. Of course, the roads are impassible, if they keep them closed all of the time. There is no road out there that is not passible, so far as snow is concerned, if it is open otherwise.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What day did the gentleman go out there?

Mr. MANN. Oh, I am out there nearly every day or night.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am glad the gentleman finds time to do that.

Mr. MANN. That is where I get my fresh air. I do not get it in this Chamber talking with the gentleman or listening to his hot air.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think it would improve the gentleman if he would go with me. Of course they can not keep the park open all night to accommodate the gentleman from Illinois. If he goes out there in the daytime, I think he will be able to get in.

Mr. MANN. Of course, that road is closed after sundown anyhow, and that is a ridiculous regulation, but to that I submit; but just to close it out of—oh, pure cussedness, it does not seem to me is the right thing to do. I had hoped that some of the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution would be here, though I understand perfectly well, having been one, that the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution have nothing whatever to do with the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Things may have changed. Perhaps it is the Regents who are closing the park up.

Mr. MANN. I do not believe that they know that the Smithsonian Institution has jurisdiction over the park.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Valuation of property of carriers: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry out the objects of the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof by providing for a valuation of the several classes of property of carriers subject thereto and securing information concerning their stocks, bonds, and other securities," approved March 1, 1913, including per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and including not exceeding \$15,000 for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia, \$3,500,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of seeing if I can get a little information with reference to previous expenditures of sums in the same line as those directed by this paragraph. Can the gentleman inform me as to what proportion of the mileage of the railroads of the United States has been valued by the Interstate Commerce Commission so far?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Completed?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They have finished and have up before the commission, my recollection is, a complete valuation of two short lines. The estimate was that they would value about 50,000 miles a year.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have been informed, I can not say just how correctly, that the cost up-to-date has been about \$8,000,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Nine million three hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Can the gentleman at that rate estimate how many hundred million dollars it will cost to finish this valuation?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is going exactly as it was pointed out it would when the first appropriation was made. The statement was then made that it would cost at least \$12,000,000 and that it might possibly cost \$20,000,000, and the House was informed fully by me at the time and notified that if Congress initiated the work it would do so upon the understanding that the expenditure resulting would be at least \$12,000,000 and possibly \$20,000,000.

That statement was made because, when the bill to authorize the physical valuation of railroads was under consideration in the House, what was considered a very extreme and wild estimate was made of about \$6,000,000. The information upon which the House acted was that the valuation would cost probably three and a half million dollars, but after it was authorized and after the commission looked into the matter and compared its plans, Judge Prouty, who was put in charge of the work, outlining the scheme of work and the method to be followed and the estimate of cost, stated it would be at least \$12,000,000, and that is what it will be; it may be more.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, how much per mile has it cost for the ordinary railroad?

Mr. MANN. There are 250,000 miles.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I mean how much per mile is the cost?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think I could tell the gentleman in a moment. We had that information last year about what it would cost per mile. They are doing about 4,000 miles a month, that is what I said, about 50,000 miles a year, about \$3,500,000, or \$70 a mile.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. When is it expected the work will be completed?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The field work will probably be finished inside of two years. After that there are a great many questions that must be passed upon, and then the commission must reach its conclusions and the estimate was it would take to January 1, 1921.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, some of this work will be out of date by that time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; provision is to be made to keep it up to date, to keep the valuation current. That is the only way it would be of any value.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Quite true.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And after they have finished the work provision is made for the railroads, by report to the Interstate Commerce Commission, to show the moneys expended in betterments and improvements, and, by rule to be fixed, that element is to be carried into the valuation, modifying it from time to time.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, if it cost \$9,000,000, it would take at least \$15,000,000 more, does not the gentleman think, to finish it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It may; it would not surprise me at all. My experience has been, as a rule, that these estimates of enterprises like this are usually low and underestimated. I believe, however, that Judge Prouty had a very accurate conception of just what this work would be and how much it would cost, and when other men were asserting that \$6,000,000 was an extravagant estimate, he reiterated and emphasized the fact that if Congress initiated the work it would do so with the knowledge that it would cost at least \$12,000,000, and that it could not possibly be done for less.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, he seems to have been about correct.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, he had worked out a plan that had to be followed and calculated what was required to be done, and his judgment was very, very accurate in the matter.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think possibly the commission has finished a little more than the gentleman has stated, because I saw a statement in a financial paper the other day that the Rock Island system had their valuation practically finished, and that is one of the large systems.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Valued at what?

Mr. MANN. Practically finished, but not completely.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Not completely but practically finished.

Mr. MANN. There are just two roads completely finished a short time ago, but that does not mean—

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Kansas City Southern, of about 1,000 miles, and the Norfolk Southern have been completed and hearings have been fixed before the commission to pass upon some questions that have been raised by the roads. After these hearings have been held the commission will then reach its conclusion, and then the road will have to appear before the courts, and it may take some time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The chairman of the committee has stated that about \$9,000,000 has been spent on this work up to the present time. It is a very grave question whether the people of the United States will get value for the money they have spent on this inquiry and the money they will spend on it. Nine million dollars at this time would be of great service to the masses of the people of this country, some of whom are clamoring for food. Despite the talk of prosperity, which is temporary to a certain extent, due to foreign conditions, there is a great deal of distress in some of the large cities just now. Organizations and groups of men and women in New York and Philadelphia have been knocking at the doors of the authorities during the last two or three days demanding lower prices upon foodstuffs.

My judgment is that the Interstate Commerce Commission could play a very strong hand in regulating prices in the United States if it cared to do it. There is no more serious question just now, even that of war, than the problem of getting the food supply to the people of the United States. There are many well-disposed persons in all sections of our country who have great concern about the welfare of people in Europe and in other parts of the world; they meet with patriotic enthusiasm and make collections for the soldiers, or unfortunates in Germany—though many of these supplies do not get through—in England, in France, and in Belgium in particular. While this is all commendable, it is rather an odd commentary upon our economic system, possibly upon our social fabric, that while all this is being done for the people abroad, so little is being done for the people at home.

It may not be altogether wise at this time of the evening to discuss a matter of this kind, but I am inclined to think there is an ample food supply for the people of the United States in the United States, and that if there was a proper distribution of cars to carry the products back and forth from the farm to the city there would be a lessening of the prices of food supplies to the people generally. One of the real difficulties is that much of the product of the country is being mobilized for export, tied up in the cars at the great ports, held in the warehouses, or awaiting ships for export. And every shipload that goes abroad seems to increase the price to the American consumer. Some strange stories come from the other side. Eggs are less in price to the people of London than they are to the people of Philadelphia. Food supplies are cheaper, we are told, in Paris than they are in New York, and yet these food supplies for foreign lands come from the United States.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman says that food supplies are cheaper, we are told, in Paris than they are in New York.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I said that eggs were cheaper in London than they are in Philadelphia.

Mr. MONDELL. Has the gentleman accurate knowledge on that subject?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have newspaper information.

Mr. MONDELL. It is very extraordinary.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I can produce the statement for the gentleman, and if the gentleman will reason a minute he will see why this is possible. We are buying up food products in this country for export to the warring nations of Europe, and that restricts the distribution of the food supply to the people of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

Mr. BLACK. I object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I object. I wish to make this statement—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is no worse condition anywhere in the United States than there is in the city of New York just now.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know more about that than the gentleman from Pennsylvania does.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Some of the people have paraded the streets asking for food.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to state that I intend to object to discussion of this matter at this time, because we are going to reach in this bill a point where there will be an opportunity for some discussion of it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] a while ago said when the valuation matter was up before the House he claimed it would cost only about \$3,000,000 to make the valuation, and that the outside estimate for it was \$6,000,000, as I understand it. The gentleman may be in the main correct. I do not recall. I do know that I warned the House at the time that it would cost \$20,000,000 to \$25,000,000 to make this valuation. I say I warned the House. I did not oppose the proposition. The gentleman stated a while ago that this valuation would now be completed within \$12,000,000. I still adhere to my statement to the House before, that it will cost \$25,000,000 to make the valuation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman misunderstood me. I said it would cost at least \$12,000,000 and might reach \$20,000,000.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman repeatedly stated that it would cost \$12,000,000. I do not think there is any "might reach \$20,000,000" about it. It might reach \$25,000,000, but it is sure to reach over \$20,000,000.

Now, as a matter of fact, there has been no valuation of any railroad completed yet. The valuation by the inspectors in the field has been completed as to two small railroads, and possibly more, a short time ago. Of course that does not pretend to state the amount of work that has been done, because work has been done on railroads all over the country, and they can not complete one road very much ahead of some other road.

After valuation in the field is completed there is much work yet to be done both before the Interstate Commerce Commission, and possibly after the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to read a telegram to the House. I do not know whether it is informing or not. I do not know what the facts are. There has been a great deal of talk here

about the Interstate Commerce Commission regulating the movement of cars. We have a bill pending to that effect. It may be proper; I do not undertake to say. I hold a telegram in my hand, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., February 23, 1917.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.:

We are grain merchants operating three large grain elevators in the city of Chicago capable of shipping, provided cars are furnished, 200,000 bushels of grain daily. As a result of the recent ruling of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the prohibition against reloading miscellaneous cars for shipment east which are made empty at our plant, we can not ship 25,000 bushels per day. We understand there is a shortage of grain and foodstuffs in the East. We can every day guarantee to ship 200,000 bushels of grain east from Chicago every day, including Sundays and holidays, providing the present impracticable restriction regarding loading of cars are canceled. In conclusion, if there is any seriousness in the scarcity of grain supplies in the East, we, with two or three other large Chicago grain houses, can cure that situation in a short time. Our idea would be to allow this problem of grain distribution to be handled by people in the grain business, to whom it presents no new or difficult features. The past three months of almost unprecedented cold weather were largely responsible for existing situation. The favorable weather which may now be reasonably expected will certainly cure the situation, provided there is not too much interference. Please understand certain moves and regulations recently adopted are correct and advisable, others almost suicidal, under the conditions. Give us permission to load all empty cars obtainable, and compel railroads to haul grain promptly from Chicago when loaded, and the Chicago grain men will cure immediately any grain shortage which exists in Eastern States.

(Signed) HALES & EDWARDS CO.

I do not know whether the Interstate Commerce Commission has made impracticable regulations relative to cars or not. I believe they have made some regulations, but I do not know whether they are practicable or not. But as a rule, when some supervisory commission undertakes to make regulations concerning the method of doing business for men who are practical, they do mix up things so as to injure rather than aid the enterprise.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. ESCH. The Interstate Commerce Commission, in an opinion handed down on the 18th of January, made a ruling in regard to cars, and in that ruling the commission practically adopted the car rules of the American Railway Association, with some minor modifications which would result in the speeding of the cars back to the owning lines. I think the difficulty in connection with the Chicago situation largely arises out of the fact that some of northwestern roads have marketed grain east of Chicago.

Mr. MANN. These elevator men did not use northwestern roads. They do not use northwestern cars. The grain goes into the elevators from the northwestern cars, but they do not come out of the elevators on northwestern cars.

Mr. ESCH. The cars are now held as currency, and they are not held on the owning line.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. I have not the floor.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not have the floor. Of course the Interstate Commerce Commission made these regulations, but the railroads did not agree to them.

Mr. ESCH. They do not enforce their own rules. They are not penalized.

Mr. MANN. To say that a car coming into an elevator can not be reloaded with anything sounds ridiculous.

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

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman please, there was a hearing some weeks ago in my city touching car shortage. The charge was made, as I recall, by Mr. McCord, who was conducting the hearing, that there were a lot of railroads in the country who were undertaking, in order to protect themselves against future contingencies, to hold cars unduly; and it was because of the selfishness of the railroads in holding back cars and refusing to return cars to other systems that there was such trouble.

I do not believe there is a man here wise enough, without a long study, to determine the equities in regard to car shortages. Just such telegrams as the gentleman speaks of are always obtained from particular concerns that happen to be hit or want to make the railroads furnish more cars than they are able to get, either through the refusal of the railroads to give them or from some order of the commission.

Mr. MANN. Why does the gentleman say "hit"? These people do not care. They are getting storage charges for their grain elevators.

Mr. SHERLEY. Maybe not; but every big shipper complains of the car shortage and of the bad treatment he receives. But

this may be accepted as true, that the railroads themselves can not be relied upon to do equity in the matter, because every railroad system undertakes to protect itself as against the other railroad systems, with the result that there are frequently tied up on certain systems infinitely more cars than they own or than they can properly use, and other railroads are starved. Whether the commission has wisely regulated it or not, I do not know, but that it needs the strong hand of a central body to regulate it I have no doubt.

Mr. MANN. Yes; you might get a strong man to regulate this body, but it would not do any good. [Laughter.] The trouble is that the demurrage on cars is too little when there is a great shortage of cars, and too much to increase it when there is a surplus of cars. You can not get anybody to regulate that.

Mr. SHERLEY. You can not simply regulate the situation by demurrage charges, unless you change them from day to day. But if the Interstate Commerce Commission is fit for anything on earth, it ought to be for determining just such a matter as this and distribute cars equitably, instead of allowing the greed of particular roads or systems to control the cars.

Mr. MANN. The Interstate Commerce Commission will never succeed in making one railroad furnish cars for another railroad, instead of making that railroad furnish cars for itself. That is the source of the trouble.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For five commissioners, at \$10,000 each; secretary, \$5,000; five clerks to commissioners, at \$1,500 each; chief clerk, \$2,000; disbursing clerk, \$2,000; clerks—4 of class 4, 5 of class 3, 10 of class 2, 17 of class 1, 21 at \$1,000 each, 21 at \$900 each; messenger; 4 assistant messengers; 9 messenger boys, at \$450 each; general mechanic (carpenter, etc.), \$840; 3 watchmen; 2 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 3 laborers, at \$660 each; telephone operator, \$720; forewoman, \$300; 6 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$172,920.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to follow as a new paragraph, on line 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman offers an amendment as a new paragraph, I want to make some inquiry about this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois can strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. What is this item on page 54, line 24, "general mechanic (carpenter, and so forth)," with \$840 as salary attached?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is an explanatory note that should have been dropped out. I will ask to have that stricken out. They wanted a general mechanic. This was an explanatory note.

Mr. MANN. I think it ought to go out.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think so. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike out, on line 24, page 54, the words "carpenter, and so forth."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to make the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 54, line 24, by striking out the words "carpenter, and so forth."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

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

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

Mr. MANN. This is an item for the Federal Trade Commission. There are several items of this character in this bill along here, and I have been wondering as I went over this bill whether we had become a government by commission. When I came to this House there was one commission—the Interstate Commerce Commission—and that did not have much to do. Now, we have here bunched together the Interstate Commerce Commission, the United States Board of Mediation and Conciliation, the Federal Trade Commission, the United States Tariff Commission, the United States Shipping Board, the United States Employees Compensation Commission, and even the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission.

Mr. TILSON. The Mississippi Centennial.

Mr. MANN. We are becoming a government by commissions. I do not know whether it is because we are too lazy to work, or whether we are such indefatigable workers that we want com-

missions to find work for us to do. I think we have run commission mad. Instead of doing things, we set up a commission, and sometimes we tell them to do something. But of all these commissions the only one that has done anything up to date is the Interstate Commerce Commission, and I am not sure but what all the trouble we are having to-day with transportation problems is due to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, the gentleman helped to create a lot of these commissions.

Mr. MANN. I take my share of the blame.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert as a new paragraph after line 3, page 55, the following: "Salaries and expenses, special experts, etc., Federal Trade Commission: For all the hereinafter-mentioned expenses necessary for the initiation of an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission at the direction of the President of the United States under the powers conferred by the act approved September 26, 1914, creating the Federal Trade Commission, into the production, ownership, manufacture, storage, and distribution of foodstuffs and the products or by-products arising from or in connection with their preparation and manufacture; to ascertain the facts bearing on alleged violations of the antitrust acts, and particularly upon the question whether there are manipulations, controls, trusts, combinations, conspiracies, or restraints of trade out of harmony with the law or the public interest, and all of the transactions and operations pertinent and incident to the foregoing. For compensation, travel expense, and per diem in lieu of subsistence at the rate of \$4, of such special experts, special examiners, special agents, special attorneys, clerks, and other employees as may be necessary. The travel expense and per diem in lieu of subsistence subject to such rules and regulations as the commission may prescribe to the commissioners and the employees of the commission, under its orders in making the investigation herein provided for to be while absent on duty outside the District of Columbia. For contingent and miscellaneous expenses, including the purchase of such books, periodicals, pamphlets, and newspapers as may be necessary, office equipment and supplies, freight and express charges, street car tickets, telegraph and telephone service, mechanical devices, including their exchange, and for all necessary miscellaneous supplies not otherwise provided for; the rental of necessary quarters to accommodate the force employed hereunder, and for such printing and binding as may be necessary, to be executed under the supervision of the Public Printer, this amount to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, \$400,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the gentleman state what his point of order is. This amendment is in the exact wording of the estimates submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury in House document 2061.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That does not make it in order.

Mr. BORLAND. It covers the work ordered by the President and for which an estimate was called for by the President from the Federal Trade Commission. The estimate went to the Secretary of the Treasury in the usual course and was transmitted to the House in this form. I would like to have the gentleman state what his point of order is.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is very simple. This authorizes an expenditure beyond the fiscal year for which this bill makes appropriations. That makes it subject to a point of order. It is contrary to the covering-in act which provides that annual appropriations shall only be available for two years after the expiration of the fiscal year for which they are made.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, if that is the only point of order—

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is the first one.

Mr. BORLAND. I would like to hear the other one.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is not necessary to say any more, because that is surely good.

Mr. BORLAND. Then I ask to modify the amendment by striking out the words "and to remain available until expended" at the close of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment as indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BORLAND. Then I offer the amendment with those words stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. BORLAND. The wording is the same down to where it says—

And to remain available until expended.

Those words are stricken out. The other language of the amendment is the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk began reading the amendment.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be considered as read, and that it be not reported again.

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Insert as a new paragraph, after line 3, page 55, the following: "Salaries and expenses, special experts, etc., Federal Trade Commission:

"For all the hereinafter-mentioned expenses necessary for the initiation of an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission at the direction of the President of the United States under the powers conferred by the act approved September 26, 1914, creating the Federal Trade Commission, into the production, ownership, manufacture, storage, and distribution of foodstuffs and the products or by-products arising from or in connection with their preparation and manufacture; to ascertain the facts bearing on alleged violations of the antitrust acts, and particularly upon the question whether there are manipulations, controls, trusts, combinations, conspiracies, or restraints of trade out of harmony with the law or the public interest, and all of the transactions and operations pertinent and incident to the foregoing.

"For compensation, travel expense, and per diem in lieu of subsistence at the rate of \$4, of such special experts, special examiners, special agents, special attorneys, clerks, and other employees as may be necessary. The travel expense and per diem in lieu of subsistence subject to such rules and regulations as the commission may prescribe to the commissioners and the employees of the commission, under its orders in making the investigation herein provided for to be while absent on duty outside the District of Columbia. For contingent and miscellaneous expenses, including the purchase of such books, periodicals, pamphlets, and newspapers as may be necessary, office equipment and supplies, freight and express charges, street car tickets, telegraph and telephone service, mechanical devices, including their exchange, and for all necessary miscellaneous supplies not otherwise provided for; the rental of necessary quarters to accommodate the force employed hereunder, and for such printing and binding as may be necessary, to be executed under the supervision of the Public Printer, this amount to be immediately available, \$400,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this provision is not in order, because it is new legislation and changes existing law.

Under the act of August 1, 1914, the heads of executive departments and other Government establishments are authorized to prescribe per diem rates of allowance not exceeding \$4 in lieu of subsistence to persons engaged in field work or traveling on official business outside of the District of Columbia and away from their designated posts of duty when not otherwise fixed by law. In the proposed amendment it reads—

And per diem in lieu of subsistence at the rate of \$4 * * * subject to such rules and regulations as the commission may prescribe.

Mr. LONDON. Would not the Federal Trade Commission be subject to the provisions of the law of August 1, 1914?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not if this one went in. It would change the law. That is why it is subject to a point of order. I have the law here.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard on the point of order? It occurs to the Chair that the point of order is well taken, for the reason stated by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BORLAND. I desire to be heard on the point of order. As I understand the law quoted by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, it provides that the heads of departments are authorized to fix the per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding \$4 per day. The point of order is that this amendment proposes to fix it at \$4 a day. It does not seem to me that that renders the amendment subject to a point of order. The Chair is well advised by this time that this estimate has been transmitted directly from the Federal Trade Commission, and it has fixed this per diem in lieu of subsistence at \$4 a day.

It has not exhausted its authority in any respect, and this amendment does not enlarge the legislative authority. It fixes it at \$4 a day, the maximum fixed by law. It does not seem to me that the point is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman from Missouri have to say on the proposition that this amendment provides that it shall be \$4 a day, while the law says not exceeding \$4 a day? And, further, that the traveling expenses in lieu of subsistence for employees of the commission as may be necessary shall be regulated by rules and regulations established by the commission? That occurs to the Chair as legislation.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to modify my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. I ask to modify it by inserting, after the word "rate," the words "not exceeding"; to strike out the word "of" and insert, after the word "necessary," the words "engaged in field work or travel on official business outside of

the District of Columbia and away from designated posts of duty when otherwise not fixed by law."

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman from New York that we better rise, so that this amendment may be put in shape.

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

The motion was agreed to.

And accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARNER, 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. 20967, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. HENSLEY, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence indefinitely on account of illness in his family.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR PORTO RICO.

Mr. JONES, chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs, submitted a conference report on the bill H. R. 9533, an act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, submitted a conference report on the bill H. R. 19359, an act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, for printing under the rule.

PENSIONS.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill S. 8113, an act granting an increase of pension to soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, and I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was read for amendment, as follows:

An act (S. 8113) 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.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Clara Talbot, widow of George W. Talbot, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of C. Ella Hartwell, widow of Charles Hartwell, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Fleagle, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserves Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Pfaff, late of Company A, and quartermaster sergeant, One hundred and first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis G. Smith, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John S. Miles, late of Company H, Forty-second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ellen A. Paine, widow of Irving H. Paine, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John P. Hicks, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abraham Swango, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Egan, late of Company I, Eighty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Tibbets, late of Company K, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas F. Stockton, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha Beard, widow of William Beard, late of Company K, Eighty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay

her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George P. T. Douglas, late of Company L, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James C. Young, late of Company G, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel E. Washburn, alias David E. Washburn, late of Company D, One hundred and thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry S. Lane, late of Company A, Seventy-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Smith, late of Company M, Ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Williamson R. Barton, late unassigned One hundred and eighty-fifth Regiment, and Company H, One hundred and eighty-sixth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Moullehour, late of Company I, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lillie N. Babbitt, widow of Allen Babbitt, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles Mallate, late first lieutenant Company B, Fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Beal, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary R. Rash, widow of Lawson Rash, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Willford, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Catherine C. Lay, widow of John L. Lay, late acting first assistant engineer, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Joel A. Griffin, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram Muir, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and Company C, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jesse Denny, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Branaman, late of Company D, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Berry H. Smith, late of Company I, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles S. Thompson, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jonas O. Johnson, late of Company A, First Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Beckwith, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Yount, late of Company L, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Fike, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John P. Ham, late of Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Otis B. Patterson, late of Company E, Nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Lowery, late of Company I, Thirty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Gustavus A. Kindblade, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred Slippey, late of Company F, Fifty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew F. Johnson, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lemuel Stokes, late of Company C, Forty-fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Patrick Kine, late of Company F, Thirty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alphonzo J. Cunningham, late of Company A, Maine Volunteer Coast Guards, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Delano Myers, late of Company G, Thirty-third Regiment, and Company F, Thirty-fourth Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Weaver, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Niles H. Arnold, late of Company I, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jesse W. Casteel, late of Company H, Thirty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Second Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Phylow A. Heath, late of Company F, Twenty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Brumette, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Smith, late of Company K, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jerome Goforth, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Christian Hohmann, late of Company A, Second Northeast Regiment Missouri Home Guards, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John A. Vanderhoff, late of Company F, First Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel B. Swift, late of Company I, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Irvin, late of Companies G and C, Nineteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James P. Hardin, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harvey W. Cory, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josiah Sadler, late of Company H, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah Cox, late of Company D, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hugh Findlay, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Allen J. Freeland, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Hanger, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Hupp, late of Company K, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Paul Sullivan, alias Matthias G. Clark, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Hill, widow of James H. Hill, late of Company A, One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Mary Agnes Hill, helpless and dependent child of said James H. Hill, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary C. Hill, the name of said Mary Agnes Hill shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary C. Hill.

The name of Emil Schincke, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Garrett F. Cowan, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John French, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis Fulton, late of Company E, One hundred and seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Hayes, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$21 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen O. Meyers, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Lynch, widow of Daniel Lynch, late of Ninth unattached Company, Massachusetts Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles H. Minson, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles A. Potter, late of Company D, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George A. Crowley, late of Company F, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Colby, late of Company I, Thirty-second Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Duke, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Loren E. Steward, late of Company G, Twenty-sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Harris, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen Sutton, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Vet-

eran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin V. Rand, late of Company B, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward T. McClannahan, late of Company E, Forty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Munsell, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of George W. Sperry, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Philip Zong, late of Company C, Eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Sheesly, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Dougherty, late of Company D, Fifty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jerome Dornsife, late of Company I, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew G. Anderson, late commissary sergeant Ninth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alice R. Finney, widow of George E. Finney, late second lieutenant Company H, Nineteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and first lieutenant and adjutant, Twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Riley Damon, late of Company A, Eighteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Pierson, widow of William E. Pierson, late of Company F, Ninety-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William L. Holmes, late of Company D, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Goodwin, late of Company C, First Regiment Maine Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alvah Babbidge, late of Company L, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen H. Goodridge, late of Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Philander W. Danforth, late of Company B, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry H. Staubus, late of Company E, One hundred and seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry J. Austin, late of Company C, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Engineers and Mechanics, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Theodore M. Davis, late of Company E, Forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. Morgan, late of Company K, Twenty-seventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of King S. Hill, late of Company H, Thirty-second Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Claudius Lane, late of Company A, Twenty-fifth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George H. Keniston, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick E. Partridge, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John O. Boubar, alias James Rockwell, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Martin, late of Company H, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. Dunton, late of Company F, Twenty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Ramsdell, late of Company K, Fifteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John G. Jackson, late of Company B, Nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Norris J. Thomas, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David F. Sanborn, late unassigned, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abram Frakes, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Sears, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas B. Wiggin, Jr., late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

- The name of John D. Whitted, late of Company G, Twenty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$33 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Peter Lynch, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment, and Company A, First Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Mary A. Cooper, widow of Thomas Cooper, late of Company A, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.
- The name of Francis J. Curtis, late of Company D, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of James D. Fletcher, late of Company H, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of John W. Laughlin, late of Company D, Twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Joseph A. Manning, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Christopher C. Brummet, late of Company B, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Charles F. Knowlton, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Asa L. Bushnell, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Egbert Hall, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserves Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Benjamin F. Spangler, late of Company K, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Lemuel C. Kittrell, late of Company H, Fiftieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of John M. James, late of Company F, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Phillip C. Cooter, late of Company E, Third Regiment, and Company A, Eleventh Regiment, Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Benjamin F. White, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Benjamin Johnson, late of Company G, Fiftieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Sylvester E. Stone, late of Company B, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of William P. Duncan, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of John A. Rice, late second lieutenant, Company L, Second Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Josiah Brewer, late of Company A, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Nannie C. Cole, widow of John P. Cole, late acting ensign, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.
- The name of Andrew J. Persons, late of Company K, Thirtieth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of George H. Hatch, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Henry D. Owen, late of Company F, First Regiment United States Lancers, Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.
- The name of James H. Call, late of Company K, Eighteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Daniel E. Stoneburner, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of John J. Randall, late of Company B, Forty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Charles H. Slocum, late of Company A, Thirty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of David H. St. Clair, late of Company B, Seventy-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of William M. Robertson, late of Company H, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Bradford P. Sparrow, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Aaron Rowell, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of John M. Gowdy, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Robert Summerville, late of Company K, Two hundred and eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of William L. Miles, late of Company C, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Albert C. White, late of Company D, Sixty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Moses Tarbox, jr., late of Company I, Sixteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of George Tarbox, late of Company H, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Cavalry, and Company M, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Samuel Wentworth, late of Company C, Fifth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Ninth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Patrick Murphy, late of Battery F, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Frank J. Davis, late of Company F, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Lester Holway, late of Fourth Battery, First Battalion Maine Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Nelson L. Nourse, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Henry H. Steward, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Francis M. Whips, late of Company H, Thirty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Oluf Volkerts, late of U. S. S. *Potomac* and *Sebago*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Jeremiah Ferguson, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Perry Green, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of John A. Crozier, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Hartman K. Wismer, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Charles B. Greenhalgh, late captain Company C, Fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of John Eltzroth, late of Seventeenth Battery, Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Carrie E. Carter, widow of William M. Carter, late of U. S. S. *Princeton* and *New Ironsides*, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.
- The name of Joseph Cook, late of Company H, Twenty-fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of James W. Dibelbiss, late of Company L, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Emily S. Robinson, widow of Lemuel Robinson, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.
- The name of Jonathan A. Deaver, late of Company D, Nineteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Melissa Hogan, widow of Robert Hogan, late of Company B, First Regiment Oregon Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.
- The name of Michael H. Carr, late of Company A, One hundred and eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of James Olds, late of Company D, Forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and One hundred and fifty-sixth Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of George M. Kelley, late of Company G, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and ordinary seaman U. S. S. *North Carolina* and *Brooklyn*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Jane Smith, wife of Seager F. Smith, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.
- The name of Josiah Woodbury, late of Second Unattached Company, Massachusetts Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of John Lee, alias James Riley, late of U. S. S. *Minnesota* and *Vandalia*, United States Navy, and Troop D, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
- The name of Marion A. Holman, widow of Edward E. Holman, late second lieutenant Company C, First Regiment Mississippi Volunteer Mounted Rifles, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.
- The name of William A. Black, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John G. Coburn, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles N. Spear, late of Company A, One hundred and eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Adams, late unassigned, Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles E. Brown, late of Company A, Fortieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Annie Earnest, widow of Jasper S. Earnest, late of Company A, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emerson G. Reeves, late of Company G, Thirty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Thomas, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. Campbell, widow of Alexander Campbell, late of Company M, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frederick Clark, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph E. Reynolds, late of Company I, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Aletha E. Reynolds, dependent mother of Cyrus W. Reynolds, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James R. Eaton, late of Company H, Third Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Howard E. Hoadley, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James A. Montgomery, late of Company M, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Hill, late of Company K, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Goodrich, late first lieutenant Company D, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Augustus Wagner, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Tarrence Murray, late of Company G, One hundred and seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Schmitt, late first lieutenant Company A, Twenty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lena S. Fenn, widow of William R. Fenn, late of Cooley's Battery, Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery (Chicago Mercantile Battery), and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emily N. Robinson, widow of Daniel Robinson, late captain, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, and major, United States Army, retired, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennie M. Hobbs, widow of Harley S. Hobbs, late of Company A, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William Abbott, late of U. S. S. *North Carolina*, *Penobscot*, and *Fearnot*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Whitchee, late of Second Battery, Vermont Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ellen A. Sawyer, widow of Addison H. Sawyer, late of Company F, First Battalion Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Caleb P. Nash, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Carter, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Angenette Barber, widow of William J. Barber, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma L. Porter, widow of George W. Porter, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Richard L. K. Grant, late of Battery E, First Battalion Maine Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George H. Nutting, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert S. Farnsworth, late of Company E, Twenty-eighth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Warren Seaward, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alphonso Wingate, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph P. Dore, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Lindsey, late of Company A, Fifty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph D. Dunn, late of Company E, Twenty-eighth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edmond Gould, late of Company K, Twenty-first Regiment, and Company I, Thirty-first Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Brawn, late unassigned, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Barbara E. Wooddell, widow of Isaac N. Wooddell, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Drown, late of Company A, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Light Artillery, and Company A, Ninth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Milton M. Adamson, late of Company I, First Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Aldrich S. Luther, late of Company I, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margert S. Dustin, widow of Charles Dustin, late captain Company F, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennie A. Cressman, widow of Daniel H. Cressman, late of the United States Marine Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Vilos E. Bryant, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha R. Griswold, widow of John M. Griswold, late captain Company B, Forty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hiram J. George, late of Company F, Thirtieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary P. Moody, widow of Benjamin A. Moody, late of Company H, Third Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thomas B. Jones, late of Company C, Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. Hack, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert P. Sheldon, late of Company C, Fourteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph M. Donnohue, late captain Company F, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Brooks, late of Company G, Seventieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Matox, late of Company E, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James P. Taylor, late of Company G, Second Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Drown, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George M. Jaco, late of Company B, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Ellis, late of Eighth Battery, Wisconsin Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry D. Baxter, late of Company H, Thirtieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ella R. Brown, widow of William M. Brown, late of Company D, Thirty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, Civil War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Andrew J. Bridges, late of Company A, Fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Welch, widow of E. Bradford Welch, late of Company I, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George W. Cushman, late of Company D, Twenty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Kelsey, late of Company D, Coast Guards, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Franklin B. Nutt, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abraham Bachelder, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Hoffman, late of Company F, Seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cyrillus B. Ayres, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Johnson, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Loftis, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George F. Thayer, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael Burns, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George E. Cross, late of Company B, Nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ada M. Kennedy, widow of Edwin R. Kennedy, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, First Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nelson W. Adams, late of Company K, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment, and Company G, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David F. Rudd, late of Fourth Battery, Iowa Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucy E. McCord, widow of Wilbur F. McCord, late of Thirteenth Independent Battery, Wisconsin Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Silas B. Garlick, late of U. S. S. *Forest Rose*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nathan H. Applebee, late of Company F, Forty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dallas Wamsley, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Theodore A. Maltby, late of Company E, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Minor, late of Company F, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

This bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the committee:

S. 228.	Clara Talbot.	S. 5318.	Elijah Cox.
S. 347.	C. Ella Hartwell.	S. 5470.	Hugh Findlay.
S. 1640.	John Flegle.	S. 5587.	Allen J. Freeland.
S. 1751.	William J. Pfaff.	S. 5693.	William Hanger.
S. 1765.	Lewis G. Smith.	S. 5694.	George W. Hupp.
S. 2279.	John S. Miles.	S. 5760.	Paul Sullivan, alias Matthias G. Clark.
S. 2324.	Ella A. Paine.		
S. 2604.	John P. Hicks.	S. 5787.	Mary C. Hill.
S. 2623.	Abraham Swango.	S. 5821.	Emil Schincke.
S. 2628.	Peter Egan.	S. 5828.	Garrett F. Cowan.
S. 2631.	Samuel Tibbets.	S. 5849.	John French.
S. 2651.	Thomas F. Stockton.	S. 5873.	Lewis Fulton.
S. 2672.	Martha Beard.	S. 6084.	William H. Hayes.
S. 2676.	George P. T. Douglas.	S. 6134.	Stephen O. Meyers.
S. 2703.	James C. Young.	S. 6163.	Mary J. Lynch.
S. 2795.	Daniel E. Washburn, alias David E. Washburn.	S. 6165.	Charles H. Minson.
S. 2814.	Henry S. Lane.	S. 6169.	Charles A. Potter.
S. 2836.	William Smith.	S. 6269.	George A. Crowley.
S. 2923.	Williamson R. Barton.	S. 6295.	James H. Colby.
S. 2947.	Henry Moullehour.	S. 6321.	James Duke.
S. 2967.	Lillie N. Babbitt.	S. 6325.	Loren E. Steward.
S. 3111.	Charles Maltlatte.	S. 6357.	William H. Harris.
S. 3171.	William H. Beal.	S. 6401.	Stephen Surton.
S. 3173.	Mary R. Rash.	S. 6409.	Martin V. Rand.
S. 3227.	John Willford.	S. 6427.	Edward T. McClannahan.
S. 3274.	Catherine C. Lay.	S. 6428.	John W. Munsell.
S. 3293.	Joel A. Griffin.	S. 6467.	George W. Sperry.
S. 3319.	Hiram Muir.	S. 6478.	Phillip Zong.
S. 3419.	Jesse Denny.	S. 6524.	Daniel Sheesly.
S. 3420.	William H. Branaman.	S. 6656.	William Dougherty.
S. 3760.	Berry H. Smith.	S. 6689.	Jerome Dornstfe.
S. 3993.	Charles S. Thompson.	S. 6705.	Andrew G. Anderson.
S. 3994.	Jonas O. Johnson.	S. 6722.	Alice R. Finney.
S. 4001.	Joseph Beckwith.	S. 6734.	Riley Damon.
S. 4002.	Thomas J. Yount.	S. 6753.	Mary J. Pierson.
S. 4208.	John A. Flke.	S. 6768.	William L. Holmes.
S. 4225.	John P. Ham.	S. 6772.	Benjamin F. Goodwin.
S. 4300.	Otis B. Patterson.	S. 6774.	Alvah Babbedge.
S. 4317.	Thomas J. Lowery.	S. 6775.	Stephen H. Goodridge.
S. 4354.	Gustavus A. Kindblade.	S. 6778.	Phllander W. Danforth.
S. 4410.	Alfred Shippey.	S. 6832.	Henry H. Staubs.
S. 4521.	Andrew F. Johnson.	S. 6844.	Henry J. Austin.
S. 4566.	Lemuel Stokes.	S. 6887.	Theodore M. Davis.
S. 4607.	Patrick Kine.	S. 6896.	William F. Morgan.
S. 4613.	Alphonso J. Cunningham.	S. 6898.	King S. Hill.
S. 4687.	Delano Myers.	S. 6902.	Claudius Lane.
S. 4737.	Isaac Weaver.	S. 6903.	George H. Keniston.
S. 4738.	Niles H. Arnold.	S. 6904.	Frederick E. Partridge.
S. 4742.	Jesse W. Casteel.	S. 6917.	John O. Boubar, alias James Rockwell.
S. 4849.	Phylow A. Heath.	S. 6919.	Benjamin F. Martin.
S. 4905.	William Brumette.	S. 6927.	Charles H. Dutton.
S. 4914.	John C. Smith.	S. 6928.	Henry Ramsdell.
S. 4943.	Jerome Goforth.	S. 6936.	John G. Jackson.
S. 5061.	John Christian Holmann.	S. 6937.	Norris J. Thomas.
S. 5112.	John A. Vanderhoff.	S. 6953.	David F. Sanborn.
S. 5122.	Samuel B. Swift.	S. 6963.	Abram Frakes.
S. 5155.	John Irvin.	S. 6985.	John A. Sears.
S. 5267.	James P. Hardin.	S. 7015.	Thomas B. Wiggin.
S. 5276.	Harvey W. Cory.	S. 7019.	John D. Whitted.
S. 5284.	Josiah Sadler.	S. 7022.	Peter Lynch.

S. 7036. Mary A. Cooper.
S. 7045. Francis J. Curtis.
S. 7048. James D. Fletcher.
S. 7052. John W. Laughlin.
S. 7055. Joseph A. Manning.
S. 7057. Christopher C. Brummet.

S. 7058. Charles F. Knowlton.
S. 7063. Asa L. Bushnell.
S. 7076. Egbert Hall.
S. 7083. Benjamin F. Spangler.
S. 7103. Lemuel C. Kittrell.
S. 7104. John M. James.
S. 7105. Phillip C. Cooter.
S. 7106. Benjamin F. White.
S. 7110. Benjamin Johnson.
S. 7111. Sylvester E. Stone.
S. 7112. William P. Duncan.
S. 7113. John A. Rice.
S. 7114. Josiah Brewer.
S. 7119. Nannie C. Cole.
S. 7146. Andrew J. Persons.
S. 7147. George H. Hatch.

S. 7149. Henry D. Owen.
S. 7150. James H. Call.
S. 7159. Daniel E. Stoneburner.
S. 7164. John J. Randall.
S. 7177. Charles H. Slocum.
S. 7178. David H. St. Clair.
S. 7180. William M. Robertson.
S. 7191. Bradford P. Sparrow.
S. 7192. Aaron Rowell.
S. 7196. John M. Gowdy.

S. 7204. Robert Summerville.
S. 7206. William L. Miles.
S. 7207. Albert C. White.
S. 7209. Moses Tarbox, jr.
S. 7210. George Tarbox.
S. 7211. Samuel Wentworth.
S. 7215. Patrick Murphy.
S. 7217. Frank J. Davis.
S. 7219. Lester Holway.
S. 7224. Nelson L. Nourse.
S. 7225. Henry H. Steward.

S. 7241. Francis M. Whips.
S. 7243. Oluf Volkerts.
S. 7246. Jeremiah Ferguson.
S. 7247. Perry Green.
S. 7252. John A. Crozier.
S. 7275. Hartman K. Wismer.
S. 7278. Charles B. Greenbaldh.
S. 7303. John Eltzroth.
S. 7319. Carrie E. Carter.

S. 7324. Joseph Cook.
S. 7325. James W. Divilbiss.
S. 7328. Emily S. Robinson.
S. 7332. Jonathan A. Deaver.
S. 7335. Melissa Hogan.
S. 7341. Michael H. Carr.
S. 7344. James Oids.
S. 7352. George M. Kelley.
S. 7363. Jane Smith.
S. 7369. Josiah Woodbury.
S. 7406. John Lee, alias James Riley.

S. 7416. Marion A. Holman.
S. 7417. William A. Black.
S. 7420. John G. Coburn.
S. 7421. Charles N. Spear.
S. 7422. Albert Adams.
S. 7431. Charles E. Brown.
S. 7432. Annie Earnest.
S. 7435. Emerson G. Reeves.
S. 7444. Robert Thomas.
S. 7469. Mary L. Campbell.

S. 7474. Frederick Clark.
S. 7476. Joseph E. Reynolds.
S. 7480. Aletha E. Reynolds.
S. 7482. James R. Eaton.
S. 7493. Howard E. Hoadley.
S. 7507. James A. Montgomery.
S. 7509. James Hill.
S. 7533. James M. Goodrich.
S. 7539. Augustus Wagner.
S. 7542. Tarrence Murray.
S. 7543. John A. Schmitt.
S. 7544. Lena S. Penn.
S. 7564. Emily N. Robinson.
S. 7567. Jennie M. Hobbs.
S. 7569. William Abbott.
S. 7585. George Whitcher.
S. 7599. Allen A. Sawyer.
S. 7600. Caleb P. Nash.
S. 7603. Joseph Carter.
S. 7621. Angenette Barber.
S. 7648. Emma L. Porter.
S. 7660. Richard L. K. Grant.
S. 7661. George H. Nutting.
S. 7662. Albert S. Farnsworth.
S. 7665. Warren Seaward.
S. 7669. Alphonso Wingate.
S. 7671. Joseph P. Dore.
S. 7676. William H. Lindsey.
S. 7677. Joseph D. Dunn.
S. 7681. Edmond Gould.
S. 7683. George W. Brown.
S. 7687. Barbara E. Wooddell.
S. 7688. John Drown.
S. 7689. Milton M. Adamson.
S. 7690. Aldrich S. Luther.
S. 7702. Margert S. Dustin.
S. 7704. Jennie A. Cressman.
S. 7715. Vilos E. Bryant.
S. 7725. Martha R. Griswold.
S. 7734. Hiram J. George.
S. 7739. Mary P. Moody.
S. 7743. Thomas B. Jones.
S. 7749. Charles H. Hack.
S. 7765. Albert P. Sheldon.
S. 7771. Joseph M. Donnohue.
S. 7772. James Brooks.
S. 7773. James Mattox.
S. 7787. James P. Taylor.
S. 7792. James H. Drown.
S. 7797. George M. Jaco.
S. 7799. Charles Ellis.
S. 7800. Henry D. Baxter.
S. 7804. Ella R. Brown.
S. 7808. Andrew J. Bridges.
S. 7812. Mary J. Welch.
S. 7819. George W. Cushman.
S. 7820. William J. Kelsey.
S. 7823. Franklin B. Nutt.
S. 7824. Abraham Bachelor.
S. 7835. William C. Hoffman.
S. 7865. Cyrillus B. Ayres.
S. 7892. James Johnson.
S. 7899. Daniel Loftis.
S. 7900. George F. Thayer.
S. 7903. Michael Burns.
S. 7904. George E. Cross.
S. 7912. Ada M. Kennedy.
S. 7913. Nelson W. Adams.
S. 7916. David F. Rudd.
S. 7931. Lucy E. McCord.
S. 7977. Silas B. Garlick.
S. 7978. Nathan H. Applebee.
S. 7984. Dallas Wamsley.
S. 8018. Theodore A. Maltby.
S. 8033. Charles Minor.

THE SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 8295) 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, which I send to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman calls up the bill S. 8295, and asks unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this bill come from the Pension Committee?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. From the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Is this the invalid-pension bill?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Yes; the bill has been passed by the Senate. It is not the House bill.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. What has become of the pension bill that came from the Pension Committee?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. That will come up next.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to state to the House that to-morrow morning, immediately after the reading of the Journal, I shall call up the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. MANN. I desire to say to the House in that connection that there will probably be a roll call upon it.

The SPEAKER. There will be three or four conference reports to be disposed of. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri to dispense with the first reading of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment to go at the end of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Eliza J. Sparrow, widow of Edwin C. Sparrow, late of Company L, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lizzie B. Wellman, widow of Henry Wellman, late of Company C, Ninety-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Wheatley, widow of Alexander Wheatley, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriet C. Squire, widow of Oscar Squire, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ellen C. Messenger, widow of Joel Messenger, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lillian A. Loomis, widow of George M. Loomis, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Helena E. Clark, widow of William F. Clark, late of Company A, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Flora L. Cummings, widow of George D. Cummings, late of Company G, Twenty-eighth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rowena M. Calkins, widow of Wilbur F. Calkins, late of Company K, Twenty-seventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and United States Marine Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julia E. Booth, widow of William G. Booth, late of Company D, Twenty-third Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Birge, widow of Burrill N. Birge, late of U. S. S. *North Carolina, Penobscot, and Savannah*, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alice P. B. Kenyon, widow of Edwin L. Kenyon, late of Company F, Eighteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Hughes, widow of Patrick Hughes, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ruth A. Ingraham, widow of William H. Ingraham, late of Company B, Nineteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary B. Johnson, widow of Anson W. Johnson, late of Company C, Second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Clark, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Kate M. King, widow of Mordecai S. H. King, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, Twenty-first Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jacob S. Fritz, late of Company I, Fortieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel P. Shaffer, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company D, One hundred and seventy-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Millie M. Ball, widow of Irvin R. Ball, late of Company M, Fifteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Uriah Ruch, late of Company G, First Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Engineers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abraham T. Casey, late of Company H, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred Quackenbush, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cerelle Shattuck, widow of Leander L. Shattuck, late major, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennie M. Chapman, widow of Oscar A. Chapman, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James K. Clear, late of Companies B and D, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ella M. Dalley, widow of Warren C. Dalley, late second Lieutenant Company E, Twenty-eighth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles Cain, late of Company F, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac J. C. Guy, late first Lieutenant Company C, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Arthur Ward, late of Company A, Sixty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Hinds, late of Companies M and B, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Annie Humphreys, widow of Preston A. Humphreys, late of Battery A, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Dyer B. McConnell, late captain Company K, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James E. Sipes, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Button, widow of Lyman W. Button, late of Company K, Fifteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ada Roberts, widow of James Roberts, late second Lieutenant Company B, Fifth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Adelaide F. Thomas, widow of Edwin G. Thomas, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Massachusetts Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elden B. Maddocks, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. Sargent, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William D. Collins, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eugene H. Otis, late of Company M, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Killigan, late of Company G, Thirty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Smith, late of Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albania D. Thornburgh, widow of Duff G. Thornburgh, late Lieutenant colonel Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George H. Wilkins, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George H. Fernald, late of Company B, Twenty-ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marian Robinson, widow of Aretus W. Robinson, late of Company H, Twenty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and Twenty-third Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William A. Millard, late of Company D, Twenty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marcellus Hoben, late of Company L, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Cavalry, and Company E, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Hines, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Timothy Stone, late of Company A, Thirtieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Hall, late of Company B, Twenty-ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Asa T. Worcester, late of Company D, Twenty-second Regiment, and Company C, Twentieth Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram Haynes, late of Company I, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick Neutzenheizer, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Leathers, late of Company I, Twenty-second Regiment Maine Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John G. McKay, late of Company A, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry E. Flanders, late of Company B, Coast Guards, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. Ashline, late of Company H, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward T. Jackson, late of Company E, One hundred and sixty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred D. Rand, late of Companies I and C, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Russell, late of Second Independent Battery, Massachusetts Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram H. Titterton, late of Company D, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Byers, late of Company D, One hundred and eighty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas R. Luckhardt, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Eighteenth Regiment, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Grubb, late of Company B, Seventy-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel McNutt, late of Company K, Fifteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Campbell, widow of James R. Campbell, late of U. S. S. *Santiago de Cuba*, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jabez R. Bowen, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Grace M. Copeland, helpless and dependent daughter of James Copeland, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and One hundred and thirty-fourth Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and Company H, Ninth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Margaret Downey, widow of Maurice J. Downey, late of Company C, First Battalion Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Horace Griggs, late of Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah M. Law, widow of Augustus A. Law, late of U. S. S. *North Carolina and Release*, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ellen Manchester, widow of Oscar A. Manchester, late of Company I, Second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Newbury, widow of George K. Newbury, late of Company E, Twenty-first Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Timothy Quinn, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank S. Shaffer, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward D. Woodmansee, late of Company C, Twenty-first Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles A. Mudgett, late of Company B, Second Battalion, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lillian S. Hawkes, widow of George F. Hawkes, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Joseph McKenney, Jr., late of Company E, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Cavalry, and Company I, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Carlton J. Beaman, late of Company C, Forty-fifth Regiment, and Company C, Fiftieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John S. Raymond, late of Company I, Thirty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Theodore B. Magie, late of U. S. S. *Oayuga*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Waugh, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank Goodwin, late of Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Clark, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas D. Scott, late of Company I, Seventeenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Addie M. Higgins, widow of Virgil N. Higgins, late of Company H, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and second lieutenant Ninety-sixth Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ezra F. McIntire, late of Company C, Nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walter M. Edes, helpless and dependent son of James Edes, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Marcellus E. Hart, late of Company M, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Gwinn, late of Company E, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and captain Company H, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Waddy Hoover, late of Company F, Seventieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Anderson, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dorr H. Mayne, late of Company G, One hundred and fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Twenty-ninth Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Lasher, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Roscoe G. Tibbetts, late of Company H, Thirty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Simon Hasselback, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment, and Company M, Second Regiment, New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Crane Patrick, widow of Shepard Goodwin Patrick, late of Company D, One hundred and fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Isalah W. Deemer, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Richards, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward E. Gould, late of Company G, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George H. Clark, late of Company G, Two hundred and third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Artley, late of Company B, Ninety-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob M. Westfall, late of Company K, One hundred and fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of May E. McCoy, widow of James B. McCoy, late of Company A, First Regiment Oregon Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucretia Whitl, widow of Lorenzo D. Whitl, late of Company M, First Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Winans, widow of William Winans, late of Company B, First Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company E, Fourth Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Oliver W. Davis, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David E. Dodge, late of Company G, One hundred and sixty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Timothy S. Heald, late of Company I, Twenty-fifth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Fisk, late of Company C, Forty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas A. Stevens, late second lieutenant Company C, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen B. Packard, late captain Company B, Twelfth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael Sheline, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leroy S. Griswold, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert H. M. Donnelly, late captain Company D, Thirtieth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael Callahan, late of Sixteenth Unattached Company, Massachusetts Militia Infantry, and unassigned Twenty-ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry S. Silsby, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dennis W. Riordan, late of Company C, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Wells, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis Seymour, late of Company G, Thirty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Johnston, late of Company L, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel E. Palmer, late of Company C, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Sixth Independent Battery Massachusetts Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Baker, dependent mother of William Baker, late of Company F, Nineteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mollie Thompson, widow of Milton B. Thompson, late of Company D, Sixtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna Alexander, widow of George Alexander, late of Company H, Fifty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Robert S. Bowman, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Moore, late of Company A, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John S. Adams, late of Company M, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Caleb Akers, late of Company B, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at that rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harrison White, late of Company A, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ella Taylor, former widow of Robert D. McCracken, late second Lieutenant Company A, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Francis A. Ricketts, late of Company A, Thirty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Smith, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Blankinship, late of Company H, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jeremiah Combs, late of Company M, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Roberson, late of Company E, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Minatree Turner, late of Companies C and D, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George S. Robinson, late of Company A, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William M. Helvy, late of Company C, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Augusta Lambert, helpless and dependent child of Andrew Lambert, late of Company A, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Roberts, dependent mother of George W. Roberts, late of Company C, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Francis E. Derby, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

This bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to said committee:

S. 214. Eliza J. Sparrow.
S. 225. Lizzie B. Wellman.
S. 230. Sarah J. Wheatley.
S. 238. Harriet C. Squire.
S. 290. Ellen C. Messenger.
S. 280. Lillian A. Loomis.
S. 287. Helena E. Clark.
S. 290. Flora L. Cummings.
S. 298. Rowena M. Calkins.
S. 305. Julia E. Booth.
S. 312. Mary A. Birge.
S. 321. Alice P. B. Kenyon.
S. 324. Mary A. Hughes.
S. 327. Ruth A. Ingraham.
S. 329. Mary B. Johnson.
S. 1487. Benjamin F. Clark.
S. 2307. Kate M. King.
S. 2317. Jacob S. Fritz.
S. 2773. Samuel P. Shaffer.
S. 2860. Millie M. Ball.
S. 2911. Uriah Ruch.
S. 2919. Abraham T. Casey.
S. 2932. Alfred Quackenbush.
S. 3577. Cerele Shattuck.
S. 3940. Jennie M. Chapman.
S. 4215. James K. Clear.
S. 4600. Ella M. Deary.
S. 4930. Charles Cain.
S. 4945. Isaac J. C. Guy.
S. 5159. Arthur Ward.
S. 5511. George Hinds.

S. 7358. David Russell.
S. 7366. Hiram H. Titterington.
S. 7376. Benjamin F. Byers.
S. 7378. Thomas R. Luckhardt.
S. 7465. Joseph Grubb.
S. 7473. Daniel McNutt.
S. 7516. Mary E. Campbell.
S. 7624. Jabez R. Bowen.
S. 7627. Grace M. Copeland.
S. 7629. Margaret Downey.
S. 7631. Horace Griggs.
S. 7633. Sarah M. Law.
S. 7636. Ellen Manchester.
S. 7637. Mary E. Newbury.
S. 7638. Timothy Quinn.
S. 7640. Frank S. Shaffer.
S. 7643. Edward D. Woodmansee.
S. 7663. Charles A. Mudgett.
S. 7670. Lillian S. Hawkes.
S. 7682. Joseph McKenney, jr.
S. 7718. Carlton J. Beaman.
S. 7731. John S. Raymond.
S. 7732. Theodore B. Magie.
S. 7733. James H. Waugh.
S. 7737. Frank Goodwin.
S. 7775. William H. Clark.
S. 7843. Thomas D. Scott.
S. 7862. Addie M. Higgins.
S. 7884. Ezra M. McIntire.
S. 7886. Walter M. Edes.
S. 7887. Marcellus E. Hart.
S. 7919. James M. Gwinn.
S. 7933. Waddy Hoover.
S. 7950. John F. Anderson.
S. 7970. Door H. Mayne.
S. 7979. William H. Lasher.
S. 7980. Roscoe G. Tibbetts.
S. 7988. Simon Hasselback.
S. 7991. Catherine Crane Patrick.
S. 7993. Isaiah W. Deemer.
S. 7995. Charles Richards.
S. 7999. Edward E. Gould.

S. 8020. George H. Clark.
S. 8021. Joseph Artley.
S. 8027. Jacob M. Westfall.
S. 8041. May E. McCoy.
S. 8051. Lucretia Whitl.
S. 8053. Mary E. A. Winans.
S. 8057. Oliver W. Davis.
S. 8063. David E. Dodge.
S. 8069. Timothy S. Heald.
S. 8084. Charles Flisk.
S. 8094. Thomas A. Stevens.
S. 8099. Stephen B. Packard.
S. 8104. Michael Sheline.
S. 8110. Leroy S. Griswold.
S. 8112. Robert H. M. Donnelly.
S. 8118. Michael Callahan.
S. 8124. Henry S. Slishy.
S. 8127. Dennis W. Rlordan.
S. 8128. John H. Wells.
S. 8129. Lewis Seymour.
S. 8130. Robert Johnston.
S. 8152. Samuel E. Palmer.
S. 8154. Sarah Baker.
S. 8156. Mollie Thompson.
S. 8157. Anna Alexander.
S. 8173. Robert S. Bowman.
S. 8174. George W. Moore.
S. 8175. John S. Adams.
S. 8176. Caleb Akers.
S. 8177. Harrison White.
S. 8180. Ella Taylor.
S. 8200. Francis A. Ricketts.
S. 8202. Henry Smith.
S. 8203. Francis M. Blankinship.
S. 8204. Jeremiah Coombs.
S. 8205. John W. Roberson.
S. 8206. Minatree Turner.
S. 8207. George S. Robinson.
S. 8208. William M. Helvy.
S. 8210. Augusta Lambert.
S. 8231. Elizabeth Roberts.
S. 8251. Francis E. Derby.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment to go at the end of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, by inserting at the end of the bill the following: "The name of Maberry M. Lacey, late first Lieutenant, Company A and adjutant Sixty-ninth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving."

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have some information from the gentleman with reference to this proposed amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will state to the gentleman that this is a Senate bill. The chairman of the Senate committee stated to Gen. Sherwood, the chairman of this committee, that this item was left out by oversight, that the committee had approved it and had intended to include it in the bill. I hold in my hand the report sent to us by the Senate committee stating that this man is 82 years old and is totally blind. It seems to me a meritorious case, and I ask unanimous consent to print in this connection this report to show these facts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The report referred to is as follows:

S. 8290. Maberry M. Lacey is a resident of Fountain City, Ind., and has an honorable military record. He entered the service April 21, 1861, at the first call for troops, as captain with Company D, Eighth Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and was mustered out August 6, 1861. He was mustered in August 19, 1862, as first lieutenant with Company A, Sixty-ninth Indiana Volunteer Infantry, to serve three years, was promoted to adjutant, same regiment, in the spring of 1863, and served honorably and faithfully until the close of the war, being mustered out July 5, 1865. He was a brave and efficient officer.

Soldier filed and established a claim for pension under the general law, and was originally pensioned at \$17 per month for shell wound of right great toe and disease of eyes, with loss of sight of right eye, which originated in the service. He is now pensioned under the age-and-service act of May 11, 1912, at the rate of \$30 per month. (Certificate No. 318839.)

It appears, however, that this old soldier is nearly 82 years of age, and medical evidence filed with the committee shows that he is totally blind and helpless, the following being the report of the physician: "That said Lacey is totally blind and helpless and his eyesight can not be restored, nor can his physical condition be improved. That his blindness is solely due to wounds and devoted service while in the line of duty as a soldier during the Civil War."

It is also in evidence that the soldier is in poor circumstances, having practically no other income than his pension. The following letter addressed to the chairman of this committee by Congressman-elect Comstock, of the State of Indiana, shows the facts in the case:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1917.

HON. CHARLES F. JOHNSON,
Chairman Committee on Pensions, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I trust that your committee may take up for action at this session of Congress the bill introduced by Senator WATSON for Maj. Maberry M. Lacey, S. 8290.

Maj. Lacey is 81 years of age; for two and one-half years he has been totally blind. I am personally acquainted with him and know his case to be unusually meritorious. From my acquaintance with him I am able to state that he has practically no income except the pension which he is now receiving.

Because of his record as an officer in the Civil War and because of his present affliction, I hope that you can approve the bill for the full amount asked.

Sincerely, yours,

DANIEL W. COMSTOCK,
Congressman Elect from the Sixth Indiana District.

It is believed that the soldier's advanced age, his long and honorable service, his blindness and helplessness, and needless circumstances justify your committee in reporting the bill favorably with recommendation for increase of pension to \$50 per month.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HASTINGS: At the end of the bill insert the following as a new paragraph:

"The name of William Watson, late of Company C, Third Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving."

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, in support of that amendment permit me to say that I introduced the bill H. R. 18269 to take care of this matter. The bill was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. The examiner of this committee was taken sick, and the committee was unable, as I know the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] will verify, to report another bill. The examiner, before he was taken sick, investigated this claim in this bill and made a favorable report upon it. I do not happen to have that with me to-night, because I was not advised this bill was going to be brought up. This report was sent over to the Senate, and it was introduced there; but the Pension Committee being closed to-night I could not secure the papers.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman will note that this is a Senate bill, which came over from the Senate, and did not originate in the House.

Mr. HASTINGS. I understand that.

Mr. DYER. Therefore his amendment would not be in order.

Mr. HASTINGS. But an amendment has been proposed to this bill.

Mr. DYER. But that amendment came over from the Senate, with a recommendation of the Senate committee.

Mr. HASTINGS. It may have been O. K'd by the Senate; but it is a House amendment, and it will go on the bill as a House amendment, and the bill will have to go back to the Senate to have that amendment concurred in by the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I will.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state if he thinks it is hardly fair to Members who have claims pending before the House Committee and have not been able to have them acted upon that he should bring in his proposition and have it incorporated in the Senate bill at this particular time when other Members who, as the gentleman states, did not know that this measure was to come up to-night and did not know they would have an opportunity to bring their proposition here for similar action?

Mr. HASTINGS. I personally know this man Watson. This bill was introduced. It has been investigated by the pension examiner; favorable report has been made upon it. I know it is a meritorious claim if there is a meritorious item in this bill. Now, I would not offer it, provided there was no other amendment offered, but there has been another amendment offered to-night.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I would like to ask if it would be possible to amend this bill when the gentleman's claim has not any evidence to present in support of the bill and there would not be anything before the House—

The SPEAKER. That is not a question for the Speaker to decide.

Mr. LANGLEY. The difference between the two cases is that the case presented by the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL], is supported by a report from the Senate Committee which officially states the facts.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker has nothing to do—

Mr. HASTINGS. It is supported by my statement that I submitted to this House, that it has been favorably acted upon by the examiner of the House Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I appreciate that; but how will the Senate know what is before the Senate when they come to consider it? The Senate will not have anything to consider.

Mr. LANGLEY. I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if this amendment should be incorporated in the bill and it goes back to the Senate, the Senate will not have the evidence to support the item, while it does have it in the case presented by Judge RUSSELL.

The SPEAKER. The Senate can turn it down, then.

Mr. LANGLEY. I understand it can turn it down; but that probably means, I fear, turning down the whole bill—

The SPEAKER. Nothing of the sort.

Mr. LANGLEY. What I mean is that I fear the injection of a new case like this at this stage of things will endanger the bill by us not getting it through and enrolled in time to become a law at this session.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, the evidence is before the Senate committee now, as I have stated to the House.

Mr. LANGLEY. Perhaps half the membership that are present have cases like the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. What has that got to do with whether it is possible to add an amendment to this bill?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Who has the floor?

Mr. LANGLEY. I was addressing myself to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma. I am not, I beg to say to the Chair, contending that it can not be done here. I know better than that. I simply do not think it ought to be done.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard for a moment when the gentleman gets through.

The SPEAKER. I thought the gentleman asked for a vote.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. No; I wanted to know who had the floor. There were two different Members talking—

The SPEAKER. There were three talking at the same time. The gentleman from Oklahoma had the floor, and his five minutes are up.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that I can not consent to this amendment. The reason I can not is because there have been other Members of the House who have approached me in the last two or three days to know whether they could put amendments on this bill, and I have told all of them we could not consent to it for several reasons. In the first place, some of the items they want to put on the bill have not been investigated by our committee. This one presented by the gentleman from Oklahoma has been passed by the committee and approved. That objection does not apply to this amendment, but I have been advised by the Senate committee that if we put amendments on this bill every probability is they would disagree to our amendments and send the bill to conference. They tell me it is exceedingly doubtful whether they can get a majority of the committee to meet again to pass on Senate bills. Therefore I think it will endanger the success of this bill to put amendments on it. I would be glad to see this claim of the gentleman from Oklahoma allowed, but it would be bad faith for me to consent to allow it to go on this bill, as I have told other Members of this House we would not consent to amendments to the bill. Of course this House has got the power to put it in if it wants to, but the committee thinks it will be a mistake to do so.

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

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman stated it was doubtful if they could get a majority of the Committee on Pensions of the Senate together. Has a majority of the Senate committee ever met during this Congress?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I think so.

Mr. MANN. I dare say not.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I think so. They have met and passed on bills.

Mr. MANN. They have a rule there that only one or two men constitute a quorum of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken, and the Speaker stated the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. HASTINGS) there were— yeas 15, yeas 15.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

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

On motion of Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri, a motion to reconsider the vote by which both of the preceding bills were passed was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, from the Committee on Appropriations, presented a conference report on the bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, for printing under the rules.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1548).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 5, 23, 24, 25, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 51, 53, 55, 59, 61, 69, and 70.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 40, 41, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 54, 56, 57, 60, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, and 71, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Senate resolutions No. 561, Sixty-third Congress, third session, and 101, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, are hereby repealed"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The Bureau of Efficiency shall investigate the methods of examining and auditing claims against the United States and accounts of disbursing officers, and of accounting for receipts and disbursements, and shall submit a report to the Secretary of the Treasury and to Congress, with recommendations, at its next regular session.

"The Bureau of Efficiency shall investigate the work performed by the Subtreasuries and report to the Secretary of the Treasury and to Congress at the beginning of the next regular session what part of the work of the Subtreasuries may be transferred to other offices of the Government, banks of the Federal Reserve System or farm-loan banks, and for the purpose of this investigation the representatives of the Bureau of Efficiency shall have access to all necessary books and other records of the Government.

"The Bureau of Efficiency shall investigate the methods of transacting the public business in the Civil Service Commission and report to Congress through the President at the next regular session of Congress. The officers and employees of the Civil Service Commission are hereby directed to furnish said bureau with such information as it may require to carry out this provision.

"The Bureau of Efficiency shall ascertain the rates of pay of employees of various State and municipal governments and commercial institutions in different parts of the United States and shall submit to Congress at its next regular session a report showing how such rates compare with the rates of pay of employees of the Federal Government performing similar services.

"Officers and employees of the executive departments and other establishments shall furnish authorized representatives of the Bureau of Efficiency with all information that the bureau may require for the performance of the duties imposed on it by law, and shall give such representatives access to all records and papers that may be needed for that purpose."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "departments" insert the following: "And independent establishments of the Government"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For employees now paid from appropriation for emergencies

arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service, \$4,140"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Federal Farm Loan Bureau; For 4 members of the board, at \$10,000 each; secretary to the board, \$4,500; chief bond division, \$3,000; 4 private secretaries, at \$2,000 each; clerks—1 of class 4, 1 at \$900, 3 at \$720 each, 1 at \$600; clerk and stenographer, \$1,200; stenographers—7 at \$1,000 each, 4 at \$900 each, 3 at \$720 each; messenger; and 3 assistant messengers; in all, \$77,920.

"For salaries and expenses under the Federal Farm Loan Board, created by the act approved July 17, 1916, including the actual necessary traveling expenses of the members of the board and such salaries, fees, and expenses as are authorized by said act, including farm-loan registrars, examiners, and such attorneys, experts, assistants, clerks, laborers, and other employees in the District of Columbia and elsewhere as the Federal Farm Loan Board may find necessary, \$182,080; in all, \$260,000. A detailed statement of expenditures hereunder shall be made to Congress.

"Estimates in detail for all expenditures under the Federal Farm Loan Bureau for the fiscal year 1919, and annually thereafter, shall be submitted to Congress in the annual Book of Estimates."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and in lieu of the matter inserted by said Senate amendment, insert the following: "Provided, That on and after July 1, 1919, no Government official or employee shall receive any salary in connection with his services as such an official or employee from any source other than the Government of the United States, except as may be contributed out of the treasury of any State, county, or municipality, and no person, association, or corporation shall make any contribution to, or in any way supplement the salary of, any Government official or employee for the services performed by him for the Government of the United States. Any person violating any of the terms of this proviso shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$1,000 or imprisonment for not less than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment as the court may determine"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 8. The Bureau of Efficiency shall investigate duplication of service in the various executive departments and establishments of the Government, including bureaus and divisions, and make a report to the President thereon, and the President is hereby authorized, after such report shall have been made to him, wherever he finds such duplications to exist to abolish the same. Report of the action taken hereunder shall be made to Congress at its next regular session."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
T. U. SISSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

LEE S. OVERMAN,
N. P. BRYAN,
REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of the said amendments, namely:

On Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4, relating to the Senate: Strikes out the provision, proposed by the Senate, for an additional assistant clerk at \$1,440 to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; appropriates \$1,800, as proposed by the Senate, for rent

of a warehouse for storage of public documents; inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, repealing certain Senate resolutions, modified so as to eliminate from such repeal Senate resolution No. 421, Sixty-third Congress, second session.

On No. 5: Appropriates for clerk hire to Members and Delegates as proposed by the House instead of as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 9, relating to the Library of Congress: Appropriates \$900, as proposed by the Senate, for an assistant in the reading room for the blind; makes the appropriations of \$1,400 for waterproofing parts of the east driveway and \$1,075 for fire hose and fittings, "immediately available," as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 10: Makes the appropriation of \$12,000 for the Botanical Garden available for the purchase of "office equipment," as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 11, 12, and 13, relating to the Bureau of Efficiency: Appropriates \$60,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$43,000, as proposed by the House; inserts the paragraphs proposed by the Senate, for an investigation by the Bureau of Efficiency of auditing and examining claims and the accounts of disbursing officers, an investigation of the work performed by the Subtreasuries, an investigation of the methods of transacting public business in the Civil Service Commission, an investigation of the rates of pay of employees of State and municipal governments and commercial institutions as compared with rates of pay of the Federal Government for similar services, an investigation of the classification, salary, and efficiency of Government employees in the District of Columbia; and requires officers and employees of the Government to furnish representatives of the bureau with information necessary for the performance of the duties imposed upon it by law.

On No. 14, relating to the Civil Service Commission: Limits the appropriation of \$7,500 for field examiners at the rate of \$1,500 per annum to five persons, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 15, 16, 17, and 18, relating to the State Department: Provides for a chauffeur at \$1,080, and strikes out provision for a driver at \$840 and a hostler at \$720; appropriates \$4,140, as proposed by the Senate, for employees now paid from the appropriation for emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service; and makes the appropriation of \$4,000 for an automobile, for official use of the Secretary of State, immediately available, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 19: Abolishes the branch printing office in the State, War, and Navy Department Building, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 20 and 21: Provides for an Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury at the rate of \$5,000 per annum from March 1, 1917, to June 30, 1918, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 22: Provides for the Federal Farm Loan Board as proposed by the Senate with the following exceptions: The salary of the secretary to the board is increased from \$3,000 to \$4,500, the salary of the publicity agent at \$2,000 per annum is omitted, the salaries of the four private secretaries are increased from \$1,800 to \$2,000 each, and the lump-sum appropriation made available for personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

On No. 23: Strikes out the appropriation of \$250, proposed by the Senate, for law books for the Comptroller of the Treasury.

On Nos. 24 and 25, relating to the Office of the Auditor for the Navy Department: Transfers a clerk of class 3 from the register's office, as proposed by the House, instead of a clerk of class 4, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 26: Provides for an "unapportioned" check assorter at \$900, as proposed by the Senate, in the Office of the Auditor for the Interior Department.

On Nos. 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31, relating to the Office of the Auditor for the Post Office Department: Appropriates \$254,730, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$284,730, as proposed by the House, for compensation of employees auditing accounts and vouchers of the Postal Service; and makes permanent, as proposed by the Senate, the authority granted the Secretary of the Treasury to diminish positions as vacancies occur and use the unexpended balances of salaries for the payment of employees in auditing accounts.

On Nos. 32, 33, and 34: Omits a clerk of class 3 in the office of the register, as proposed by the House, instead of one of class 4, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 35 and 36: Appropriates \$1,400, as proposed by the Senate, for a private secretary for the captain commandant in the office of the Coast Guard.

On Nos. 37, 38, and 39: Appropriates \$4,500 for the pay of the Chief of the Secret Service Division, and \$3,500 for the assistant

chief, as proposed by the House, instead of \$4,000 and \$3,000, respectively, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 40 and 41: Strike out, as proposed by the Senate, the language relative to per diem in lieu of subsistence, in appropriations for collecting internal revenue.

On Nos. 42, 43, and 44: Provides for 61 assistant messengers, as proposed by the House, instead of 40, as proposed by the Senate, in the Office of The Adjutant General, and restores the language, stricken out by the Senate, requiring employees of The Adjutant General's Office to be exclusively engaged on the work of his office, during the fiscal year 1918.

On No. 45: Appropriates \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, for a blue-printing plant in the Bureau of Steam Engineering of the Navy Department.

On Nos. 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, and 51, relating to the General Land Office: Provides for two additional clerks at \$1,600 each, three additional clerks at \$1,400 each, four additional clerks at \$1,200 each, and four additional clerks at \$1,000 each, as proposed by the Senate, and strikes out the paragraph, inserted by the Senate, authorizing the use of \$6,500 of the appropriation for surveying for the current year in the payment of field employees detailed to the General Land Office.

On Nos. 52, 53, 54, and 55, relating to the Pension Office: Strikes out a chief of division at \$2,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides for a law clerk at \$2,250, as proposed by the House, instead of a chief of the law division at the same salary, as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out the language, inserted by the Senate, modifying the limitation on the filling of vacancies occurring during the fiscal year 1918.

On Nos. 56 and 57, relating to the Patent Office: Appropriates \$10,000 for special and temporary services of typewriters to keep current the work of furnishing manuscript copies of records; and inserts authority for the purchase of law books, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 58, relating to the Bureau of Education and the General Education Board: Inserts a substitute for the matter proposed by the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate and the matter inserted by said Senate amendment which prohibits, after July 1, 1919, Government officials and employees from receiving salary as such officials from any source other than the United States Government or State, county, or municipal governments, and affixes a penalty for the violation of the act.

On No. 59: Strikes out the appropriations of \$20,000 for rent for the Geological Survey and \$6,000 for the Bureau of Mines, proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 60 and 61, relating to the Post Office Department: Appropriates for the officers and employees of the Post Office Department in the manner proposed by the Senate, instead of in the manner proposed by the House; strikes out the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, placing postmasters in the classified service.

On Nos. 63, 64, and 65, relating to the Census Office: Provides for an additional chief statistician at \$3,000, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates \$647,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$512,000, as proposed by the House, for securing information for census reports.

On No. 66: Appropriates \$120,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$110,000, as proposed by the House, for contingent expenses of the Steamboat-Inspection Service.

On No. 67: Increases the amount for personal services in Washington that may be used from the appropriation for the enforcement of wireless communication laws from \$7,150 to \$8,050, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 68: Reduces the rate per day to be paid to experts and temporary assistants in Children's Bureau from \$8 to \$6, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 69 and 70, relating to the Court of Claims: Provides for four stenographers at \$1,200 each, as proposed by the House, instead of five stenographers at \$1,200 each, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 71: Provides for additional compensation to employees of the Government paid from appropriations in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1918 as proposed by the Senate as follows:

"SEC. 7. That to provide, during the fiscal year 1918, for increased compensation at the rate of 15 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate per annum of \$480 or less, and for increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate of more than \$480 per annum and not exceeding \$1,000 per annum, so much as may be necessary is appropriated: *Provided*, That this section shall only apply to employees who are appropriated for in this act specifically and under lump sums or whose employment is authorized herein: *Provided further*, That detailed re-

ports 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."

On No. 72, relating to the section authorizing the President to report upon the coordination of the work of the departments; Inserts a substitute for the Senate amendment requiring the Bureau of Efficiency to investigate the duplication of work and to report such duplication of service to the President; and gives the President authority to abolish duplications where they may be found to exist.

JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
T. U. SISSON,
JAMES W. GOOD,

Managers on the part of the House.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had further insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. BRYAN, and Mr. SMOOT as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8229) to establish a national military park at the battle field of Guilford Courthouse.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1878) making appropriations for payment of certain claims in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims, reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts, and under the provisions of section 151 of the act approved March 3, 1911, commonly known as the Judicial Code.

PENSIONS.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill S. 8296.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 8296) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. For the purpose of reserving the right to object. I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee if he is willing to have an amendment go on his bill?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. No; I would not agree to any amendment at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. You have about 100 bills?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. These are Senate bills.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. About 100 pension bills here?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I presume there are about that many items in the two bills.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. How many hundred in your committee that have not been acted upon?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. We have acted upon every bill that has been prepared by the examiner. The table was cleaned up.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. That does not answer my question.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. We acted upon every bill that was presented, where evidence was filed and it was possible to prepare it.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. You do not know how many bills there were in your committee that you have not acted upon at all?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I could not say exactly. I think there were three or four thousand bills introduced and presented to the committee, and I presume we passed about 400 bills.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. About 400 bills?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I would like to add also that in about 7 cases out of every 10 no evidence has been filed, although the bills have been introduced.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. You have had three bills there for two years that I have filed, with the evidence, and that not

one member of your committee has ever read. One of those bills you did turn down, and that is the bill I wanted acted upon to-day. There is not one syllable of the testimony that any one member of your committee has read, and still you have acted upon that bill and turned it down.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I beg to differ with the gentleman. I have in mind the bill in question; but it was considered by the subcommittee, and they made an adverse report. The full committee made an adverse report on the bill, and I think, if I am not badly mistaken, you filed some additional evidence and asked that the bill be reconsidered. The committee reconsidered the bill, and upon a two-thirds vote of the full committee again rejected it.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I talked with each member of the subcommittee, and each member told me he had never read the testimony, that he knew nothing about it; that the only thing he knew was what the examiner had attached to the outside of the bill, which did not recommend or recommend it to pass.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Was not that a summary of the facts?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. No; it was not a mere summary of the facts. In the first place, it was not a sufficient statement of the facts as they appeared from the testimony, and it was not a correct conclusion from the evidence that was before the examiner.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Is not that only your opinion of the matter?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. It is not my opinion. It is a matter of fact. The record shows it.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I just want to say to the gentleman from Minnesota that the man who prepares these cases for the committee is supposed to be as near an expert pension man as it is possible to get. He is detailed by the Department of the Interior to prepare these claims for the committee—to brief them up, so to speak. If there is a better man in Washington or in this country on pension matters than the special examiner for our committee, I do not know who he is. That man is a man that I believe knows more about pension matters than any other man in this country.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Unfortunately, I do not know the man.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will my friend from Ohio [Mr. KEY] permit me to say that I was formerly connected with the bureau—

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I object.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I have known William McKinley Cobb for a long time. There is not a more thorough man in the whole pension service than he is, nor one who would more faithfully and accurately make a summary of the facts in a case for the consideration of the committee.

Mr. MANN. I suggest that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEY] move to go into committee.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move to go into committee.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MANN. Will not the gentleman withhold it for a moment?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. No. I have been after this committee for a year and a half.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman withhold it for a moment?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota (continuing). And I have met with such discourtesy that I feel there is not anything that can be done in the House according to its rules but that ought to be done to this very generous and magnanimous committee.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman withhold the point of no quorum a minute?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Very well; I will.

Mr. MANN. Let me put the situation to the gentleman: These are Senate bills. I would not blame the gentleman at all if these were House bills. But after all, here is the situation: The Senate has been very courteous to the House about House pension bills. I am not interested. I very seldom introduce pension bills. But we have got to maintain some sort of courtesy between the two bodies, and if we refuse to consider Senate pension bills toward the end of the session, we will meet the same kind of a proposition at the other end of the Capitol. They will refuse to give any consideration to our bills.

Now, there was quite a strong degree of opposition to the passage of private pension bills in the Senate at one time. Some of the southern Senators for a while refused to permit private pension bills to be considered over there by unanimous consent, and they are considered in no other way in the Senate. But after a while they were induced to withdraw their opposition. Now, when the House passes a pension bill and sends it

to the Senate—when it reaches the Senate the Senate sometimes by unanimous consent takes it up and passes it. I do not think it is quite the thing for the gentleman to raise his objection to a Senate bill under those circumstances.

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

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. NORTON. I want to say that I have had about the same experience as the gentleman from Minnesota. I have, as far as I can recall, only one pension bill before this committee. That is as much as I have had in the last year and a half.

Mr. MANN. I do not care how much the gentleman criticizes the House Pension Committee, but—

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I may say that I am in the same situation as the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. NORTON. The examiner for the committee reported, as I understand, that the claim that I presented was a very good one, but in a very gentlemanly manner they just brushed it aside. I do not know whether you have to chase the committee like a greyhound, or like a hound dog or not, but it appears that way.

Mr. MANN. Here is the situation: The Pension Committee of the House can take care of itself, but ought we to raise such an objection on a Senate bill? That simply kills this Senate bill and puts an end to certain courtesies between the two bodies about those bills. I think it would be a mistake.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. The only conclusion I can draw is that we have got about four or five thousand of these bills pending before the committee and we have got only about a hundred reported out. Are four or five thousand of more importance than a hundred? That is the question.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Well, there might have been four or five thousand bills introduced, but in not more than four or five hundred cases has the evidence been filed in support of the bills, and the committee does not report bills unless the evidence is filed. I have known of some Members having submitted 600 bills before the committee, who have not filed the evidence.

Mr. MANN. The House committee has had nothing, or practically nothing, to do with these bills. These are Senate bills.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. May it please the gentleman from Illinois, I realize that; but I can not get through my sense of justice or fairness a proposition to permit a hundred bills to go through and allow 500 or 5,000 not to be considered at all.

Mr. MANN. Here is the point: Certain bills were introduced in the House, and certain bills were introduced in the Senate. If this were at the beginning of a session of Congress and the House committee had a bill here, a House bill, the gentleman would have the right to use every parliamentary method of forcing the House committee to consider his bill. It would be perfectly legitimate to do it. But when the Senate passes a pension bill and sends it over here, the House will not get its bills considered in the Senate unless we treat the Senate bills courteously in the House. Now, merely to object will not seem to them courteous, and the gentleman will not accomplish anything except to stop the Senate bills.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I will put them in the same category as the House bills. I will treat them all alike.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that four or five thousand House bills will not be passed. House bills are considered by the House committee, and the Senate bills are considered by the Senate committee. They do not make any changes in the Senate committee, except sometimes as to amounts or where the amounts fixed violate their rules, or where somebody has died. I hope the gentleman will not put the House in that position; that is all. I do not care anything about the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. May it please the gentleman from Illinois, I realize there is much in what he says, but it does not appear to me to be fair to permit a few bills—I do not care where they come from or who introduces them—to be passed and then have the committee object to giving other bills fair consideration.

Mr. MANN. But that will not get the gentleman's bill considered. That is all.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I believed the committee was absolutely honest when it turned down this bill of mine on the evidence, but when I found out afterwards that the committee had not read the evidence, and did not know anything about it, and would not permit me to come before it and present the evidence, then I doubted whether the committee or the members running it, had anything in mind except to take care of a few of their special friends.

Mr. MANN. But that does not apply to this bill. These are not their special friends. This is a Senate bill. They did not bring this bill in for consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Well, Mr. Speaker, in consideration of what the gentleman has said, and as evidence of my

high respect for our distinguished leader, I will withdraw my point of order. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment. The bill (S. 8296) was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Louis Hagenbuecher, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Percy A. Farrar, late of Troop B, Thirteenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Edward Robinson, late of Company L, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Mattie S. M. Hope, widow of Chester J. T. Hope, late of Battery A, Battalion Utah Volunteer Light Artillery, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Chester J. T. Hope until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of M. B. Sasser, late of Company A, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hans C. Nielsen, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Carl J. Nelson, late of Company D, First Regiment South Dakota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Robert L. Zell, late of Company I, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Clark E. Messenger, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$6 per month.

The name of Edward Harris, who was wounded while assisting the United States marshal and a detachment of United States troops in an engagement with Bear Island Indians, Minnesota, October 5, 1898, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Elder, late of Company M, One hundred and fifty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Elmer Bjarnson, late of Battery B, Utah Volunteer Light Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Meda Mathey, widow of Edward G. Mathey, late captain, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, and lieutenant colonel, United States Army, retired, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Leonard Kempenar, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Byron W. Jacks, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abel H. Hall, late of Company F, First Regiment Montana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Harry F. Roddy, late of Company E, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of William A. Bowens, late of Company E, Third Regiment Georgia Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Forty-second United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Della B. Lydecker, widow of Garret J. Lydecker, late colonel, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and brigadier general, United States Army, retired, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ethel M. Robards, widow of Frank F. Robards, late captain, United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Frank F. Robards until he reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Arabella G. Walker, widow of Asa Walker, late rear admiral, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Lotta K. Boyd, widow of Charles T. Boyd, late captain, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of the said Charles T. Boyd until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of William E. Pnett, late of Company M, Twenty-second Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George P. Cross, late of Company B, Thirty-eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Moir, late of Battery B, Utah Volunteer Light Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Herbert G. Hoots, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Alada Thurston Paddock Mills, widow of Albert Leopold Mills, late major general, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ferdinand Klawitter, late of Troop K, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank Burrow, late of Company E, Second Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. West, late of Capt. C Hancock's cavalry company, Nauvoo Legion, Utah Volunteers, Utah Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph J. Meyers, late of Battery A, Battalion Utah Volunteer Light Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Kathrina E. T. Vreeland, widow of Charles E. Vreeland, late rear admiral, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Robert A. Imrie, late of Company E, First Regiment Colorado Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of William F. Core, late of Company A, One hundred and fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Ernest Wesche, jr., late of Company F, First Battalion Wyoming Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary L. Pritchett, widow of Edwin E. Pritchett, late first Lieutenant Fifth Regiment United States Field Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Edwin E. Pritchett until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Elizabeth S. Naylor, widow of Harold S. Naylor, late first Lieutenant Fifth Regiment United States Field Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Harold S. Naylor until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Aurelia H. Gibson, widow of William C. Gibson, late Lieutenant commander United States Navy, and rear admiral United States Navy, retired, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emily A. Baldrige Cavender, former widow of George W. Baldrige, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Johanna E. Waalkes, widow of John Waalkes, late of Company C, Thirty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of the said John Waalkes until they reach the age of 16 years.

This bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

S. S. Louis Hagenbucher.	S. 6618. William E. Puett.
S. 78. Percy A. Farrar.	S. 6877. George P. Cross.
S. 81. Edward Robinson.	S. 6836. George Moir.
S. 82. Mattie S. M. Hope.	S. 6971. Herbert G. Hoots.
S. 1519. M. B. Sasser.	S. 7108. Alada Thurston Pad-
S. 1558. Hans C. Nilsen.	dock Mills.
S. 2197. Carl J. Nelson.	S. 7249. Ferdinand Klawitter.
S. 2359. Robert L. Zell.	S. 7289. Frank Burrow.
S. 2590. Clark E. Messenger.	S. 7440. John A. West.
S. 3645. Edward Harris.	S. 7517. Joseph J. Meyers.
S. 4046. John H. Elder.	S. 7545. Kathrina E. T. Vree-
S. 4080. Elner Bjaranson.	land.
S. 4465. Meda Mathey.	S. 7705. Robert A. Imrie.
S. 4630. Leonard Kempner.	S. 7745. William F. Core.
S. 4952. Byron W. Jacks.	S. 7890. Ernest Wesche, jr.
S. 5223. Abel H. Hall.	S. 7974. Mary L. Pritchett.
S. 5290. Harry F. Roddy.	S. 7975. Elizabeth S. Naylor.
S. 5464. William A. Bowsen.	S. 7987. Aurelia H. Gibson.
S. 5801. Della B. Lydecker.	S. 8000. Emily A. Baldrige
S. 6294. Ethel M. Robards.	Cavender.
S. 6305. Arabelle G. Walker.	S. 8182. Johanna E. Waalkes.
S. 6614. Lotta K. Boyd.	

The following committee amendments were severally read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "\$30" and insert "\$17."
 Strike out line 10, page 1, and lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 2.
 Page 2, line 6, strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12."
 Page 2, strike out lines 8 to 13, inclusive.
 Page 3, strike out lines 1 to 3, inclusive.
 Page 3, line 8, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$17."
 Page 3, line 13, strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12."
 Page 3, line 16, strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12."
 Page 3, line 24, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$17."
 Page 4, strike out lines 5 to 7, inclusive.
 Page 4, line 10, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$12."
 Page 5, strike out lines 3 to 13, inclusive.
 Page 5, strike out lines 18 to 21, inclusive.
 Page 5, line 24, strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12."
 Page 6, strike out lines 1 to 9, inclusive.
 Page 6, strike out lines 18 to 21, inclusive.
 Page 6, line 24, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$17."
 Page 7, strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive.
 Page 7, strike out lines 8 to 11, inclusive.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 8120) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of William W. Cook, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles Milk, late of Companies L and M, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The name of William R. Dority, late of Company A, Thirtieth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Joseph P. Sullivan, late of Company D, Second Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Merritt, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Worthen, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John T. Edson, late ensign, United States Navy, War with Spain, and grant him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Celestine Lacy, widow of James H. Lacy, late chief carpenter's mate, United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Homer T. Barnett, late of Troop A, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bessie D. Blu, widow of William R. Blu, late of Troop C, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Maurice H. Myers, late of Company I, Second Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$10 per month.

The name of Robert H. Cowan, late assistant paymaster, United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$18 per month.

The name of Peter Downey, late of Company B, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Charles H. Craddock, late of Company K, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Herman L. Shank, late of Company A, Thirty-second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Clarence A. Hunt, late of One hundred and seventh Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Guss E. Gurtz, late of Company L, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Arthur Leland, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Signal Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William H. Jones, late of the Forty-fifth Company Coast Artillery Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Victor F. Marshall, late of Company I, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, First Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Joseph O. Dennison, late of Companies E and M, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Thomas R. Peak, late of Company H, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edwin C. Gasque, late of Eighty-second Company United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Vernon D. Bennett, late of Company F, First Regiment South Dakota Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Horace M. Patton, late first Lieutenant Company E, Fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert J. May, late of Company F, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Arthur Isert, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Elsie M. Duryee, widow of Louis H. Duryee, late of Company E, Battalion of Engineers, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Louis H. Duryee until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Francis M. Moore, late of Company B, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles F. Johnson, late of Company F, Twenty-first Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Lucius V. Hubbard, late second lieutenant, Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$15 per month.

The name of George L. Aldrich, late of Company H, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert G. Daugherty, late of Company K, Twenty-first Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Nanette W. Sheffield, widow of Everette R. Sheffield, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Everette R. Sheffield until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Andrew E. Waterman, late of Company H, First Regiment South Dakota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis W. Hill, late of Troop C, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Milton T. Benham, late of Company K, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Engineers, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Robert O. Dunn, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George W. Smith, late of Company B, Two hundred and first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Gordon Hinton, late of Company D, Forty-second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of J. Augustus Thilman, late of Companies D and E, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Francis Roy, late of Company C, First Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank G. Schutt, jr., late of band, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$10 per month.

The name of James Cunningham, late of Company G, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Robert M. Watkins, late of Troop H, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen H. Whitman, late of Company F, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adelbert R. Burke, late of Company H, First Regiment Montana Volunteer Infantry and band, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Mary R. Edwards, widow of Frank A. Edwards, late colonel, United States Army, retired, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Wilbur C. Gabret, late of Company L, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of James G. Rollins, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank W. Brown, late of Company G, Twentieth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walter H. Starling, late second lieutenant and battalion adjutant, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$15 per month.

The name of Walter P. Norris, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$15 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edmond de Jarnac, late of band, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. Kelley, late of U. S. S. *Alabama*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Frank H. Latham, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The name of Charles William Finley, late of Company C, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Florence V. Handbury, widow of Thomas H. Handbury, late colonel, Engineer Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Jane Bowman, widow of Albert Bowman, late of Company E, Second Regiment United States Dragoons, Texas and New Mexico Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Durbin L. Badley, late sergeant-major and first lieutenant Company G, First Regiment Idaho Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Battle, dependent mother of Thomas A. Battle, late of Company M, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary H. Trimble, widow of Joel G. Trimble, late captain, First Regiment United States Cavalry, and major, United States Army, retired, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James Pickett, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ander J. Heatley, late of Company A, Third Regiment Georgia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$16 per month.

The name of Robert Starkey, late of the U. S. S. *Potomac*, United States Navy, War with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alice Hathaway, widow of Forrest H. Hathaway, late lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster's Department, and brigadier general, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George J. Ham, late of Troop C, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Riddle Wilson, dependent mother of Robert Griffith, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles M. Way, late of Company K, First Regiment South Dakota Volunteer Infantry, and Troop K, Eleventh Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of John Safranek, late chief musician Thirty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walter K. Neal, late of First Company, United States Volunteer Signal Corps, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Robert W. Irvine, late of Troop H, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Eugenia L. Williams, widow of William M. Williams, late captain Company I, Forty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and captain and major, United States Army, retired, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary B. Orner, dependent mother of William B. Orner, late of U. S. S. *Baltimore* and *Buffalo*, United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John W. McCown, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Henry Ferguson, late of Company E, Twenty-fifth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Bellion, widow of Henry Bellion, late of Company E, First Regiment United States Dragoons, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Arthur H. King, late of Battery A, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles H. Bacheider, late of Battery C, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of John W. Thomas, late of Company C, First Regiment South Dakota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Fred D. Abbott, late of Company G, First Regiment Montana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Mary T. Seay, widow of Samuel Seay, late major, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Samuel Seay until he becomes 16 years of age.

The name of Daniel I. Jemel, late of Company G, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert S. Clouse, late of Troop E, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank J. Conway, late of Company H, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Leonard P. Kehrmeier, late of U. S. S. *Rhode Island*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thomas B. Jeffries, late of Company M, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bertha C. Pratt, widow of Peter L. Pratt, late ensign, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$15 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Peter L. Pratt until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Harry C. Chute, late of Company D, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The name of Emma E. Normoyle, widow of James E. Normoyle, late major, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Milton M. Lile, late of Company F, Second Battalion of Engineers, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$46 per month.

The name of Anna B. Davis, widow of Wirt Davis, late colonel Third Regiment United States Cavalry, and brigadier general, United States Army, retired, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Flora G. Redman, widow of Henry Redman, late first lieutenant Company D, First Regiment North Dakota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of the said Henry Redman until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Elizabeth J. Anderson, widow of Charles Anderson, late of Company D (Capt. M. M. Williams), Second Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maude Deignan, widow of Osborn Deignan, late boatswain, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Osborn Deignan until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Perry Ryals, late of Capt. Downman's company, Alabama Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bertha M. Shaw, widow of John W. Shaw, late of Company G, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said John W. Shaw until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Charles A. Dobratz, late of U. S. S. *Puritan*, United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Annie A. Haines, widow of John T. Haines, late major, United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emory C. Powers, late of Company D, Second Regiment Virginia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Lavina A. E. Rogers, widow of William W. Rogers, late of Capt. Sweat's company, Georgia Mounted Volunteer Infantry, Florida Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Letta D. Webster, widow of Edmund K. Webster, late major Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Mary Renfro, widow of Nathaniel Green Renfro, late of Capt. E. T. Kendrick's independent company, Florida Mounted Volunteers, Seminole Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma E. Barrett, widow of John Barrett, late of ordnance detachment, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Martha P. Johnson, widow of William Johnson, late of Capt. James P. Goodall's company, Oregon Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William H. Van Name, late of Company G, Second Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

This bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

S. 1919. William W. Cook.	S. 5939. Edmond de Jarnac.
S. 1933. Charles Milk.	S. 5951. Charles H. Kelley.
S. 2566. William R. Dority.	S. 6004. Frank H. Latham.
S. 2607. Joseph P. Sullivan.	S. 6008. Charles William Finley.
S. 2861. William H. Merritt.	S. 6070. Florence V. Handbury.
S. 2922. William C. Worthen.	S. 6207. Mary Jane Bowman.
S. 3158. John T. Edson.	S. 6233. Durbin L. Badley.
S. 3163. Celestine Lacy.	S. 6276. Mary Battle.
S. 3192. Homer T. Barnett.	S. 6280. Mary H. Trimble.
S. 3232. Bessie D. Blu.	S. 6319. James Pickett.
S. 3719. Maurice H. Myers.	S. 6323. Ander J. Heatley.
S. 4018. Robert H. Cowan.	S. 6333. Robert Starkey.
S. 4057. Peter Downey.	S. 6346. Alice Hathaway.
S. 4077. Charles H. Craddock.	S. 6417. George J. Ham.
S. 4078. Herman L. Shank.	S. 6425. Rittie Wilson.
S. 4110. Clarence A. Hunt.	S. 6473. Charles M. Way.
S. 4135. Guss E. Gurtz.	S. 6488. John Safranek.
S. 4186. Arthur Leland.	S. 6531. Walter K. Neal.
S. 4187. William H. Jones.	S. 6553. Robert W. Irvine.
S. 4264. Victor F. Marshall.	S. 6605. Eugenia L. Williams.
S. 4314. Joseph O. Dennison.	S. 6649. Mary B. Orner.
S. 4320. Thomas R. Peak.	S. 6674. John W. McCown.
S. 4391. Edwin C. Gasque.	S. 6719. Henry Ferguson.
S. 4423. Vernon D. Bennett.	S. 6735. Elizabeth Bellion.
S. 4475. Horace M. Patton.	S. 6770. Arthur H. King.
S. 4529. Robert J. May.	S. 6777. Charles H. Bachelder.
S. 4530. Arthur Isert.	S. 6803. John W. Thomas.
S. 4535. Elsie M. Durjee.	S. 6866. Fred D. Abbott.
S. 4596. Francis M. Moore.	S. 6877. Mary T. Seay.
S. 4638. Charles F. Johnson.	S. 6897. Daniel I. Jelnel.
S. 4754. Lucius V. Hubbard.	S. 6912. Albert S. Clouse.
S. 4845. George L. Aldrich.	S. 6941. Frank J. Conway.
S. 4898. Albert G. Daugherty.	S. 6958. Leonard P. Kehrmeyer.
S. 5023. Nanette W. Sheffield.	S. 6994. Thomas B. Jeffries.
S. 5087. Andrew E. Waterman.	S. 7009. Bertha C. Pratt.
S. 5167. Lewis W. Hill.	S. 7011. Harry C. Chute.
S. 5214. Milton T. Benham.	S. 7043. Emma E. Normoyle.
S. 5248. Robert O. Dunn.	S. 7085. Milton M. Lile.
S. 5265. George W. Smith.	S. 7109. Anna B. Davis.
S. 5303. Gordon Hinton.	S. 7141. Flora G. Redman.
S. 5365. J. Augustus Thilman.	S. 7143. Elizabeth J. Anderson.
S. 5405. Francis Roy.	S. 7163. Maude Deignan.
S. 5431. Frank G. Schutt, jr.	S. 7183. Perry Ryals.
S. 5510. James Cunningham.	S. 7230. Bertha M. Shaw.
S. 5627. Robert M. Watkins.	S. 7238. Charles A. Dobratz.
S. 5628. Stephen H. Whitman.	S. 7268. Annie A. Haines.
S. 5631. Adelbert R. Burke.	S. 7339. Emory C. Powers.
S. 5791. Mary R. Edwards.	S. 7479. Lavina A. E. Rogers.
S. 5844. Wilbur C. Gabret.	S. 7515. Letta D. Webster.
S. 5846. James G. Rollins.	S. 7656. Mary Renfro.
S. 5862. Frank W. Brown.	S. 7790. Emma E. Barrett.
S. 5930. Walter H. Sterling.	S. 7932. Martha P. Johnson.
S. 5935. Walter P. Norris.	S. 8017. William H. Van Name.

The following committee amendments were severally read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 1, strike out lines 6 to 9, inclusive.
 Page 2, strike out lines 1 to 3, inclusive.
 Page 2, line 6, strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12."
 Page 2, line 14, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$17."
 Page 3, line 3, strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12."
 Page 3, strike out lines 12 to 14, inclusive.
 Page 4, line 4, strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12."
 Page 4, line 23, strike out "\$24" and insert "\$12."
 Page 5, strike out lines 4 to 7, inclusive.
 Page 5, strike out lines 13 to 16, inclusive.
 Page 6, line 6, strike out "\$30" and insert "\$24."
 Page 6, line 18, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$17."
 Page 6, line 22, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$17."
 Page 7, strike out lines 5 to 11, inclusive.
 Page 8, line 9, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$17."

Page 9, line 5, strike out "\$17" and insert "\$12."
 Page 9, line 12, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$17."
 Page 9, line 24, strike out "\$15" and insert "\$12."
 Page 10, line 1, strike out "\$15" and insert "\$12."
 Page 10, line 5, strike out "\$24" and insert "\$30."
 Page 10, line 20, strike out "\$40" and insert "\$35."
 Page 11, strike out lines 12 to 15, inclusive.
 Page 12, strike out lines 8 to 10, inclusive.
 Page 13, line 8, strike out "\$30" and insert "\$20."
 Page 14, line 6, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$17."
 Page 15, strike out lines 4 to 10, inclusive.
 Page 15, line 14, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$17."
 Page 15, strike out lines 15 to 20, inclusive.
 Page 16, line 4, strike out "\$50" and insert "\$35."
 Page 16, strike out lines 6 to 9, inclusive.
 Page 17, strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive.
 Page 18, strike out lines 3 to 5, inclusive.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to the case of George J. Ham, of the Regular Establishment, whose case appears on page 12, stricken out by the committee. I did not offer an amendment because I have no doubt the action of this committee will meet with strong resistance in the Senate, and, I think, after further consideration they will conclude that this case ought to remain in the bill.

This man Ham had three years of honorable service. The difficulty about his case seems to be that he had no hospital record; but there is much evidence by officers and enlisted men of his company, people who knew him, that he was not strong and vigorous, that he was ill while in the service, although he was not the sort of man who would go to the hospital. There is evidence to the effect that he came out of the service a badly broken-down man; that he has been ill ever since; that he is ill now and has a very bad case of tuberculosis; that he is entirely without means and has a considerable family to support. I think it is a very good case. I hope the committee will give it careful consideration.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. We will be very glad to consider the case carefully and to do what may appear to be proper and right for the soldier.

Mr. MONDELL. I fear that the committee, perhaps, seeing that the man had no hospital record, concluded that he could not have been ill in the service. There is considerable testimony to the effect that he was not strong and that he was ill while in the service, but did not go to the hospital.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Where was his service?

Mr. MONDELL. He served mostly in the United States. I do not know whether he had any foreign service or not.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill as amended.

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

On motion of Mr. KEY of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bills were passed was laid on the table.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its amendments and ask for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

The Chair appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. KEY of Ohio, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. SELLS.

GLACIER PARK HOTEL CO.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 784) to authorize the sale of certain lands at or near Belton, Mont., for hotel purposes. It is an emergency, as they want to build the hotel before the spring season opens.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 784. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized to sell and convey to the Glacier Park Hotel Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Minnesota and authorized to do business in the State of Montana, its successors and assigns, for hotel purposes, and at a price to be fixed by appraisal at not less than \$25 per acre, and under such terms, conditions, and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, all that part of the south half of the northwest quarter of section 36, in township 32 north, of range 19 west, Montana principal meridian, within the following-described area: Beginning at a point on the southerly line of the right of way of the Great Northern Railway Co., 100 feet southerly from and at right angles to the center line of the main track of said railway at a point in said center line 484 feet easterly from its intersection with the west line of said section 36; thence southerly at right angles to said center line 330 feet, this course following approximately the line of the westerly fence constructed by the United States Forestry Service in 1909; thence easterly at right angles to the last-described course 672 feet; thence northerly at right angles to the last-described course to the said southerly line of right of way, this course following, approximately, the line of the easterly fence constructed by the United States Forestry Service in 1909; thence westerly along the said southerly line of the right of way of the Great Northern Railway to the place of beginning, excepting therefrom that portion within lot 8, containing 5 acres, more or less, within the Flathead National Forest, at or near Belton, Mont.: *Provided, however,* That any hotel erected on

said land shall be operated by the said Glacier Park Hotel Co., its successors and assigns, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe for the conduct and operation of hotels within the Glacier National Park.

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

SETTLEMENT OF TITLES TO LANDS IN CALIFORNIA.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 6692, on the Union Calendar, to dispose of a land matter, to give private individuals an opportunity to save the Federal Government appropriating money.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 6692.

Mr. MONDELL. Reserving the right to object, let the bill be reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 6692) to amend section 6 of an act to expedite the settlement of title to lands in the State of California.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act of Congress approved July 1, 1864, being an act entitled "An act to expedite the settlement of titles to lands in the State of California," being chapter 194 of volume 13 of the Statutes at Large, page 334, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. That it shall be the duty of the surveyor general of California to cause all the private-land claims finally confirmed to be accurately surveyed and plats thereof to be made whenever requested by the claimants: *Provided,* That each claimant requesting a survey and plat shall first deposit with the Secretary of the Interior a sufficient sum of money to pay the expenses of such survey and plat, and of the publication required by the first section of this act, and the money so deposited shall be available for expenditure by the surveyor general in payment of the expenses of such survey and plat, including all the expenses incident thereto, and of the required publication. Whenever the survey and plat requested shall have been completed and forwarded to the Commissioner of the General Land Office, as required by this act, the surveyor general shall state an account showing the exact cost of the survey, plat, and publication, and any excess deposited over such cost shall be returned to the claimant."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. NORTON and Mr. STAFFORD reserved the right to object.

Mr. MANN. I think I can explain that to the satisfaction of Members.

There is a law now that authorizes some of these private lands in California to be surveyed at the expense of the claimant of the property. The law provides that he shall pay the expense into the district court. When the survey is completed the district court may pay for the survey out of the deposit and pay back to the claimant the residue. That requires that the survey shall be made first. The district court can not pay the money until the survey is made. The only way it can be made under existing law is to make it out of the appropriation which Congress provides for public surveys. The department has held that they can not make private surveys out of the money appropriated for public surveys. And there you are. The man can deposit his money in the district court but he can not get the survey made. This permits him to deposit the money with the Secretary of the Interior, the money to be used in making the survey.

Mr. NORTON. How long has this been the law?

Mr. MANN. It has been on the statute books for a long time. The Secretary of the Interior drew this bill because there is a claim out there, and there is no way of making the survey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. FARR and Mr. CASEY, by unanimous consent, were given leave to extend remarks in the RECORD.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 24, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an amendment to the act approved June 28, 1902, relative to storekeeper gaugers (H. Doc. No. 2084); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of the Interior, submitting an item of legislation authorizing the expenditure of funds of the appropriations for the support of St. Elizabeth's Hospital (H. Doc. No. 2085); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, submitting an item of legislation under the appropriation "Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts" (H. Doc. No. 2086); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of appropriation for alteration, remodeling, etc., of the post-office, courthouse, and customhouse building, and for remodeling and repairing buildings on the site of the Federal building at Richmond, Va. (H. Doc. No. 2087); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. RAINEY, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill (S. 55) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to use at his discretion surplus moneys in the Treasury in the purchase or redemption of the outstanding interest-bearing obligations of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1541), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15400) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to lease certain property, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1544), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17806) to regulate the payment of salaries of post-office clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1545), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 21032) to authorize the Director of the Bureau of the Census under certain conditions to prepare and distribute blank ballots and to receive and count marked ballots and report to Congress the result of an advisory vote; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 21033) to amend sections 2, 13, and 14 of an act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen," and so forth, approved March 4, 1915; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 21034) excepting certain classes of manufacturers and dealers from the operation of the provisions of section 5 of H. R. 19410, making appropriation for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Resolution (H. Res. 524) directing the Comptroller of the Currency to inform Congress regarding amounts loaned on food and other necessities of life held in storage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FOSTER: Resolution (H. Res. 525) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to make an investigation and report upon the advisability of establishing and maintaining Government fuel yard or yards in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution (H. Res. 526) authorizing the President and Attorney General of the United States to issue

orders to corporations and individuals concerning control of cold storage and other large supplies of food and fuel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARKLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 527) for the consideration of Senate bill 1082; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Resolution (H. Res. 528) for the consideration of H. R. 21009; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CRAGO: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania on the subject of taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII,

Mr. GRIEST introduced a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania protesting against the imposition of Federal taxes on profits of corporations, stock companies, and so forth, and other Federal Government taxation upon sources heretofore relied upon by the States for their revenues, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII,

Mr. AUSTIN introduced a bill (H. R. 21035) granting an increase of pension to William Harris, which was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of sundry letter carriers of Altoona, Pa., favoring House bill 17806; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BEALES: Resolution of the Philadelphia Produce Exchange, opposing House bill 20573 reducing tax on oleomargarine; to the committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREW: Petitions of citizens and food embargo committee, of New York, demanding an embargo on foodstuff; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of 25,000 citizens of New York State, against war with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of joint legislative board of the State of New York, protesting against House bill 20572; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Northeastern Association of Fish and Game Commissioners, with reference to anadromous fish; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOOLING: Resolution of Massachusetts Association of Fish and Game Commissioners, relative to the control of anadromous fishes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FOCHE: Memorial on embargo on food and fuel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Petitions of the Illinois Fish and Game League and of Lottie B. Gregory, of Rockford, Ill., for the migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of R. M. Pollitt and other citizens of Oglesby, Ill., for prohibitory bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of John Sauer and 30 other citizens of Streator, Ill., to refer the question of war or peace to a popular vote; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Men's Bible Class of the First Presbyterian Church, Ottawa, Ill., for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., protesting against mail-exclusion bills and prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Caroline E. Noble, Boston, Mass., member 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, memorial of the Northeastern Association of Fish and Game Commissioners with reference to anadromous fish; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petitions of various newspapers in the sixth district of Massachusetts, relative to liquor advertisements in the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of Bankers' Association of the District of Columbia, relative to the amendments to the Sterling intangible-tax law; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of National Daylight Saving Association, favoring passage of House bill 20499, daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEISTER: Petition of 51 citizens of Butler County, Pa., favoring a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various residents of Latrobe, Pa., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of mail-exclusion bills and prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial adopted at a public meeting held at Bolivar, Pa., on February 14, 1917, favoring a national constitutional amendment to prohibit polygamy and polygamous cohabitation in the United States and dependencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial adopted at a mass meeting held at Derry, Pa., on February 15, 1917, urging a national constitutional amendment to prohibit polygamy and polygamous cohabitation in the United States and dependencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry church organizations of Pennsylvania, favoring a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINKAID: Petition of residents of Ericson, Nebr., favoring legislation to exclude liquor advertisements from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of residents of Chambers, Nebr., in opposition to the United States becoming involved in the European war and favoring a referendum vote on war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGEE: Memorial of sundry church organizations of the State of New York, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLATT: Petition of citizens of Pine Plains, Red Hook, and Elizaville, all in the State of New York, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Walden, Reason, and Middleton, N. Y., asking for submission to the States of a national prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Memorial of 403 citizens of New York, favoring passage of the food-embargo resolution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of citizens of New York City, for embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Memorial of City Council of Malden, Mass., approving the action of the President in severing diplomatic relations with the German Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROWE: Memorial of post-office employees of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring readjustment of salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, relative to Federal encroachment upon State revenue sources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Helen B. James, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of the Casey bill, relative to woman's division in Federal Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of J. M. C. Freeman, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against taxing insurance companies in revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Colgate & Co. and Frank E. Foster, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Gudrun L. Drewsen and G. H. G. Petersen, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of the migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of De Kalb Junction, N. Y., Mrs. Martha Hardy, president, Mrs. H. Humphrey, Mrs. C. R. Hedden, Mrs. S. H. Hazlone, Mrs. L. C. Rice, Delia Stevenson, Mrs. Frank Cline, Mrs. Addie Hill, Mrs. Ella Larocks, Mrs. Ora L. Tupper, Mrs. C. E. Alverson, Mrs. M. E. Westcott, Mrs. O. W. Griskill, Miss Leona Riley, Mrs. Bessie Freeman, Mrs. S. Elsey, Mrs. A. C. Farr, Mrs. John Perkins, Mrs. Frank Petrie, Mrs. C. C. Lytle, Mrs. J. S. Gilson, Miss Josephine Locklin, Mrs. E. B. Lee, Miss Lula Lee, Mrs. Sara Risley, Mrs. Dorothea R. Mitchell, Beulah P. Mitchell, Ethel G. Mitchell, Mrs. M. Saunders, Ethel Prouty, Mrs. H. Patterson, and Mrs. Cora S. Wilson, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Epworth League, De Kalb Junction, N. Y., Raymond Bishop, chairman, Ralph Bishop, Raymond Rice, Mrs. L. C. Rice, Mrs. Mary Ellis, Mrs. G. A. Bishop, Mrs. S. Geary, G. A. Bishop, Raymond G. Bishop, Mabel Carley, Evah Chapin,

Helene Rose, S. G. Carley, Ethel G. Mitchell, Roger F. Williams, Paul Hosmer, Raymond Williams, William L. Redmond, Grace Andrews, Ord K. Lobdell, A. J. Tyner, Roger Williams, Earl H. Bishop, John Prouty, Roy S. Bishop, and William Redmond, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Judiciary.

Also, petition of Methodist Episcopal Church, De Kalb Junction, N. Y., H. M. McGrun, S. G. Carley, George Elsey, sr., William P. Sham, Iona Rose, Ralph Bishop, Earl H. Bishop, Earl G. Bishop, Raymond Rice, Raymond Bishop, L. C. Rice, G. A. Bishop, Mrs. G. A. Bishop, J. A. Carson, Mrs. George Elsey, jr., Mrs. T. Hosmer, Mrs. D. H. Roulston, Albert Hosmer, H. L. Paterson, L. L. Rasey, Macey L. Patterson, Mrs. Stevenson, Mrs. Taylor, Mrs. Nora Robinson, Mrs. L. C. Rice, Victor Bishop, Mabel Carley, Wesley H. Rice, Paul Hosmer, Everett Gardner, William Alkerton, Dorothea R. Mitchell, Helena B. Patterson, Mrs. Edwin Lee, Mrs. William Olkerton, John Prouty, Ethel Mitchell, Harold Patterson, Raymond Williams, George Soper, Raymond Monthorp, Robert C. Hayes, Guy W. Roulston, Otto B. Davis, Myrtle Penney, Mrs. Ellis, Ruth Elsey, Mrs. James Tanner, and Helena Rose, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of Congregation of Christ Episcopal Church of Pottstown, Pa., calling on Congress to provide for the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 24, 1917.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, February 20, 1917.)

The Senate reassembled at 10.30 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator permit me to introduce a bill before he demands a call?

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator can do that after a quorum is here. 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:

Bryan	Hughes	Norris	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Oliver	Swanson
Clark	Jones	Overman	Thomas
Colt	Kenyon	Penrose	Vardaman
Culberson	Kirby	PoinDEXTER	Walsh
Cummins	La Follette	Sheppard	Warren
Curtis	Lane	Sherman	Watson
Dillingham	Lea, Tenn.	Simmons	Weeks
Fernald	Lodge	Smith, Ga.	Weeks
Fletcher	McCumber	Smith, Mich.	
Gronna	McLean	Smoot	
Hollis	Martin, Va.	Stone	

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. He is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. I wish to state that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is detained from the Senate by illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. CLAPP, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. KERN, Mr. REED, Mr. SHAFROTH, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. STERLING, and Mr. UNDERWOOD answered to their names when called.

Mr. DU PONT, Mr. BRADY, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. SHIELDS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

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

DANISH WEST INDIAN ISLANDS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, with the consent of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], I desire to have the conference report on the Danish West Indian Islands government bill laid before the Senate.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no objection, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 20755) to provide a temporary government for the West Indian Islands acquired by the United States from Denmark by the convention entered into between said countries on the 4th day of August, 1916, and ratified by the Senate

of the United States on the 7th day of September, 1917, and for other purposes.

Mr. STONE. I ask for the adoption of the conference report. The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. STONE. I should like to say that I would be glad to have the action of the Senate reported to the House of Representatives as soon as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The House of Representatives will be notified of the action of the Senate on the conference report.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask my colleague if he will consent that the Senate now take up the conference report on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill (H. R. 18542) and have the report adopted?

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator anticipate that it will lead to any debate?

Mr. OVERMAN. There may be some questions asked regarding it; but I do not think it will lead to any extensive debate.

Mr. SIMMONS. I dislike very much to interfere with the consideration of a conference report upon one of the great appropriation bills—

Mr. OVERMAN. This is a very important bill, as the Senator knows.

Mr. SIMMONS. But I should not like to have matter injected here that would consume much time.

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to say that this is a full agreement. Of course, the Senate now having the bill must first act upon it, and then it will have to go to the House. I should like to have the report taken up at this time.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the Senator agree if the report leads to prolonged discussion to withdraw it?

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not see how it can lead to much discussion.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I hope the Senator from North Carolina will not insist upon taking up that conference report in the midst of the consideration of the revenue bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. It will have to be acted upon, if we are to get it through at this session.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It will precipitate considerable debate. There are some very important questions involved in it.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not see how it can lead to much debate. The conference report has already been once before the Senate, and the Senate has heretofore agreed to most of the items in it. When the report was heretofore presented it was sent back to conference, as the Senator remembers, and there is nothing now that the Senate can do except to agree to the report or not to agree to it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I recall the matter of the so-called Smoot amendment, and there are other matters of importance in the bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. There was a test vote on that, resulting 70 to 4.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. OVERMAN. I say that the former report has been heretofore considered, as the Senator remembers, and the Senate refused to agree to it, and sent it back to conference. Now the conferees come back and report a complete agreement.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand the situation. Now the conference report is before the Senate for an agreement.

Mr. OVERMAN. For final agreement. In other words, the Senate is not in a position to make any fight on the Smoot amendment, because the House has agreed to the Senate action, and the Senate can not take up that question now.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not desire to argue that question, but I do desire to argue some other questions involved in the report.

Mr. OVERMAN. I know what the Senator is alluding to, and I do not see why we should not take it up and get through with it, because if we are going to have an appropriation bill at all it has to go to the House of Representatives. It is here, and it has to be acted on there before it can become a law. It may go over there and not be agreed to, and then we will be without a bill on the subject. I hope the Senator will agree to let it come up.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There are a great many other appropriation bills, of course; but I understand that the intention is to pass the revenue bill before adjournment.