

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

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

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

Mr. WEEKS subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to say one word which I did not have an opportunity to say on account of what seemed to me to be the haste of the proceedings relative to the passage of the Post Office bill.

I do not propose to take any definite time to discuss what has transpired in connection with this bill, but I should not be doing justice to myself if I did not enter my protest against the action which has destroyed several millions of dollars of property and has destroyed the mail facilities in five of the largest cities of this country, and those cities produce a net revenue of sixty-odd millions of dollars a year. There is not, and never has been, a word of testimony against that service from any man who has been getting the benefit of it, but, on the contrary, universal testimony in favor of its continuance.

In the name of those people who have been paying such a large revenue to the Government for all these years, and who wish the service of the pneumatic tubes continued, I enter my protest against the high-handed method which has been adopted in this connection, destroying the property of the companies and destroying the mail facilities of the people who have been enjoying them.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. GORE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 11945.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will not press his motion at this late hour.

Mr. GORE. I will say to the Senator that my purpose was to ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and then to ask to lay it aside.

Mr. PENROSE. Does the Senator from Oklahoma intend to proceed with the consideration of the measure this evening?

Mr. GORE. I will say to the Senator that my purpose was to have that motion adopted, ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and then request unanimous consent to temporarily lay it aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment. The Chair understands that a moment ago the Senate, by unanimous consent, agreed that the unfinished business should go over until 12 o'clock on Monday. The Chair will rule that, without unanimous consent, what the Senator from Oklahoma proposes can not be done.

Mr. PENROSE. I object.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, it can not be done.

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I submit a report from the conference committee on the naval bill and ask for its immediate consideration. It will take but a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report will be read. 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. 10854) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, 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 37, 47, 52, and 170.

B. R. TILLMAN,  
CLAUDE A. SWANSON,  
JOHN WALTER SMITH,  
BOIES PENROSE,  
H. C. LODGE,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

L. P. PADGETT,  
J. FRED C. TALBOTT,  
D. J. RIORDAN,  
THOMAS S. BUTLER,  
WILLIAM J. BROWNING,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

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

The report was agreed to.

#### MICHIGAN AVENUE CONDUIT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I ask the permission of the Senate to allow the consideration of a bill that will take but a minute. It merely gives permission to lay a conduit in the

street toward one of the buildings of the Catholic University. I present it at the instance of the Committee on the District of Columbia. It carries no appropriation nor anything of the kind. It merely grants permission to place pipes under a street to convey heat from one part of the University to another.

Mr. PENROSE. Let it be read for information, Mr. President.

Mr. LEWIS. Yes; of course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill. The Secretary read the bill (S. 3929), as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized to grant permission to the Catholic University of America to lay a conduit for the transmission of power from their power house under and across Michigan Avenue northeast between Harewood Road and Brookland Avenue, in the District of Columbia, into and upon the property of the associated professors of St. Mary's Seminary, of Baltimore, Md., known as the Sulpician College, under the regulations and subject to the limitations prescribed in the act entitled "An act regulating permits for private conduits in the District of Columbia," approved May 26, 1900.

Sec. 2. That Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there 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.

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

#### RECESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m., Saturday, June 29, 1918) the Senate took a recess until Monday, July 1, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, June 29, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our God and our Father, for that friend toward the higher civilization, which has ever characterized us as a Nation, we lift up our hearts in love and praise and beseech Thee to continue that inspiration to grander heights of glory, until we indeed shall become the ideal Nation of the earth, and to Thee we shall ascribe all praise in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, was received.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, 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 bill of the following title:

H. R. 12441. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes.

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 bill of the following title:

S. 1553. An act to give effect to the convention between the United States and Great Britain for the protection of migratory birds, concluded at Washington, August 16, 1916, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2104) to amend sections 4402, 4404, and 4414 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 2104. An act to amend sections 4402, 4404, and 4414 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

#### EXPEDITING APPROPRIATION BILLS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wants to make a very short announcement, and that is that so far as he can act as a steering committee he is going to have the right of way given to

these appropriation bills and such things as must be signed to-day or make trouble. The Chair thinks everybody agrees that that should be done. [Applause.]

CONFERENCE REPORT ON SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the sundry civil bill (H. R. 12441) and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BROWNE rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BROWNE. To ask that the gentleman from Kentucky yield to me a moment while I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in regard to war legislation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in regard to war legislation. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FARM CONDITIONS.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to briefly extend my remarks on farm conditions—the farm and the farmer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on farm conditions. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are the gentleman's own remarks?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes; they are my own remarks, but they include brief resolutions passed by a grange. The whole article will not take up more than a column of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House and the administrative authorities to some resolutions adopted by one of the granges in my district, and to be permitted to make just a few brief observations relative thereto.

The success of this terrible war depends not alone on the men in the trenches. Our brave boys can not fight the Huns on empty stomachs. We must feed and clothe them, and do it well. To whom do we look for these mighty resources but to the farm and the man who farms the farm? I believe the American farmer is bending every energy to meet the heavy requirements now upon him, notwithstanding the fact that the farm boys are being called in great numbers to the colors and the harvest is ripe and the laborers are few. I have oftentimes doubted whether or not we are giving the farmer the encouragement justly due him. We fix the price on many of the things he produces, but do we give enough consideration while in the fixing business to the things the farmer must buy in order to produce the necessities of civil and military life?

I was born on a farm and am proud to own and operate the farm my grandfather cleared up and settled a century ago. I think, therefore, that I have first-hand knowledge of farm life and farm conditions. The daylight law does not affect the farmer. You can turn the clock forward or backward by legislation as you like, but it is before sunup until after the sun has sunk in the west with the American farmer. While we are crowding and urging the farmer to produce, produce, and still keep on producing more and more, let us see to it that he gets a fair shake and a fair deal. Inquire what the farmer has to pay for his binder and binder twine and machinery of all kinds. Labor is from two to three times more than in prewar times. The farmer made as much money before the war as he can make now with wool at \$1 per pound and wheat at \$2.50 to \$2.75 per bushel. There is no doubt about the truth of this statement.

I have voted to increase the pay of the laboring man, the Government clerks, the rural carriers, et al., because I believed they were entitled to have their pay increased, but I beg of you, my friends who represent the great industrial centers and know but little about the conditions on the farm, to not forget "Old Rube" back on the farm, who is bending his back to carry the great load upon him. He feels satisfied and happy when he cleans up a thousand or two per annum for investment in his farm, and throws in his own labor and that of his faithful wife and children for good measure. There are no millionaire farmers. Let's fix the other fellow up some and give the faithful farmer and his household a chance to take a half holiday.

But my granger friends tell their own story better than I can tell it for them in the following resolutions:

NEW LONDON, OHIO, June 14, 1918.

WILLIAM A. ASHBROOK, M. C.

DEAR SIR: We ask, Why isn't the farmer entitled to the same interest on his investment as the city man? Industrial enterprises pay 7 per cent on their preferred stock and often more on their common, but the farmer who can get 6 per cent on his investment is mighty lucky.

When a big business concern wants to make an improvement or extension, they are safe in doing so, knowing they can increase the price of their output and soon get back the money expended for improvements. The farmer has to take just what is offered when he sells and pay what is asked when he buys.

Is there any business man under the sun who is denied the privilege of naming his selling price and thereby being sure of at least the cost of production?

We, the members of Ruggles Grange, No. 2119, of Ashland County, Ohio, have—

*Resolved*, That we should be granted a better price for our products, that we may have a small profit above cost of production. We understand that a fixed price is to be paid on all wool in the hands of producers.

*Resolved*, That while we recognize the exigencies of war and yield to none in patriotism and love of our country, yet we nevertheless appeal for an impartial hearing before the War Industries Board on the sale and movement of wool from the producer to the consumer, and we request this honorable board to withhold final decision upon this vital subject as to the methods of sale and prices until such hearings are completed.

We ask our lawmaking body to not curtail the selling price of our products without doing the same on articles we must buy, to wit: Machinery, fertilizer, twine, clothing, etc.

It is of great importance that the farmer be able to sell his products at a living profit if he continues to raise wheat and wool or takes a vacation in raising these commodities.

Very respectfully,

E. J. CRITTENDEN,  
J. M. FAIR,  
M. G. GITON,

Committee on Resolutions.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL (NO. 723).

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the statement will be read in lieu of the report.

There was no objection.

The statement was read.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12441) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, 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 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18, 20, 28, 29, 34, 35, 39, 40, 41, 45, 50, 53, 54, 59, 60, 69, 70, 71, and 72.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 7, 9, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 36, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61, 66, 67, and 68, 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 "\$1,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$10,500,000"; 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: Transpose the matter inserted by said amendment to follow the sum "\$300,000" in line 9, on page 96, of the bill, amended to read as follows: "Provided, That any license issued under the act of October 6, 1917, may be canceled by the Director of the Bureau of Mines if the person to whom such license was issued shall, after notice and an opportunity to be heard, be found to have violated any of the provisions of the act: *Provided further*, That platinum, iridium, and palladium and compounds thereof are hereby made subject to the terms, conditions, and limitations of said act of October 6, 1917, and the Director of the Bureau of Mines is hereby authorized, under rules and regulations approved by the Secretary of the Interior, to limit the sale, possession, and the use of said material"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: 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: Restore the language stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "Four-fifths of the two preceding sums shall be paid out of the Treasury of the United States and the other one-fifth out of the revenues of the District of Columbia"; 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 sum proposed insert "\$2,995,285"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following:

"For an investigation to be made by the Director of the Reclamation Service of the reclamation by drainage of lands outside existing reclamation projects and of the reclamation and preparation for cultivation of cut-over timberlands in any of the States of the United States, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase, maintenance, repair, hire, and operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger vehicles, and for all other expenses, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$100,000."

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 sum proposed in said amendment insert the sum "\$5,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Protection of the Capitol during the period of the war: For an additional uniformed police force during the period of the war for the protection of the Capitol Building and Grounds, the Senate and House Office Buildings, and the Capitol power plant, and for emergencies, and each and every item incident thereto, \$30,000, one-half to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half by the Clerk of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That the appointment to the positions herein provided shall be made by the Sergeants at Arms of the two Houses and the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds and shall be made solely on account of efficiency and special qualifications."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 8 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the words "until expended" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "during the fiscal year 1919"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "purchase, exchange, care, and maintenance of a motor-propelled vehicle"; and the Senate agree to the same.

SWAGAR SHERLEY,  
JAMES F. BYRNES,  
F. W. MONDELL,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

THOMAS S. MARTIN,  
LEE S. OVERMAN,  
O. W. UNDERWOOD,  
F. E. WARREN,  
J. H. GALLINGER,

*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. 12441) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, 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 said amendments, namely:

On No. 1: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, extending the appropriation for post allowances to diplomatic and

consular officers for the fiscal year 1919, to include diplomatic and consular officers regardless of where stationed, and also to the officers of the United States courts in China.

On Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5, relating to public buildings: Strikes out the appropriation of \$150,000, proposed by the Senate, for the Honolulu, Hawaii, post office; inserts the appropriation of \$272,000, proposed by the Senate, for the New York assay office; strikes out the appropriation of \$70,000 for the Paris, Tex., post office; and strikes out the appropriation of \$68,200 for additional boilers and equipment for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

On Nos. 6 and 7, relating to marine hospitals: Strikes out the appropriation of \$15,000, proposed by the Senate, for repairs to the old marine hospital at Cincinnati, Ohio, and provides \$4,000 for a refrigerating plant at the marine hospital at Mobile, Ala.

On Nos. 8, 9, 10, and 11: Strikes out the appropriations, proposed by the Senate, for the quarantine stations at Cape Charles, Va., Reedy Island, Del., and Savannah, Ga.; increases the appropriation for wire fencing at the Port Townsend, Wash., quarantine station from \$600 to \$1,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 12 and 13: Strikes out the authority, proposed by the Senate, permanently placing warrant officers of the Coast Guard on the same basis as warrant officers of the Navy in respect to pay and allowances.

On Nos. 14 and 15, relating to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing: Appropriates \$1,800,000 instead of \$1,731,600, as proposed by the House, and \$2,039,118, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries of employees other than plate printers and plate-printers' assistants, and appropriates \$2,000,000 instead of \$1,930,000, as proposed by the House, and \$2,100,600, as proposed by the Senate, for wages of plate printers and plate-printers' assistants.

On No. 16: Appropriates \$10,500,000 instead of \$10,200,000, as proposed by the House, and \$10,900,000, as proposed by the Senate, for expenses of the Customs Service.

On No. 17: Inserts the language, proposed by the Senate, requiring the report of receipts and expenditures under the appropriation for the Committee on Public Information to contain a list of employees and the salaries paid to them.

On No. 18: Strikes out the increase, proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to keep informed regarding, and to enforce compliance with, the acts to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads.

On Nos. 19 and 20, relating to the Advisory Committee for Aeronautics: Authorizes, as proposed by the Senate, the use of \$10,300 for printing and binding the bibliography of aeronautics; restores the language, stricken out by the Senate, requiring the Secretary of War to house the committee in Government buildings occupied by the Signal Corps.

On Nos. 21, 22, and 23, relating to the emergency shipping fund: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that the appropriation for plants for shipbuilding shall be available for ship maintenance or repair; increases from \$50,000,000 to \$75,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for housing; appropriates \$20,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, to carry out the act authorizing the President to take over certain transportation systems in connection with shipbuilding.

On No. 24: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that the appropriation for the disposition of remains of officers, soldiers, and civilian employees shall be available for the disposition of the remains of retired officers and retired enlisted men who die while on active duty.

On No. 25: Inserts the appropriation of \$10,000, proposed by the Senate, for a ferry line in the vicinity of Seventh and Water Streets to East Potomac Park.

On No. 26: Appropriates \$8,100, as proposed by the Senate, for installing a water main across the new Aqueduct Bridge.

On Nos. 27 and 63: Appropriates \$30,000 for additional protection to the Capitol Buildings and Grounds, as proposed by the House, modified so as to require the appropriation to be disbursed one-half by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half by the Clerk of the House, and that appointments to the force shall be made by the Sergeants at Arms of the two Houses and the Superintendent of the Capitol, and shall be made solely on account of efficiency and special qualifications.

On Nos. 28 and 42: Appropriates \$100,000, as proposed by the House, for an investigation of the reclamation of lands by drainage, modified so as to include drainage of lands in public-land States outside of existing reclamation projects and in other States and the reclamation of cut-over timberlands.

On No. 29: Restores the language, stricken out by the Senate, providing for 10 supervisors of surveys, at \$250 per month each, in the Public Lands Service.

On Nos. 30, 31, and 32: Appropriates \$2,500 for a disbursing clerk in the Geological Survey, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38, relating to the Bureau of Mines: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the Director of the Bureau of Mines to cancel licenses issued under the explosives act of October 6, 1917, and provides that platinum, iridium, palladium, and compounds thereof, shall be subject to the terms of that act; strikes out the increase of \$100,000, proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for the investigation of ores and other mineral substances; strikes out the increase of \$50,000, proposed by the Senate, for mining experiment stations; inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, prohibiting the use of any of the money for a Government fuel yard for the purpose of taking over or interfering with yards or coal dumps that have been used during the past year by coal dealers for supplying the general public; and provides that the appropriations for the establishment of the coal yard shall be paid four-fifths from the Treasury and one-fifth from the revenues of the District of Columbia, instead of half and half, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 39, 40, and 41, relating to the Reclamation Service: Restores the language, stricken out by the Senate, prohibiting the use of the appropriation for Rio Grande irrigation project for drainage except in irrigation districts formed under State laws, and strikes out the increase of \$20,000, proposed by the Senate, for cooperative and other miscellaneous investigations.

On Nos. 43 and 44: Appropriates \$25,000, as proposed by the Senate, for repairing roads in Yellowstone Park and in the adjoining forest reserves from the Lake Hotel to the Cody entrance.

On No. 45: Strikes out the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, reappropriating the appropriation for 1918 for the Mount Rainier National Park.

On Nos. 46 and 47: Appropriates \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$150,000, as proposed by the House, for a bathhouse at the Hot Springs Reservation, Ark.

On Nos. 48 and 49: Appropriates \$20,000, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$15,000, as proposed by the House, for expenses of the department of manual arts of the Howard University.

On Nos. 50 and 51, relating to the Department of Justice: Restores the language, stricken out by the Senate, directing the Department of Justice to expedite the final determination of suits to set aside conveyances of allotted lands for the removal of restrictions on allotted lands belonging to the Five Civilized Tribes and increases the appropriation for law books from \$90 to \$112.50, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 52, 53, 54, and 55, relating to the United States courts: Appropriates \$660,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$620,000, as proposed by the House, for the salaries of district attorneys and expenses of their offices; provides a maximum of \$3,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$3,500, as proposed by the Senate, for regular assistant district attorneys; appropriates \$175,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$200,000, as proposed by the Senate, for assistants to the Attorney General in special cases.

On No. 56: Appropriates \$90,000, as proposed by the Senate, for a lighthouse depot in Alaska.

On Nos. 57 and 58, relating to the Bureau of Fisheries: Appropriates \$400,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$375,000, as proposed by the House, for the propagation of food fishes, and inserts the appropriation of \$5,000, proposed by the Senate, for the establishment of an auxiliary station on Lake Champlain.

On No. 59: Strikes out the appropriation of \$32,000, proposed by the Senate, for additional land for the Bureau of Standards.

On No. 60: Appropriates \$2,450,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Immigration Service.

On Nos. 61, 62, and 63, relating to the employment of labor in connection with the war: Inserts the language, proposed by the Senate, making the appropriation available to aid in the standardization of wages paid by the Government; provides that appropriations for payment of wages shall not be available to pay wages in excess of the standardization determined upon by the War Labor Policies Board; and appropriates \$5,500,000 instead of \$1,500,000, as proposed by the House, and \$7,590,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 64: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, continuing the unexpended balance of the appropriation heretofore made for the Joint Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

On No. 65: Inserts the language, proposed by the Senate, modified so as to provide for a motor-propelled vehicle for the Botanic Gardens.

On Nos. 66 and 67, relating to the Senate Office Building: Appropriates for maintenance and furniture for the Senate Office Building, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 68: Appropriates \$41,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Senate kitchens and restaurants.

On No. 69: Strikes out the appropriation of \$20,000, proposed by the Senate, for the restoration of the historical frieze in the Rotunda of the Capitol.

On Nos. 70, 71, and 72, relating to the office of superintendent of documents: Strikes out the two additional clerks at \$900, proposed by the Senate; strikes out the increase in pay, proposed by the Senate, for 24 clerks from \$840 to \$900 each.

SWAGAR SHERLEY,  
JAMES F. BYRNES,  
F. W. MONDELL,

*Manager on the part of the House.*

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Washington rise?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I want to see if I can secure time to ask a question of the chairman in charge of the bill (H. R. 12441) in connection with the sundry civil bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] is recognized for an hour.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will wait, I would like to make a statement to the House, and then I will yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amended this sundry civil bill, considering its size, perhaps less than any other sundry civil bill has been amended in a great many years. There were 72 amendments. With the exception of three of them, there was none of major importance, considering the matters that we are dealing with in the bill.

They added in round figures about \$53,000,000 to the bill. Of that amount \$45,000,000 was represented in two items in connection with the shipping program, \$25,000,000 being an increase in appropriations and authorizations for the housing of employees incident to their work and \$20,000,000 being for transportation purposes in connection with the housing program. There was also added in connection with the program of the Labor Bureau an increase from \$1,500,000 to \$7,000,000 in connection with the employment of labor.

Those increases made a total of about \$52,000,000. The other increases were scattered over a number of items and amounted to not a great deal, the detail of which is set out in the statement and in the report.

The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment touching the shipping program. In point of fact, the need for these increases had been brought to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations too late to be considered in connection with the bill, but they were of sufficient importance for the committee to suggest that they be taken up in the Senate committee, where a statement as to the needs could be made and where, if the Senate thought it necessary to make the appropriations, the matter could then be dealt with in conference. The Senate did feel that the increase of \$25,000,000 for housing and \$20,000,000 for transportation in connection with the housing was warranted.

In point of fact, the testimony before the committee showed that they had already allotted more than the amount of money that had been given them, and that they had not solved the problem and could not solve it for the money that was allowed as the bill passed the House. They also were in doubt as to whether the language that authorized them to deal with this housing program permitted the dealing with it by an increase in the facilities for transportation, and yet it had developed that that was one of the economical and desirable methods.

What was meant by that is this: There are a number of places where, by aiding transportation companies in affording transportation facilities for laborers, they brought into the usable field areas where housing could be obtained that otherwise could not be used by the employees in connection with the work at the shipping plants.

In regard to the labor situation, I would like to state that there has been a very unfortunate condition the country over, known to everybody who has kept up at all with the industrial program that this country was facing. We have had to revolutionize in many particulars the industrial activity of this country. We have had to divert labor that in peace time was employed in work which was much to be desired, and yet which in war times was not permissible if the work of the Nation was to be done in the prosecution of this war. That has resulted in throwing out of adjustment all the old-time conditions in connection with the demand and supply of labor, and with the disruption of the old status grew up a situation of com-

petitive bidding on the part of different departments of the Government and different industries of the country which resulted repeatedly in increasing the price of labor and in causing undue movement and turnover in labor.

Labor agents were going over the country seeking to obtain labor needed by their respective industries, and in order to obtain it outbidding the people where the labor was employed. The result was that there were any number of instances in which war activities had labor taken away for some other war activity, and then in turn outbidding the men who had first outbid them they brought that labor back, and we had the spectacle of dozens and dozens of agencies in this country, some of them governmental agencies, maintaining expensive bureaus to obtain supplies of labor and interfering most seriously with the production of the country by this constant shifting of labor from one center to another. The matter became so acute that it was necessary to take some drastic action by the Government. That action has been taken. The President has issued a proclamation requesting all of the manufacturers of the country after August to desist from endeavoring on their own initiative to obtain laborers, requesting that they apply only to the Government for the labor that may be necessary; and with that order has come a centralization into one source of the entire activities of the Government touching the recruiting of labor. Instead of the ordinance people and the shipping people and numerous other bureaus undertaking to have labor agencies, it has all now been centered in the Department of Labor. Part of that program had come into existence at the time that the hearings were held before the Committee on Appropriations of the House, and for the purpose of establishing governmental agencies looking to the employment of labor and the distribution of it as it might be needed, the sum of \$2,000,000 was asked at that time before that committee. The committee reported in favor of \$1,500,000, and that amount was acquiesced in by the House and was carried into the bill. After the hearing was had before the House committee, and prior to the hearings before the Senate committee, it was determined not only to centralize the procurement and distribution of labor for governmental purposes in one department, but there was determined upon the cessation on the part of individual manufacturers of any effort to obtain labor.

That meant a tremendous enlargement of the field of activities that had to be occupied by the Department of Labor in connection with the mobilization and distribution of labor. Accordingly, they asked an additional amount of \$7,600,000, which amount was allowed by the Senate committee and approved by the Senate. The matter then went into conference. The conferees have agreed on a sum of \$5,500,000. It was strenuously insisted on the part of the Senate conferees that the entire amount requested was needed. I believe the House conferees have an appreciation of this problem. It is in some respects the greatest problem that confronts this Nation, and upon its correct solution depends absolutely the full carrying out of the plans of the Government in the prosecution of this war.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, I should like to conclude my general statement and then I will be glad to yield.

The House conferees would not in any way minimize the importance of the work to be undertaken, and we have agreed to that part of the Senate amendment which carries some legislation looking to the enforcement of the determination that will be arrived at by the War Labor Policies Board touching the amounts of money that should be paid. That will be found in this language:

*Provided*, That no money now or hereafter appropriated for the payment of wages not fixed by statute shall be available to pay wages in excess of the standard determined upon by the War Labor Policies Board.

The reason for that is not only to provide agencies for getting labor but to see to it that when a scale is agreed upon as a result of the activities of the War Labor Policies Board it shall not then be disregarded by any department of the Government in any way, so as to provide absolutely that the bidding of department against department shall cease and that the zeal of men to accomplish their particular work shall not carry them away from a national policy, to the detriment of the work of other departments and of other men.

Touching the amount of money that was needed by the Department of Labor in establishing agencies, there was, of course, room for difference of opinion, and, as I stated, the Senate insisted that the full amount of \$7,600,000 should be allowed. We believed that it was impossible to spend that amount of money wisely at once in connection with this work, and that if we were mistaken in that view the situation could be readily met by Congress at its next session, but that to give now the

total amount asked was to invite an expenditure that in every instance would not be wise. It is one thing to establish agencies; it is another thing to consider that it is necessary to have an agency started everywhere with paid employees for the carrying out of the work. My own belief is—and I hope it will be the policy of Mr. Densmore, who has charge of this employment department—that there can be obtained in every State of this Union men of very great capacity who will gladly give their services in connection with the carrying out of this most important work in their respective States, just as they have done it in connection with the Food and the Fuel Administrations, and that thereby we will get men of a caliber, experience, and talent that can not be hoped for at salaries which the Government could or would pay, and that then, under these men, can be put such paid employees as are necessary to do the merely clerical work in connection with the carrying out of the program. We therefore insisted upon a reduction of the amount. We might have been willing to go lower than the amount stated, but the amount that has been fixed was the one finally agreed upon between the conferees of the two Houses after several days of very strenuous discussion touching the matter.

Mr. NOLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield first to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], and then I will yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I should like to inquire in reference to the standardization of wages. I have gathered from the gentleman's very clear and full statement that the activities of this branch of the Department of Labor extend over three things: First, the procuring and regulating of employees for Government work; second, the procuring and regulating of employees for private manufacturing concerns; and third—and this the gentleman has not touched upon, but it is suggested by the language of the bill—the standardization of wages. It is proposed by this that the War Labor Policies Board shall have the power, if it finds wages paid in any particular place not high enough in their judgment, to have hearings and raise the wages?

Mr. SHERLEY. It would have the power to fix the wage that should be paid by any governmental agency engaged in governmental work, the idea being that where the work was similar in character, instead of leaving the wages to vary, as they have in the past, to standardize them.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If that is to be done, and I am willing to admit that it is highly important work and ought to be done, the idea of it is an extremely difficult thing to carry out, and the board having it in charge should be composed of the highest type of men. Can the gentleman inform the House as to the character of the men which will compose it?

Mr. SHERLEY. The board is composed of representatives of the Shipping Board, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Railroad Administration, and the Agricultural Department.

I say to the gentleman that Mr. Densmore, who has charge of these employment agencies in the mobilization of labor, has nothing directly to do with the War Labor Policies Board, except that it is expected that through his agency he will be able to give to the board information as to rates of wages, conditions of labor, and supply of labor to aid them in the administration of their problem.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If the board is to have charge, as indicated by the gentleman, of labor in Government work and practically of private manufacturers, that pretty nearly gives Government control of the labor of the country.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course they have no power to determine by any legislation here or elsewhere the wage that shall be paid by private establishments. They can indirectly effect it, of course. The President has no power under the proclamation to compel the private manufacturers to secure such labor as they desire through governmental agency.

But the President has requested it by proclamation, and I have no doubt that the patriotism of the employees generally will cause them to acquiesce in the proclamation issued. He has of course indirect power. The Government by virtue of its control over priority, over fuel, over material needed by the manufacturers, can interfere with manufacture by denying them the fuel or material they want, and they could very easily be compelled to acquiesce in the policy of the Government. In point of fact, there is no doubt in my mind that we have reached the point where there will have to be a very marked curtailment of the activities of manufacturers engaged in non-essential manufactures.

I called attention on this floor a few days after the war was declared to the fact that "business as usual," which was

the cry that went up in England when the war broke out, which was the cry that was echoed here in America, was a vicious cry, and that it could not be permitted to be the policy of the Nation if we were to do the real work of winning this war.

The industrial capacity of America is not equal to the burden of carrying on the tremendous work of the Nation in prosecuting this war, and at the same time carry on a lot of industries that were perfectly proper in normal peace times, but which now can only exist at the expense of the efficiency of the Nation. The only mistake we have made has been a mistake in delay in enforcing that policy, just as we are going to be forced to the other policy of heavy taxation, that I at the same time spoke of, if we are to preserve the credit of this Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. One question more. The result of this would be that the Government board would practically fix the wages of labor throughout the United States.

Mr. SHERLEY. I hope that will be true.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. NOLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. NOLAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asked the question if this would not be a standardizing of wages in the war industries. The chairman is aware of the fact that in the shipyards the wages are standardized from the Pacific to the Atlantic coast?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. NOLAN. And along that line the effort is to standardize wages.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is an extension of that idea.

Mr. NOLAN. One other question: In relation to the State agencies for cooperation, the gentleman is aware of the fact that quite a number of men are directors in the United States employment that are not under salary?

Mr. SHERLEY. There are some, but as far as possible we ought to obtain in each State men of the first caliber of ability to administer this important work in these respects.

Mr. NOLAN. I call attention to the fact that in California we have a State employment service which is cooperating with the United States employment service.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is one reason why we did not think that they needed \$7,500,000. This is as much money as is being given to the entire Food Administration, and is considerably more money than is given to the Fuel Administration.

We thought it was a false perspective that could lead to a belief that so much money was required for this work at this time.

Mr. NOLAN. Although the gentleman understands that their work is being extended into almost every avenue?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do so understand it.

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

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman has touched on what I was going to ask. I would like to ask him, more definitely, whether it is the intention of this War Labor Policies Board to standardize or attempt to standardize, by moral suasion or otherwise, the wages of men employed in private factories throughout the country?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think it is, and I think it is necessary if the scheme is to go through. If you are to have private establishments paying a higher wage, and by a higher wage bidding against the Government, to that extent you are going to have interference with Government work.

Mr. MAPES. This board will attempt to increase the wages where the board thinks the wages are too low and to lower them where it thinks the wages are too high?

Mr. SHERLEY. Perhaps I can answer that by saying they propose to standardize the wages.

Mr. MADDEN. They will not lower them.

Mr. SHERLEY. I hope they will standardize them both ways where the facts warrant it.

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Miss RANKIN. Will this board attempt to standardize the wages of Government employees when those wages have been fixed by statute?

Mr. SHERLEY. It could not. Where the wages have been fixed by statute, the statute controls.

Miss RANKIN. And could the board go into bureaus and departments and standardize the wages there?

Mr. SHERLEY. I presume, where those wages are the result not of statute but of agreement, it could; but I say in answer to the lady's inquiry that that is not the real problem confronting the Government. It is a negligible problem compared with the real problem of wages in industry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am sure that the entire membership of the House appreciates the hard and heavy work done by the Committee on Appropriations. The statement just made by the chairman with regard to the Labor Utilities Bureau is of great importance, and is of interest to all of us. It will be read with interest by the people of the entire Nation. The Committee on Appropriations has had much work to do in connection with the war. It has had to name appropriations without stint for actual war work, and it has had to stand firm against demands for appropriations on account of "near" war work. And then it had to examine all the other requests for appropriations for the general expenditures of the Government—a much wider range than the public generally understands. This will be made quite clear when I ask the chairman, after he has just finished the statement he has made, in regard to a minor item, amendment numbered 45, inserted by the Senate, providing that the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$75,000 made in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1918 for Mount Rainier National Park shall be made available for the fiscal year 1919.

Mr. SHERLEY. The reason the House did not carry that item was because the testimony before the committee was that prior to the 1st of July the park authorities would have expended the money. The Senate was misinformed as to that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is, the park board found a chance to expend the money prior to the 1st of July of this year?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. There is another amendment, No. 28, to which I desire to direct attention, the insertion of the words "and cut-over timberlands" in regard to an appropriation of \$100,000 respecting investigations concerning the reclaiming of swamp lands.

Mr. SHERLEY. The difference between the Senate and the House was this: The House inserted language, which I explained at the time the bill was pending, for the purpose of having an investigation made by the Reclamation Service touching lands that by drainage could be made usable, and concerning which it might be desirable to have drained in order to give to returning soldiers a field of useful activity. The Senate committee cut that out, but on the floor an amendment was offered and agreed to substantially the same as the House amendment, except that it made clear that such investigation and survey should be not only of lands that might be reclaimed by drainage, but also of cut-over lands, and provided that the survey should be under the Secretary of the Interior. The House agreed to the Senate amendment with this change only: That it should be, as it had been in the House provision, under the head of the Reclamation Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let me call attention to the fact that a large part of the cut-over lands and, of course, all of those owned by the Government are in the forest reserves, and the forest reserves are under control of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SHERLEY. There is nothing here that interferes with the survey of those lands, and all that is provided is a survey.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And it can be carried into the forest-reserve projects?

Mr. SHERLEY. It can be anywhere in the United States.

By unanimous consent, Mr. JOHNSON of Washington was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. WALDOW. Do I understand the gentleman correctly to make the statement that the bill carries \$53,000,000 in addition to the amount carried by the bill as it passed the House?

Mr. SHERLEY. I could not give to the gentleman the amount exactly, because I have had very little time to verify my memory, but the Senate added approximately \$53,000,000, and we have cut out of that something like \$3,000,000.

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

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I direct the attention of the chairman of the committee to amendment No. 33, which has to do with the Bureau of Mines. We have heard much in the House recently of the need of controlling platinum. I notice that the second part of this amendment places platinum and the compounds of platinum, under the terms, conditions, and limitations of the act of October last, under the Bureau of Mines. Will the gentleman explain the real purpose and need of that special provision?

Mr. SHERLEY. Platinum is a very necessary mineral in connection with the manufacture of high explosives, and in some of the processes used platinum is a necessary agent for the reduction of nitrogen into such inactive form as makes it usable in connection with explosive manufactures. It was believed that the law should be plain to embrace within its scope platinum and its derivatives and compounds.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other matter I desire to call to the attention of the House, because it was a subject of some controversy when the bill was before the House, and that is the appropriation in connection with wages that are to be paid plate printers and other employees in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. The House increased the appropriation for the purpose of increasing the wages in regard to the employees other than plate printers \$91,600. The Senate gave the entire amount which had been sent as a supplemental estimate by the Treasury Department after the agitation on the part of the employees touching the wage. The conferees have agreed to an additional increase of \$69,400, making a total increase of \$160,000 for employees other than plate printers. As to plate printers, the House agreed to an increase of \$100,000 in appropriation for the purpose of increasing their pay, and the Senate increased it considerably. The conferees have added \$70,000 to the House sum, so that there is now an increase of \$170,000 for such purposes, making a total of \$330,000 of increase as against \$669,718, which was submitted in the supplemental estimate of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. I can only repeat what I said on the floor, that in my judgment the House amount was a sufficient amount to increase the pay of the lower-paid employees to \$2.24 a day, exclusive of the \$120 general increase. The amount now carried will enable them to be paid very considerably more than that amount.

Mr. SANFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. SANFORD. I notice by amendment No. 63 that the Senate provided \$30,000 for extra Capitol policemen, and provided that the appointments shall be made solely on account of efficiency and special qualifications, and shall not be in patronage. Do I understand that the House conferees insisted that the Capitol police jobs shall be in patronage?

Mr. SHERLEY. They did not.

Mr. SANFORD. I see in the conference-report agreement those words were stricken out.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will tell the gentleman why. We provided that the appointment of those extra police should be under the Sergeant at Arms of the respective Houses and the Superintendent of the Capitol, Mr. Elliott Woods. They have been employing such extra police for some time past under a special fund that has been in charge of Mr. Elliott Woods, and men have been appointed solely on the ground of efficiency. That policy is to be maintained, and the only reason we struck out the language was that we did not feel that the provision should carry legislative language that seemed to be a reflection upon the respective bodies. For myself I do not believe that any one of those men ought to be or will be appointed for any other reason than his efficiency, and I am pronounced in the belief that they ought not to be and will not be made the subject of patronage on the part of membership of either the House or the Senate, and I do not think it was seemly to carry that sort of language in the report.

Mr. SANFORD. Does the gentleman think, and does the committee think, that it is unseemly for the respective bodies to run their business on the patronage system? For instance, the Capitol police always have been run under the patronage system.

Mr. SHERLEY. The question of the regular police is not involved in this amendment at all. I will say to the gentleman there is nothing here that is going to be done that looked to doing anything more than obtaining necessary efficient employees for the protection of the Capitol at this time.

Mr. SANFORD. That will be a new departure, absolutely.

Mr. SHERLEY. That statement involves a number of matters that we might discuss had we more time, both in regard to the present situation and that which obtained in the days when the gentleman's party was in control.

Mr. DEWALT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. DEWALT. The large industrial centers of the country being so vitally interested in regard to this question of the turnover of the employment of labor, I would like the gentleman to state whether I am correct in my figures, namely, that the Senate amendment, to wit, \$7,600,000, was cut by the conference committee to \$5,500,000.

And there was a tentative understanding, as I gathered from the gentleman's remarks, that if this Employment Service Bureau hereafter should by affirmative proof show that their

necessities were larger they would be listened to patiently as well as affirmatively.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course, we are not going to have closed minds on this or any other thing. We are inviting this bureau to exercise the economy which should characterize all bureaus, and believe that they have all the money that is needed; but if we are mistaken in that fact I hope we will be big enough to readjust our minds to that fact.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. ROBBINS. I am very much interested in the housing proposition, and I listened with great interest to the gentleman's statement. In this second allotment to be made under the appropriations under this bill is there any change in the method of applying and distributing to the various industrial communities of the country greater housing accommodations for war purposes?

Mr. SHERLEY. This relates only to the Shipping Board problem. The committee has pending in connection with the deficiency bill an estimate of \$100,000,000 for the Department of Labor in connection with the housing problem generally outside of the Shipping Board's field.

Mr. ROBBINS. I was very much concerned lest this would not reach the interior points.

Mr. SHERLEY. There is pending before the committee an estimate submitted by the Department of Labor, and advocated by Mr. Eidlitz, of \$100,000,000.

Mr. ROBBINS. And that will take care of these industrial centers in the interior of the country?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is what it is intended for.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I used?

The SPEAKER. Thirty-five minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. May I make an inquiry of the gentleman? I understand the lady from Montana is very anxious to have 10 minutes on a matter in which she is deeply interested.

Mr. SHERLEY. I hope to be able to yield to the lady, although not that much time, but as much time as I can. I am under promise to expedite this bill, and minutes are precious in these closing days, and I know that she will appreciate that.

Mr. GILLET. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have no desire to deny time. I hoped not to take all the time that I have taken in making my statement.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I still think the lady from Montana should have 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has only 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] 15 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, when the sundry civil bill was brought into the House I called attention to the very extraordinary character of this legislation. It provides for the activities of the Federal Government, as I then said, from the Virgin Islands to the Philippines, from Panama to the farthest reaches of the North Pacific. Its items relate to the activities of the Federal Government in all of the territory between these widely separated points where the flag floats and where the Federal Government exercises control. The bill is unusually large; necessarily so, in these times of war. But in making up the bill originally every activity of the Federal Government other than those vital to the war and its successful prosecution was trimmed as closely as the committee was justified in trimming it, not to do actual harm and injury to any necessary work in progress. In view of this fact, in view of the fact that the committee were under obligations to keep all of the appropriations for activities not absolutely essential to the prosecution of the war as low as possible, I think the work of the committee and the judgment of the House in support of it are fully sustained in the fact that this bill, carrying a multitude of items of great importance, was amended in so few particulars by the Senate. After a perfectly friendly and harmonious conference the House yielded only on a few items, the more important of which had to do with matters with regard to which the House was not fully informed at the time the bill passed, and relative to which the House committee believed there was a probability of the necessity of considerable increases. The major increases, amounting to \$45,000,000, as has already been stated by the chairman of the committee, relate to housing and transportation activities of the Shipping Board. When the bill passed the House it seemed altogether probable that larger sums than those allowed in the House bill would be necessary for these purposes.

After the bill passed the House there came the President's order enlarging the activities of the newly formed Bureau of Employment in the Department of Labor. As one of the House conferees, I shared the opinion of my colleagues that, while there was clearly a necessity for increased appropriations to meet the new activities, the sum that had been requested was unnecessarily large. We did not feel it wise to invite extravagant expenditures at the beginning of the expansion of this very important work, and I am of the opinion that the sum agreed upon will be abundant for the work during the fiscal year. If it is not, Congress will be in session and can make further provisions.

The hearings both in the House and in the Senate relative to the condition of labor in the country emphasized the evils that have been wrought by the constant competition of one Federal activity against another in bidding for labor. This had not been in the interest of labor in the main, for while it had raised wages temporarily at certain points, many of those employments were temporary and a large part of the time of certain classes of labor was spent in joy riding from one place of employment to another. So that it is very doubtful if labor received as large a reward during the period covered by these pullings and haulings hither and yon as it would have received had it remained at its original employment. The worst offenders in this matter were not the Government bureaus themselves, much as they offended, but the so-called cost-plus contractors. They had absolutely no conscience. It was apparently entirely immaterial to them what a work cost, what salaries were paid, how high the expense of an operation ran. A project estimated to cost \$21,000,000, like the Hog Island shipyard, for instance, will eventually cost \$55,000,000, at least, and others of these activities in proportion.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Does that mean without any amplification in the original project?

Mr. MONDELL. I think there is some amplification in the Hog Island project that would perhaps account for two or three millions of that sum. I should say that one might say very conservatively that the increase was from \$21,000,000 to \$51,000,000 or \$52,000,000 for the original plan. This enormous increase was largely due to failure on the part of the contractors to conduct their enterprise in a businesslike way and in their reckless bidding against all others in the attempt to secure labor. This competitive bidding went on in many instances when these enterprises actually had more men on their work than they could keep properly employed. In the case of Hog Island it was reported by officials in charge on behalf of the Federal Government that during a very considerable period of time there was not over 25 to 30 per cent of labor efficiency; that for certain periods not over a third of the men were given an opportunity to work. They were there in such numbers and material was so delayed and the work so badly organized that they could not be given employment. It was largely these cost-plus contractors that kept labor drifting and shifting from one part of the country to the other, without benefit to labor and to the very great detriment to the interests of the country. This has ceased to a certain extent, owing to orders that have been issued touching those matters, and we hope that it will be further cured through the activities of this bureau.

I do not anticipate that these gentlemen will accomplish as much as they hope for or expect, but it is well that their hopes are high and that they expect to accomplish a very great deal. Otherwise they would accomplish but very little, for the task is an enormous one, and I hope it will be performed to the benefit of the country. While we support this appropriation, we of the minority can not overlook the fact that this Labor Employment Bureau can be made a mighty engine to help in making the country safe for Democratic candidates.

If we were disposed to be captious and suspicious we might with reason claim that the hope of political advantage through the appointment of thousands of "deserving Democrats" to carry on active political work at public expense was one of the controlling reasons for asking for these large appropriations.

I do not make that charge; and yet I realize that there is great temptation to use these great lump-sum appropriations which are granted and the tens of thousands of men who will be appointed under them for political purposes. Notwithstanding this danger, we of the minority are faithfully supporting these activities of the Government, realizing that whatever political activity there may be in connection with them will be for the benefit of the Democrats.

We have now the great organizations of the Federal Food and Fuel Administrations, the Committee on Public Information, the increased activities of the Agricultural, Interior, Commerce, and other departments, nation-wide and liberally endowed, and to these we now add the nation-wide Labor Employment Bureau.

All these could be utilized tremendously for political purposes. I fear they will be to a large extent, but we support them, notwithstanding, as a part of a general plan believed to be helpful in the winning of the war.

If anything further were necessary to prove the unwavering fidelity of the Republican Members of Congress to every object and purpose claimed or hoped to be useful in the prosecution of the war, it is found in their support of vast appropriations to be used in building up great nation-wide organizations like the Bureau of Public Information and the Food, Fuel, and Labor Employment Bureaus, which can and may be used to further the political interests of the party in power. I would support these activities so far as I believe them essential, though I believed they would be used to a certain extent for political purposes; but I suggest to my Democratic friends that they may easily overdo these things. I do not believe the people will tolerate an extensive use of appropriations and patronage for political purposes in this time of war if they become fully aware of it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are some items in this bill relating to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, with regard to which there has been some difference of opinion and some controversy. The House subcommittee took up the matter of increased wages for the low-paid employees of the bureau. No estimates had been made contemplating any increase. I do not say that in criticism of anyone. But that was the situation with regard to the original estimates. Estimates to cover increased wages were invited, and a hearing of the employees was had. The House gave the bureau in the items covering these employments what they believed was a sufficient sum to advance the low-paid employees in the amounts which it had been suggested they were entitled to.

There were some who did not believe the sum allowed was sufficient to cover the increased wages. The Senate allowed the full amount of the estimates. That not only meant the full amount of the original estimates, which might or might not have been reasonable, but also the full amount of the supplemental estimates, and of course the committee was forced to take into consideration the whole matter. It was claimed that, while the amount allowed by the House might provide for, and probably would provide for, advancing all of the low-paid employees, it was doubtful if it would also allow an advance above these lowest-paid employees in the various grades running up to the highly skilled employees. In order to make it quite certain that a reasonable sum should be available for that purpose, the House conferees agreed to some considerable increases in both of the two items affecting these employees; increases which, in my opinion, with the repay work, are abundant to provide the increases that have been suggested and to give to these employees whose pay has been unquestionably too low a very considerable increase. The House expects those increases to be made, and believes there are abundant sums provided for making those increases.

Mr. Speaker, other than these items to which I have referred, the amendments of the Senate are in the main not particularly material. The conferees of the House were in full agreement in all the matters in conference, as they were originally in the making up of the bill. We believe that the sundry civil bill, as now presented to the House, takes care of every war industry provided for in the bill abundantly, provides for every other useful activity of the Government appropriated for in the bill reasonably, and will afford abundant funds with which to pay the increased salaries and wages contemplated in certain cases and keep the wheels of Government running smoothly, so far as they receive lubrication from this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Sisson). The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Gillett].

Mr. Gillett. Mr. Speaker, the lady from Montana takes up so little of the time of the House and I take so much that I suggest that the gentleman from Kentucky yield to her my time.

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield the lady five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The lady from Montana is recognized for five minutes.

Miss RANKIN addressed the House. [See Appendix.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say just this in reply: Any basis of estimate upon repay work that places it at \$40,000 is so necessarily erroneous as to make the calculation all out of line, and that must be apparent to anybody who knows the expenses of the Government now as compared with the expenditures heretofore.

How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Four minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Could unanimous consent be given for five minutes, not to be taken out of the hour, so as to leave the gentleman from Kentucky four minutes?

Mr. SHERLEY. In the closing days when we have so much to do I do not think it is fair to the House to enlarge the time for the discussion of a matter that is settled. I do not understand that the lady from Montana [Miss RANKIN] desires to make any motion, so that this discussion leads nowhere. I will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] if he desires any time out of the four minutes remaining?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes; if I may have it.

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETTE], reserving a quarter of a minute to myself in which to make a motion.

Mr. GILLETTE. Inasmuch as very often in past years when coming out of conferences on this sundry civil bill, which covers all the various interests of the country, I have had occasion to criticize the Senate for what I thought was their loading up of the bill with matters for their personal and local interests rather than for the good of the whole country, I wish to say that I am very happy that in this instance I can, on the contrary, commend them, and state that they have departed from what I sometimes thought was their custom, and they have recognized the emergency of war times and have to a large extent ignored their individual interests, so that this bill deals mainly with the interests of the whole country and is not blotted with the perquisites of individual Senators. I wish to say a few words about what, it seems to me, is the most serious and far-reaching item in this whole bill, this appropriation for the marshaling of the labor of the country. I doubt if the Members of the House appreciate what a tremendous innovation that is touching all our industrial forces. If it is carried out as the Senate hearings indicate is the intention of the Labor Industries Board, it really means that all the labor of this country is going to be held in the grasp of this board. As a member of the minority I am not blind to the political possibilities of such a tremendous engine, reaching all over the country, with its branches in every State and in every considerable city, and influencing all labor; but I appreciate that we have shut our eyes, or at least we have taken our chances already on many such opportunities, and I am ready here to hope again that the administration will not take the advantage which is so completely put in their power to make it a political engine. But whether they do or not, I believe some such organization is indispensable for war production, and no matter what its political results I favor it. But aside from the political possibilities, the operation of this new bureau excites some apprehension. It is incumbent upon us to try it; but it strikes me that the great difficulty is going to be, not in the employment feature of the provision, but in the wage feature of it, in the standardization of wages. While the provision preventing wages to be paid in the different departments above the amount fixed by this bureau controls the Government offices, it does not in the slightest degree affect private individuals, and there, it seems to me, will come the difficulty. Of course, the Government itself has had the power to remedy that in the past, but it has not been done. We have seen constantly one bureau here in Washington bidding against another for labor. I remember an instance when the Navy Department took men from the Superintendent of the Capitol, paying bricklayers \$8 a day where they had been paid \$6 a day. That is simply a specimen of the way different departments have bid against one another. Of course, it was inevitable. Each department feels the urgency of its work and is a little reckless as to how it shall carry it out. It does not consider much the relative importance of the work of other departments, but bends all its energies to get its own work accomplished, and the others do the same, and so there has ensued reckless competition and bidding against each other for labor. The administration has seemed powerless to prevent that, even right here in Washington, and my fear is that when it starts out to prevent it throughout the country by private as well as Government employers, it will find it has tackled a problem too vast for it effectively to cope with. But I believe something of this sort must be done. I have not been able to think out a better plan, and so I indorse this with best wishes for its mastery of a most difficult and intricate problem.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

#### LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing certain correspondence with Col. Myron M. Parker, of Washington, in regard to certain statements made in debate on the floor here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman from Vermont to include in his request that I also be permitted to insert a letter from Mr. Brownlow, one of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and some remarks by myself, to be printed alongside of the matter that the gentleman from Vermont will print in the RECORD.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is only fair, Mr. Speaker, and I am quite content to have such an understanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, is this matter of such a public character that it ought to be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is my purpose in asking to have it printed.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume that the gentleman from Vermont would not take up the time of the House or the pages of the RECORD with any private affair relating to the Green Mountain State. I will inquire of the gentleman from Kentucky, if the gentleman from Vermont can not furnish the information, whether the correspondence which he seeks to put in the RECORD is of such a public character that the Membership of the House will be interested in it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It is a matter of a public nature. I made some remarks the other day, and in those remarks I mentioned the name of Col. M. M. Parker. He has written a letter to the gentleman from Vermont asking that his letter be inserted in the RECORD. I am perfectly willing that that shall be done if I can follow with a letter from the Commissioner of the District, with some remarks of my own.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is a matter of crimination and recrimination of remarks that have heretofore taken place.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I started to explain at the outset that this refers to a matter in debate on the floor involving a former constituent of mine who has no Representative in Congress and who desires to have his explanation made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. STAFFORD. If I had heard the gentleman's original remark, I would not have arisen to reserve an objection, but he was speaking in that subdued tone that he sometimes uses, and I did not hear him.

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina was given leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, 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. 11692) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1919, and for other purposes, had further insisted upon its amendments still in disagreement, and asked a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and had appointed Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mr. GALLINGER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### EXTENSION OF TIME OF FEDERAL CONTROL OF RAILROADS.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk began the reading of House resolution 407.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee (interrupting). Mr. Speaker, if I may interrupt, this is a privileged resolution, and yet I understand that the gentleman who objected to unanimous consent yesterday in the consideration of this joint resolution reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has now no objection to it. So, in order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order to consider immediately House joint resolution 303.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of House joint resolution 303. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 303) to extend the time within which the President may relinquish control of any railroad or system of transportation, as provided in section 14 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, to January 1, 1919.

Whereas it was provided in section 14 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, "that the President may, prior to July 1, 1918, relinquish control of all or any part of any railroad or system of transportation, further Federal control of which the President shall deem not needful or desirable"; and

Whereas it has been found that it can not be determined by July 1, 1918, whether certain railroads and systems of transportation under Federal control are needful or desirable for the successful operation of the railroads during Federal control: Therefore be it

*Resolved, etc.*, That the time within which the President may relinquish control of all or any part of any railroad or system of transportation, further Federal control of which the President shall deem not needful or desirable, as provided in section 14 of said act, be, and it is hereby, extended to, and including, January 1, 1919.

With the following committee amendment:

Add, at the end of the resolution, the following:  
 "Provided, however, That the right conferred upon the President to relinquish prior to July 1, 1918, control of all or any part of any railroad or system of transportation without consent of the carrier, as provided in section 14 of an act approved March 21, 1918, entitled 'An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes,' which right is herein extended to and inclusive of January 1, 1919, shall not be construed to include any railroad engaged as common carrier in general transportation such as mentioned in section 1 of said act, not owned, controlled, or operated by another carrier company and which has heretofore competed for traffic with any railroad or railroads of which the President has taken and retained the possession, use, and control, it being the intent of Congress that every railroad not owned, controlled, or operated by another carrier company and which has heretofore competed for traffic with a railroad or railroads which the President has taken and retains the possession, use, or control, or which connects with such railroad and is engaged as a common carrier in general transportation shall be held and considered as within Federal control as defined in said act and to be entitled to the benefits of all the provisions of said act so long as the railroad or railroads with which it has heretofore competed for traffic or with which it connects shall be retained under Federal control."

Mr. RUCKER took the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, the two preambles to this resolution state the reasons given by the administration for asking for this extension of time. While it says "railroads," its practical application will be to the so-called short-line railroads that were brought under Government control by what was known as the Cummins amendment, an amendment offered in the Senate to the railroad-control bill and which amendment when the bill reached the House was concurred in by a vote of the House. Consequently, as far as the Cummins amendment is concerned, it did not go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The Railroad Administration states that inasmuch as practically every one of the short lines differs in conditions from every other short line, depending upon its relation to the trunk lines or connecting lines, it is necessary to consider the special facts and circumstances in the case of each one of these lines. The time they have had has been used up in doing that which was absolutely necessary to do in order to have a standard form of contract for all railroads under Federal control and they have not had the time necessary to investigate each one of the short lines. They say that the general policy of the Railway Administration has been, as shown by the testimony of Mr. Payne, who was before the committee, to relinquish all railroads that were simply plant facilities. They have relinquished a number of short lines with the consent of the owners of those short lines. But the Railway Administration feel, and so construes the law, that it ought to relinquish all railroads that are not necessary for war purposes, not necessary for the Government to control, in order to better promote the prosecution of the war. And it has asked this further time to consider each individual case and to try, if possible, to have a contract in every case so as not to have to finally resort to the courts to decide what may be demanded as a compensation, and that if these lines are kept by force of law within Government control the lines will have the whip hand of the administration in making these contracts; that they will be under Government control and be where they can not be relinquished at the option of the Government whenever it is found it is not to the advantage of the Government to retain them. I have tried to explain the attitude of the administration in wanting further time. It was said by Mr. Payne, who represents the Railway Administration, that in so far as they have investigated these short lines it believes that if all the short-line railroads that were taken over by virtue of the Cummins amendment were retained it would be a great loss to the Government aggregating in the neighborhood of \$20,000,000 per annum, and the administration feels that it ought not to retain them at such an expense to the taxpayers.

On the other side, the short-line people by their representatives have been before the committee and have stated in no uncertain language and in no doubtful terms that by virtue of the Government status, the control, whether exercised or not, has greatly reduced their gross earnings in the time that they have been within Government control. Some of them say that their gross earnings have run down 50 per cent; that the Railway Administration through the local officials have been in its treatment hostile, and has in some instances issued an absolute embargo order against freight being shipped over their roads,

while others have refused to route freight over their roads where it was for their advantage not to do so.

Therefore, the short lines, by their representatives, contend that if they are relinquished now without any protecting provisions and not having the same benefits of roads which are retained under Federal control, that many of them will have to cease operation and that the communities they serve will be very greatly damaged, and they state in detail a great number of items of damage that will accrue to them, claiming that it will practically ruin some of the local communities that they serve. They insist that a great injustice will be done them, and that even though there is ultimate loss to the Government they should be retained until their connections are released, or the roads with which they are in competition are relinquished. An amendment was offered in the committee by a member of the committee, as set forth in the resolution as reported.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. What is the status of a line that has already been relinquished or might be before this resolution is agreed to?

Mr. SIMS. That is a very pertinent question, and one as to which, so far as this resolution is concerned, I do not wish to vouchsafe an opinion. When Mr. Payne was before the committee I asked the question, whether if this resolution was passed unamended, and they relinquished a railroad or it had already been relinquished, would they, under the law, have the right to bring back into Government control that relinquished railroad, supposing it was not thought to be necessary at the time of the relinquishment, but it was ascertained afterwards that it might be needed by the Government—whether the Government then, without further legislation, could resume Federal control. He answered that the matter was something about which legal minds differed; that the act of 1916 referred alone to systems of transportation, and if we relinquished these roads and took them from under the operation of the Cummins amendment, not being systems of transportation within the meaning of the original act, it was contended by some legal authorities that the President would not have the power to again resume control under the act of 1916, and having been relinquished under this act, it was a doubtful question, while others contended that the administration would have the right to resume control of any road that was once in the control of the Government.

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

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. SNOOK. I want to say that when the chairman propounded that question to Mr. Payne, the latter part of the short-line amendment was not then being considered. That was afterwards proposed in the Senate. That part beginning with the word "it," on line 4, page 4, was not in the amendment when Mr. Payne's attention was called to the fact.

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

Mr. SNOOK. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Is the language of the resolution incapable of being interpreted to carry out the intent of the latter part of it as expressed in the language beginning on page 3, line 4, where it sets forth what the intent of Congress is in passing the resolution? If that language was not in there, would not anyone know what the intent was upon reading the resolution?

Mr. SIMS. Answering for myself I would think there would be no question about it.

Mr. WALSH. We have had about forty-seven different varieties of legislative language used during this session, and if you are going to put a concluding paragraph to each act or resolve stating what the intent of Congress is, it seems to me to be the height of absurdity. We better draft our language so that everybody will know what it is. I want to ask the gentleman if he can not interpret this resolution to mean just what it is stated is the intent of Congress without so expressing it.

Mr. SIMS. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] offered this amendment in the committee, I prefer that he make reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I yield to him.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think the language is absolutely clear without stating that it is the intent of Congress, and I also think that the language in the original act was clear in section 1, where it says:

That every railroad not owned, controlled, or operated by another carrier company, and which has heretofore competed for traffic with a railroad or railroads of which the President has taken the possession, use, and control, or which connects with such railroads and is engaged as a common carrier in general transportation, shall be held and considered as within "Federal control," as herein defined.

And that when the House agreed to that amendment that there was no question but that all of these lines that connected

with or competed with another carrier would be taken in, but they have not been.

Mr. WALSH. For the reason that they consider the word "railroad" to mean a system.

Mr. RAYBURN. Not at all. The intent of Congress, I think, was expressed in that, but over here in section 14 they did a very peculiar thing. They vested in the President power to turn them loose before the 1st day of July, and this amendment says that he can not do that if he retains the control of the carrier with which it connects or competes.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to ask the opinion of the chairman of the committee which reports the resolution if it would in any way vitiate this resolution if the phraseology expressing the intent of Congress is stricken from the resolution.

Mr. SIMS. Answering offhand, I would not think it would; but, as I did not offer the amendment, and am not responsible for it, I do not want my interpretation to be regarded as conclusive.

Mr. WALSH. But the gentleman is proposing it, and he has the resolution in charge. He is responsible for the resolution as presented to the House.

Mr. SIMS. The committee adopted the resolution.

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

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts agree that the intent that is declared is unnecessary because the proposed amendment otherwise speaks for itself, and that the intent is evident as contained in the bill?

Mr. WALSH. I understand; but from my reading of the resolution without that as with it, it is giving the authority which is expressed in the intent. It is just mere surplusage, and if to every law we pass we are going to hitch on five or a dozen or two dozen lines saying what the intent of Congress is we are going to be kept busy.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will permit, considering the history of this legislation and the difference of opinion that has been expressed as to what the law now is, does not the gentleman think, from his standpoint it being mere surplusage, that it leaves nothing open for construction, so the declaration of intent leaves nothing for construction?

Mr. WALSH. Then we ought to put in another paragraph and say what the intent of Congress was in putting in a paragraph declaring what the intent of Congress was, and so on.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. I will.

Mr. CRAMTON. I desire to ask the gentleman from Tennessee whether it is true, if he knows, that the Railroad Administration yesterday and to-day have rushed out a great number of notices to the short-line railroads notifying them they are cut loose from the national system?

Mr. SIMS. Relinquished?

Mr. CRAMTON. Relinquished.

Mr. SIMS. I have no knowledge on that subject.

Mr. CRAMTON. If that is true, if such notices in numbers are being rushed out yesterday and to-day in the face of the adoption of this resolution, would it not be patent it was the desire of the Railroad Administration to avoid the terms of this resolution?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I think that is an argumentative question and does not need a reply. These relinquishments which the gentlemen have heard of as being sent out may be every one of them confined to railroads not doing a general transportation business and not having connection—

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not know, and I am quite curious in reference to the question raised by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD] whether by rushing out notices of that kind they can avoid the effect of this resolution.

Mr. SIMS. I could not answer any further than I have.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, a member of the committee.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman does not care to yield at this moment, I will wait until the members of the committee have been heard.

Mr. SIMS. How much time have I consumed?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield before that in order to answer one question?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used 17 minutes.

Mr. SIMS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The question I want to ask is related to the question asked by the gentleman from Indiana and that is, what would be the effect upon the short-line railroads which were relinquished prior to the adoption of this resolution? I understood the gentleman from Tennessee to state that such short-line railroads as have been relinquished have

been relinquished by agreements with the owners of those roads?

Mr. SIMS. Very largely; but I do not think it includes all of them; but I am speaking from recollection.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. There are some that have been relinquished over the protest of those short lines?

Mr. SIMS. Over their own protests. Mr. Speaker, how much time does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire?

Mr. ESCH. I think only five minutes.

Mr. SIMS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH].

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the urgency of this resolution impels me to limit the time I shall occupy in explanation. Now, unless this resolution speedily goes over to the Senate it can not be passed prior to the 1st day of July, when certain provisions of the Federal control act become operative. We had supposed when we enacted the Federal control act, including the Cummins amendment to section 1, that the status of the short-line roads had been clearly defined and fixed. It seems, however, that up to date they do not as yet know their status. In fact, but very few lines that have made applications to be brought under Federal control have had them adjudicated. There have been about 40 short lines which have been released upon their own request. There have been a less number that have been relinquished without their consent. There are about 750 short lines in the United States. They cover 30,000 miles of trackage. The capitalization of those railroads amounts to \$2,000,000,000. From those facts you can realize the importance of the problem that is presented. These short lines desire to have a chance to live. We by this legislation wish to give them that chance by saying that they shall be retained under Federal control so long as the lines with which they compete or the roads with which they connect are retained under Federal control. When the trunk line has been relinquished the short line goes with it. The short lines do not object to that situation—

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman give us his view as to the case of the railroad coming within the class he is describing but which has heretofore without its consent and over its protest been relinquished? Will the amendment and resolution be of any benefit to such lines?

Mr. ESCH. Where the line has been relinquished?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; over its protest.

Mr. ESCH. And against its protest?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. In my opinion such roads, once having been relinquished, might apply to the President for reinstatement under the provisions of section 9 of the Federal control act, which provides as follows:

And the President, in addition to the powers conferred by this act, shall have and is hereby given such other and further powers necessary or appropriate to give effect to the powers herein and heretofore conferred. The provisions of this act also apply to any carrier to which Federal control may hereafter be extended.

The question was put to Mr. Payne, the counsel for the Railroad Administrator, as to whether the power granted in the language I have just read would not permit the agencies of the Government to retake such lines. He did not wish to express an opinion, because he said that it might come up to him in his capacity as legal advisor of the administrator, but he said if for purposes of carrying out the war it became necessary to retake such roads, he would not hesitate to so advise the Director General.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. I will.

Mr. GILLETT. Would it not be true that the most that that would provide would be that the President in his discretion could take it if he wished, but the road would have no right to insist on being taken, so that the roads really would not have the same right as the roads under this resolution would have?

Mr. ESCH. The roads that have been relinquished without their consent are comparatively few in number and are such that they could not be directly useful in the conduct of the war and would be able, perhaps, to conduct their business in a successful manner whether under Government control or not. Now, the purpose of the legislation is to give these short lines, as I said, a chance to live. If it were not for the war, if it were not for the Federal control of carriers, these short-line roads would have continued their existence as before. But the taking over of the trunk lines by the Federal Government has handicapped practically every short-line carrier. It has rendered it almost impossible for some of them to live, because of the reduction in the amount of freight which is given to them to carry, because of the financial difficulties, the difficulties in financing

their short-time certificates, securing extensions of their loans from the banks and from other money institutions.

We asked the question whether these short-line railroads, in view of the fact that they would have maturities on the 1st of July, could not go to the War Finance Corporation and get relief. We were told efforts were made by some short lines to get such relief, and such relief had been refused.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. ESCH. So that avenue of financial relief seems to have been closed to the short-line carriers. They could not go to their local banks and get extensions, because extensions to the limit have already been granted of four months and of six months. What are they to do when these certificates become due and they can not finance themselves? Some of these short lines have been struggling along by assuring their creditors that the Federal Government would soon take care of the situation and, by placing them under Federal control, enable them to have opportunity for securing advancements and financial protection.

Mr. DEWALT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. DEWALT. Will the gentleman please refer to the fact that in the meanwhile the securities of these short-line railroads have depreciated remarkably, and therefore they can not raise money on those securities?

Mr. ESCH. The gentleman has stated a fact that has come to the knowledge of the committee and only reinforces what I am saying in reference to the necessity of taking care of these short lines by extending the period for six months within which their situation can be thoroughly examined and their status finally determined.

Mr. DILLON. Will the gentleman yield a moment to me?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. DILLON. I suggest also to the gentleman that none of these short-line roads have been able to obtain a dollar under the finance-corporation bill.

Mr. ESCH. I have just made that statement. The testimony before the committee is to the effect that, notwithstanding a short line is the direct or shortest route for traffic, the Federal administration has routed the freight over the longer road because the longer road was already under Federal control. That resulted in diminution of the traffic of the short line, and as the short line must live by reason of its freight traffic, local and interline, it is seriously damaged by reason of the operation of the Government itself. I know it has been stated here, and it was the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, when he opposed taking over the short lines, that the Government did not want to take over crippled railroads any more than the Secretary of War wanted to take over cripples for war service. That is true as a statement, but when the Government does the crippling, as it does with reference to these short lines, by routing freight over other lines and discriminating against them so far as freights are concerned, then it is a moral obligation, if not a legal one, for the Federal Government to come to the support of the short lines.

Mr. DEWALT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. I will.

Mr. DEWALT. Will not the gentleman state that the original purpose of this legislation was, and the amendment proposed by the short-line people was, that there should be a distribution of freight to them, as they were formerly accustomed to, and a distribution of cars, and that has been taken away from them?

Mr. ESCH. That has resulted in very serious damage to them from a financial standpoint. They have offered a tentative contract to the Director General, and under the terms of that contract they do not ask to have a guaranty of 6 per cent on their capitalization as has been charged in certain quarters. They simply wanted a contract made with the Government which would assure them a larger division of the freight rate, which would insure a fair share of the cars and of the motive power. This to date has been denied many of these short lines, and it has come to a very critical condition with reference to many of them. And unless this relief is extended I look to see many of them in financial straits and some of them placed in bankruptcy, and some of them may have to be scrapped.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I would say to my friend that I have some sympathy with the administration in not wanting to take over any institution that might be a losing one financially. Can we take it from what the gentleman has said that we can attribute, in part at least, the hard financial situation of these short lines to the act of taking over all the railroads over which they themselves had no control?

Mr. ESCH. Yes; in a very large degree. And it is because it is beyond their control that they come to Congress and ask this relief.

Mr. DEWALT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. DEWALT. I wish the gentleman would state to the committee as a further persuasive argument that these short lines, so called, have been largely, if not exclusively, built by local capital, and that local capital now holds their bonds and vested securities.

Mr. ESCH. Yes. These bonds are not held to any large extent in Wall Street. They are held in the communities which originally built the roads. The small merchant, the small capitalist, the local bank, and local company hold these securities, and they have already depreciated in value, and unless they are given this protection they will still be more largely diminished in value, to the hurt of thousands who hold these bonds and securities.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Are there any of these short-line roads that were not taken over by the Railroad Administration—by the Government?

Mr. ESCH. We can not get any statistics. We have asked for full information, but it is very difficult to pin the administration down so that it would name the roads.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The reason why I ask the question is that some weeks ago I addressed an inquiry to the Railroad Administration about a certain short-line road that ran through territory in my district. Up to this time I have received no answer as to whether that road is or is not under Federal control. Now, the first part of your resolution, as I understand it, provides that the Government can not relinquish control of these roads, and the latter part of it says that the intent of the act is that all competing roads or short-line roads should be under control of the Government. The question to my mind is whether there are any roads that were not taken over by the Government that would come within the meaning of the first part of the resolution.

Mr. ESCH. I think our committee assumed that they were all taken over, and it was our intent that they should be all taken over under the Cummins amendment to section 1 of the railroad control bill.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. And if they were not taken over, under the latter part of the resolution they would be?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

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

Mr. ESCH. Certainly.

Mr. DEWALT. Is it not a fact that in the hearings before the committee it was also disclosed that tentative agreements were offered to the short lines, and that the threat was held out—if I may so call it—that unless the short lines agreed to the proposed bargain they would then be relinquished?

Mr. ESCH. Yes. That appeared in the testimony.

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

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. As I understand it, the intent here is to make mandatory the taking over of the short lines that compete and connect with the other roads?

Mr. ESCH. Yes; mandatory.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Now, then, if in the meantime, before this resolution could pass this House and the Senate, a number or any one of the short-line railroads could be dropped and there would be no recourse unless an amendment here would make it mandatory to take over those that had already been dropped?

Mr. ESCH. Some of them wanted to be dropped.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I mean those who cared to be carried.

Mr. ESCH. I think there are so few cases of that kind, where their status has been finally determined by the Director General's office, that we would not need to offer an amendment to this resolution to cover that.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I am a little apprehensive, because I know of one that has just been hanging by the merest thread for some little time, and the thread might be severed at any moment and we would find ourselves without any relief. Already a line 70 miles in length in my district has been abandoned and is liable to be scrapped. It was built by the local people, and we can not finance it now because of the demands of the Government for all the finances to be concentrated here. I really think it is an important point.

Mr. ESCH. Some criticism has been made of the form of the resolution because it closes with a statement of the express intent of Congress with reference thereto. It is because we

were not getting an interpretation of the Federal-control act in consonance with the Cummins amendment to section 1 that we thought we would make it so plain that there could be no doubt as to the will and wish of Congress with reference to the short-line roads.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] have so thoroughly covered this question that I feel that anything I might say would be surplusage now. But a situation has developed with reference to the short-line railroads that I think is sufficiently alarming to warrant us in taking some definite action with reference to it.

It was the intention of the Railroad Administration before our act was passed, and has been since that time, not to retain control of the short-line railroads, and they based their action, since the law was enacted, on that clause that gave the Director General, through the President, the power to release those roads before the 1st day of July. According to my way of looking at this question—and it was my way of looking at this question when it first came up—there were two alternatives. One was that if all the short-line railroads of the country were taken into this system it would make a considerable charge against the Treasury of the United States to operate and maintain them under Federal control. The other was, if the short-line railroads were not taken, it amounted to murder to them, so far as that is concerned.

Now, I think that the small sum—the way we speak of sums at this time—of \$20,000,000—and that is the estimate that Mr. Payne, the counsel for the railroad directorate makes, as the charge that would be placed upon the Treasury of the United States for taking over these small competing lines—that sum at this time—\$20,000,000—compared with the destruction of nearly \$2,000,000,000 worth of property, is a small thing indeed in comparison. Not only that, but these people who own the short-line railroads have a great interest in them. They have invested their money in them. They have labored for years and years to build up those short-line railroads. But their interest is not as great or compelling with me as the proposition that people have moved in along these short-line railroads, have established farms, have built up towns and small cities in many instances, have built up factories, and that business must go on if those people do not go into bankruptcy; and they certainly will go into bankruptcy if the Government, since it has taken over the roads with which they compete and with which they connect and which are retained under Federal control, relinquishes control of the short lines.

Now, I believe it was the intent of Congress when it passed the railroad-control act that these short-line railroads were going to be taken into this system. The Railroad Administration is not administering the law from that viewpoint. Hence the amendment that we put on in the committee, which I believe makes it absolute, without any fear whatever, that as long as the line with which these short lines connect and compete are retained under Federal control, these short lines themselves will be retained under Federal control also.

Now, the question came up here a moment ago as to whether a railroad that had already been released from Federal control could come back into the system if this amendment were adopted. I think, whether we adopt this amendment or not, that if we had allowed the President to go on and release the short-line railroads at any time up to the 1st of July there is no question but that the Government could have taken them back under Federal control any time during the life of this law. Now, with this amendment I do not think there is a question in the world but that the lines that have been released before the 1st day of July will be automatically taken back into this system, because the language, it seems to me, is as plain as the English can be written. It goes on to say that the right of the President to relinquish before July 1, and so forth, shall not be construed to include any railroad engaged as a common carrier in general transportation, such as is mentioned in section 1 of said act, not owned, controlled, or operated by another common carrier. It seems to me that that language makes it absolutely certain that these railroads come back automatically under Federal control where they have been released, and that it keeps under Federal control the railroads that have not been released.

Mr. FESS. Is it the gentleman's opinion also that the bad condition of the short-line roads is due largely to recent legislation, by which the Government has taken over the railroads?

Mr. RAYBURN. There is no question about that. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] remarked upon that—about

routing freight over other lines that they had definitely taken under Federal control.

Mr. FESS. If that condition were brought about by any private management we would be inclined to give relief here by legislation, would we not?

Mr. RAYBURN. There is no question about it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SNOOK], a member of the committee.

Mr. SNOOK. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I had the pleasure of addressing the House upon this subject when the railroad legislation was first before Congress. At that time I expressed the opinion that there was some doubt in my mind as to the proper treatment that these short-line railroads should receive; but since the enactment of the law for Federal control I have had occasion to study the question at first hand by talks with those administering railroad affairs, by observing how it worked when applied to a railroad in our own district, and by talking with other men who have been interested in the short-line railroads. We find this to be a fact: When the Government took over the trunk lines it placed the administration of all the railroad affairs in the hands of men who have heretofore been dealing with trunk-line affairs, and therefore the freight that formerly was routed over the short-line roads was nearly all diverted to the trunk lines. We also find by a study of the question and by talking with the men interested in the short lines that there has been a loss in the receipts of nearly every short-line railroad of from 50 to 75 per cent. That has been the result on the short lines that have not been taken over by the Government.

It shows that if we continue our present policy it will result in the destruction of nearly all these railroads, because they can not survive a loss of 50 per cent of their income, which was all too small to begin with. Although shippers may route their freight over these short-line railroads, the management disregards that routing and ships the freight over the trunk lines, where formerly it was accustomed to be shipped over these short lines.

Then we find another thing that stands in the way of their successful operation, and that is the thing to which the gentleman from Wisconsin has referred. That is the question of finance. The Government has taken over the other lines and left these lines without the protection offered by the law providing for governmental control; therefore they are unable to secure financial aid. These two things, the loss of business and the loss of power to secure financial aid when their obligations are falling due, make it almost certain that they can not be longer operated and that they will be compelled to cease operation and be sold for scrap. Now, what does that mean? There are 765 of them. Many of them run through the very best country in America. It means that the people living along these lines, who have established elevators and manufacturing plants and towns and cities, will be without railroad facilities. We are spending millions of dollars a year to improve the rivers and harbors of the country; we have spent millions in the improvement of the Ohio River in the last 25 years. I am convinced that the loss to the people of my State in one year will be greater if the traffic on the short-line roads is suspended than would be caused by the loss of all the traffic carried on the Ohio River in 10 years. [Applause.]

I want to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts has made some criticism of this amendment, especially of the last paragraph.

In view of the construction that the Railroad Administration put upon the original act, to my mind it is absolutely necessary that the last paragraph of this amendment be retained if we expect to accomplish what we are setting out to do. Judge Paine, on page 9 of the hearings, was asked the question whether he thought the short-line railroads were taken over under the original act. I did not have time to read all he said, but he replied in substance that a short-line road not forming a part of a system of transportation may properly be held not to be included within the purview of an act which gives the President the power to take over systems of transportation. This shows that the Railroad Administration is inclined to take the position that under the terms of the law as it now stands there is doubt on this subject, and is also inclined to hold that it is not compelled by this act to take over the short-line railroads. So this makes it necessary to write into the law something that will make it plain, that those administering the law will understand that it is the intention of Congress that these railroads, whether they have heretofore been taken over and relinquished or whether they are now being operated under Federal control, are to be retained and given the benefit of all the provisions in the original railroad act. I believe when Congress adopted the Cummins amendment, when the original act was passed, it was

the belief of most Members that this settled the short-line question. But we see that it did not settle it. The attitude which those in authority assume in my judgment makes it necessary to adopt that part of the amendment which reads as follows:

It being the intent of Congress that every railroad not owned, controlled, or operated by another carrier company and which has heretofore competed for traffic with a railroad or railroads which the President has taken and retains the possession, use, or control, or which connects with such railroad and is engaged as a common carrier in general transportation, shall be held and considered as within Federal control as defined in said act and to be entitled to the benefits of all the provisions of said act so long as the railroad or railroads with which it has heretofore competed for traffic or with which it connects shall be retained under Federal control.

The reasons for the adoption of this amendment are many. The fact that the Government is prescribing what may be shipped and how and when any commodity may be transported, and over what routes all shipments shall be made has worked to the advantage of the railroads under Government control and has deprived those not under control of so much of the business they formerly enjoyed that many of them find it impossible to continue operation under such conditions.

I wish to call the attention of the House to several statements on the question made by Mr. Ben B. Cain to our committee during the hearings on this subject. Mr. Cain made a very clear statement of the reasons why this amendment should be adopted, and the quotations which I make from his statement I regard as being especially in point:

We thought that the reasons were sufficient. First, there was the practical reason. We believed that these railroads do serve a useful purpose in the winning of the war. The transportation machine is not alone useful for the purpose of moving men and ammunition. The man in the front-line trenches or behind the cannon over yonder is not the only man necessary for the winning of this war. Behind the Army are the men and the women and children at home. We believe that the short roads should be retained under the absolute control of the Director General, so that they may be utilized and their activities directed as the men in uniform under the direction of the War Department are moved here and there in the great struggle in which we are engaged. And so we said to the Director General upon practical grounds, in order that these short-line properties might function as units in the great transportation machine, that they ought to be preserved; they ought to be put under the power of the Director General for these reasons: That he might exercise the right, as to prescribing priorities of shipment, the right of directing embargo, the right of pooling railroad equipment regardless of ownership, the necessity of coordinating the handling of labor conditions, the importance of precluding the possibility of a conflicting and destructive jurisdiction between State and National railroad commissions and the Federal Railroad Administration, and the necessity of the elimination of waste in the Nation's resources.

And then we gave another reason which applies to the roads themselves, and that is the credit or the financial reason. We said to him in this letter: "Financing has been made impossible. Government loans have preempted banking facilities of the Nation, with the bare exception of commercial transactions based on paper discountable under the rules of the Federal reserve banks. Short-line railroad securities in the amount of thousands of dollars are maturing each month, which under present conditions it is impossible to liquidate. State, private, and national banks all over the country are holders of these securities, so that credit has been interned in this manner, and directly and indirectly the peoples of the Nation are suffering."

Then, in conclusion, let me call your attention to a word picture, in which Mr. Cain clearly shows what a calamity will fall on every rural community that is deprived of the service of one of these short-line railroads and left without railroad facilities:

In conclusion, gentlemen, permit me to say to you that there are people along these roads that are in as much suspense as the roads themselves. Eight years ago, when I started to build that road in Texas, I followed the engineer through cattle ranches that had never known a plow and knew but little of civilization. I had not let the contracts and started grading before the covered wagon began to make its appearance along the line, and here and there a man unloaded his family and his all, and struck his tent and began his little house or lived in that tent and opened his farm. One hundred miles of territory that had theretofore been devoted almost exclusively to the cattle business became a somewhat thickly settled agricultural country, because the land was new and unoccupied and because the territory was good. Tenant farmers who had accumulated nothing in the more thickly settled sections of the State and other States came there and bought that land on credit, and I saw, when the wagons would come by, women and children, some of them 14 and 15 years old, and all of their bedding with them; the cow trailing along behind the wagon and the dog under the wagon—all that they had; but they came to a new country determined to build up and own instead of being tenants. And those boys who were 15 or 16 years old went in and took hold of that opportunity with their father and mother and the other children, and helped pay for these homes. Some of them have been paid for and they own them—the first time they ever owned property in their lives.

I saw those boys, drafted into the Government service. Some of them came to me and said, "We can not leave the old folks; they haven't quite paid for the farm, and we want to stay here. Can't you help us keep from going into the Army for a time anyhow?" I said, "I can not help you, boys; it is your duty to go to the front." Those boys left those homes, and when the mother followed them to the front gate to kiss them good-bye, and they looked back at that home that they had helped pay for, and they went out to defend a condition and a country that had made these things possible, they expected their country would take care of what they were leaving behind them. They are over yonder in khaki, and when they come back, if the home is desolate, if the folks have suffered, and the land they left worth \$30 and \$40 an acre is reduced to \$15 or \$10 an acre, what are we going to say?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DILLON], a member of the committee.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I simply want to call attention to the Cummins amendment, and read it to you:

That every railroad not owned, controlled, or operated by another carrier company, and which has heretofore competed for traffic with a railroad or railroads of which the President has taken the possession, use, and control, or which connects with such railroads and is engaged as a common carrier in general transportation, shall be held and considered as within "Federal control," as herein defined, and necessary for the prosecution of the war, and shall be entitled to the benefit of all the provisions of this act.

Under the Cummins amendment there is not a short-line railroad in the country that is not included under the provisions of the act. That was the intent of Congress when we passed the law.

I now call your attention to the relinquishment clause, which reads as follows:

That the President may, prior to July 1, 1918, relinquish control of all or any part of any railroad or system of transportation, further Federal control of which the President shall deem not needful or desirable; and the President may at any time during the period of Federal control agree with the owners thereof to relinquish all or any part of any railroad or system of transportation.

Under the release clause the Director General says he has the right to turn back any short-line road. The committee thought that the right to do so was not granted by the original act. The Congress never intended to grant such arbitrary power to the Railroad Director. The short lines can not exist without connections with the trunk lines, and this Congress ought not to pass a law that will push them into bankruptcy, for that is what it means for all of these short lines. Communities and towns have been built up along these lines and they ought not to be destroyed. The original intent of Congress was as clear as could be made, that if the short line goes out the connecting lines must go out with it, so that no injury shall be done to any short-line road. It appeared from the examination of Mr. Payne, the solicitor of the Director of Railroads, that the Government intends to hold this right of relinquishment over the short lines and could easily be used as a bludgeon over the short lines by which he could say, "You agree to this contract, or we will eliminate you without any notice," without any hearing upon the part of the line. This, it seems to me, would be an act of manifest injustice to every short-line railroad in the country. It ought not to be done. I favor this resolution. I think it is properly drawn and it ought to have the support of every Member of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to a member of the committee, Judge DEWALT.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, this resolution as now presented contains two distinct ideas. The first is that which was proposed by the administrator of the Railroad Bureau, namely, an extension of time for the relinquishment from the date stated in the original act up to January 1, 1919. That was the resolution as originally proposed by the administrative bureau. The short lines then came in and pleaded for relief, and they introduced an amendment to the resolution. That amendment is the second idea in the resolution. That is simply this, that no short line shall be released until the main or trunk line with which the short line competes or with which it connects is also relinquished. In other words, it places the short line on a parity with the main or trunk line. This proposition further takes into view the capitalization of two billion of dollars as represented by the short lines. It takes into consideration altogether 765 short lines, because that is the number in the United States. One hundred and sixty-five of those lines have already been taken over and the remainder are in a chaotic state, not knowing whether they will be taken over or be relinquished, and the purpose of this resolution is to confine the administrative functions of the Railroad Bureau to this fact, and this alone, that this chaotic condition, so far as the short lines are concerned, must be removed and that they can not be relinquished until the trunk lines with which they compete or with which they are connected are also relinquished. That is the sum and substance of the whole thing. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is very important and necessary, but it is a sad commentary as to the condition into which this Congress has sunk that it should be necessary. The meaning of the act which was heretofore passed was perfectly plain. It is also plain that it has been disregarded. Whatever may be said as to whether there was or has been an actual violation by the Railroad Administration of the law as laid down by this Congress, there can not be the slightest question that the Railroad Administration knew perfectly well that the spirit of the law and the intent of Congress was being violated.

Notwithstanding the law—I believe the law was explicit as to its terms, and surely it was plain as to its meaning and intention, that the short lines should not be relinquished—yet they have proceeded to relinquish them over their protest.

Nor is that all. As gentlemen who have been speaking on the subject before me and others have said, they have proceeded in defiance of the directions of the shipper to route freight over certain other lines in order to kill off the short lines. There can be no question in the minds of any gentleman but that that is illegal and that short lines are being ruined by this practice. I could go on and review other matters to show you that the Railroad Administration has been disregarding and violating the law, but the few moments that have been allotted me are insufficient.

Gentlemen said repeatedly, when we granted great powers to the Railway Administration—powers not only unprecedented in this country but almost unprecedented anywhere—that there was no fear that they would be abused, that no official would overstep reasonable bounds or use them in an oppressive manner, but here we have a positive example of what the Railroad Administration intends to do in the way the short lines have been treated. If there is anybody that ought to be fair, it is those officials who have been placed in charge of the management of the railroads. If there is any institution that ought to be just it is the Government of this country which is represented by them. But they have absolutely ignored the law and have attempted to defy Congress. Then my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] possibly not understanding the situation, has asked why the committee has been so particular to append to this resolution a statement of the express purpose and intent of Congress in enacting it.

It is simply in order that these gentlemen can not without effrontery exceeding anything they have already shown say they do not understand this law and that they will construe it in opposition to its plain import and meaning. We want to make this so plain that the wayfaring man can not err therein. We intend that there shall be no further pretense that the law is not understood. Unless I completely misunderstand the purpose of this Congress, it has determined positively that the short lines shall be taken over. To do otherwise would be a blunder so astounding that it is utterly incomprehensible how any man or set of men could make it. It is claimed that these lines are not profitable. The same claim could be made with reference to every short branch or feeder which the great systems own and which it is not proposed to discard. These lines of track by themselves may not be profitable, but as feeders to the great lines they are profitable. In the same way they are profitable to the country at large, which can not afford to dispense with them even if it was willing to commit the moral wrong of destroying the communities through which they run, communities which have been built up on the faith and assurance of the laws as they then stood, which permitted these short lines to exist.

Mr. Speaker, it would be nothing short of a crime to now compel these short lines to be torn up, their property to be junked, the communities through which they run to be left without transportation, and it would be an act of folly that surpasses anything ever done in the history of this country. To prevent such action this resolution should be adopted.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress passed the act of March last, it was very manifestly the legislative intent clearly expressed, that the Railroad Administration should take over the short lines, coordinate them with the trunk lines, and operate the entire system of roads, great and small as a unified whole. It was an intolerable thought to this body that these short lines as a result of Government administration of the trunk lines should either in whole, or in part, languish and die. These roads are as essential to the smaller communities, as the trunk lines to the great centers of wealth and industrial activities. Yet this result of cessation, or bankruptcy, will be the lot of many short lines, unless action is taken to-day. It has been established by the statements made on this floor unchallenged, and uncontradicted, that unless the pending resolution is agreed to, reaffirming in unmistakable terms the legislative intent of the act of March, there are many short lines, in many communities that will be forced to discontinue their operations to the very great prejudice and loss of those communities.

The amendment to this resolution reaffirms the legislative intent, and makes certain that which we thought was already certain.

I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] with respect to the general principles relating to the preparation and construction of statutes, but confronted with the situation

developed under the interpretation impressed upon the act of March last, this body should reaffirm and declare anew the intent of the original act in the most positive and emphatic fashion. The gentleman from Massachusetts suggests that the declaration of intent in the resolution is surplusage. Possibly, but by all means should it be retained in the resolution. With that language retained there is no possibility that the meaning and purpose of the original act can be misunderstood. It is a plain and emphatic declaration on our part that the Government shall take over the short lines and operate them so long as it operates the trunk lines with which they connect, or compete.

That is what we meant by the original act, and that is the meaning that we now reaffirm. If there is any form of words other than that in the resolution by which our intent can be more definitely and positively expressed, then I am in favor of using that language in this resolution. As I have stated, this resolution simply says to the Railroad Administration that so long as the trunk lines with which these short lines connect continue to be administered and operated by the Government, then in the public interests the Government operation of the short lines shall continue for the same period.

I have listened in vain during the progress of this debate for some one to point out why the policy proposed with reference to the short lines is not a just and proper policy. No suggestion to that effect has been made. No one has risen in this debate to intimate that we, having in mind the interests of the entire Nation, should establish a system of railroad administration under which the trunk lines alone are to be operated, and the vast aggregate of smaller lines, with a mileage of 30,000 miles, and an aggregate value of something like \$2,000,000,000, with their vast potentialities of benefit to the communities which they serve, should be left to their own devices under the new conditions created by Government administration of the trunk lines. It is freely admitted that such a policy will mean ruin for many of the short lines, and destructive losses to the communities which they serve.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be most unfortunate to strike out a single line or word from this resolution of reaffirmation and redeclaration of a legislative intent that we thought had been heretofore expressed in terms of sufficient clarity.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. In the gentleman's judgment, will this take over those lines that may have been relinquished before this bill becomes a law and make it mandatory?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I am not entirely clear upon that point.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Why would it not be advisable to add at the end of the resolution the following:

And regardless of and despite any order of relinquishment heretofore made or of any other act which may have heretofore been done by or for the United States as to such control.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I am not in charge of this joint resolution, but so far as I am concerned, I frankly say that I see no reason why the amendment suggested should not be accepted.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself to the last clause of the joint resolution, the one which provides that the Railway Administration shall continue to hold and operate the short-line railroads as long as the railroads with which they are competing are held in Federal control. A question has been raised here as to whether the short-line railroads which have heretofore been relinquished will be recovered into the Federal control in case of the passage of this resolution. In my judgment there is very strong ground for saying they would be, and I base that upon this language—

shall be held and considered as within Federal control as defined in said act.

That is, by the very language of this resolution, we define the intent of Congress to be that the railroads thus defined and described shall be held and considered to be within Federal control. So that I trust that that sets at rest that question. The short-line railroads are mainly railroads that have been constructed by local capital and are operated in response to local demands. If they are not taken over by the Federal Government, they have absolutely no opportunity to survive. That seems to be generally agreed. The routing of all the through traffic controlled by the Railroad Administration will pass over trunk lines, and even if the shipper should desire to favor the short-line railroads and to take the trouble to route his freight

over the short-line railroads it might still be within the power of the Railroad Administration for public reasons to change that routing.

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

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. SNOOK. They are now doing that very thing.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman says they are now doing that very thing. So the short-line railroad has no opportunity whatever to protect its through traffic or its share of its through traffic, and it has little opportunity to protect its local traffic. It has only one outlet, its connection with the trunk lines, and they are under the jurisdiction of the Federal control and the short-line railroad is embarrassed, of course, by such regulations as the Federal administration may make. Now, the clear intent of the Congress was that the taking over of the trunk-line railroads should not operate to destroy these local competing roads, and it would be the greatest violation of public policy if we allow that taking of the trunk-line railroads to operate to destroy just and legitimate competition which has been built up in response to a local demand. I am somewhat at a loss to know how under the present trend of railroad legislation in this country we are going to secure independent lines of railroads. How can independent lines be built? Here they have been built in many cases from local capital, and under that can not sustain themselves in opposition to the combined competition of the Railroad Administration, and they must go down. Now, suppose they perish. What opportunity is there in the future for the building of an independent line of road to compete with the present trunk line? It is a very serious question in our transportation system.

Another question is this, gentlemen: We have not an abundance of transportation facilities in this country. We are short of transportation facilities. It is perfectly possible for the Railroad Administration to make full use of these short lines by routing over them the surplus amount that they can carry, to the exclusion of the trunk lines.

VETO MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 1206).

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this message involves a matter of considerable interest to the membership of the House, and I believe a quorum should be present here to receive this important message.

Mr. CANNON. Can not the message be withheld temporarily until we can dispose of this resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state this: He is in no rush about laying this message before the House, but the Post Office Committee wants to meet at half-past 3 and see what they are going to do about reporting another bill. The Chair did not understand what the gentleman said.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me possibly the committee ought not to take any action until the message is disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Well, all the disposition that is necessary to make at this time is to have the message read, and then the gentleman from Tennessee or somebody else will make a motion to refer the message and the bill itself to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. STEENERSON. But the Constitution provides that the House shall proceed to vote on the question—

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that. It may proceed to-day, next week, or next year. It has been ruled on over and over again. It does not mean you shall immediately take it up. The Chair has read that section of the Constitution until he knows it by heart, and has read all the decisions. It may lie on the Speaker's table if they want to or take it to the committee if they want to. It need not be reported back if the committee does not want to do so.

Mr. STEENERSON. Well, the message will be read, and then we will take such steps as are desirable.

The SPEAKER. Of course.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Chair mean to state that while the vetoed message is pending upon a bill such as this that the House can proceed to consider and pass an identical bill with the exception of that part which is the subject of veto?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know what the committee will report back except in the light of experience. The Chair does not understand the point the gentleman makes.

Mr. WALSH. The point I sought to make is this: Whether the House can proceed to consider a bill just identical in language and effect to that which has been vetoed while the veto is pending upon a particular part—

The SPEAKER. Oh, no; you have got to vote on the veto.

EXTENSION OF TIME OF FEDERAL CONTROL OF RAILROADS.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I understand the time has expired of the hour which was controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee. I ask if we could not vote on this?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has seven minutes more. [Cries of "Vote!"]

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman wants to move the previous question on the resolution and amendments thereto the Chair will withhold the President's message for a few moments.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I promised gentlemen a little more time, but in view of the situation I move the previous question on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage. Before making that motion I want to ask unanimous consent to strike out all of the preamble except the last two words on page 2, "be it."

The SPEAKER. The preamble is the last thing that is voted on.

Mr. SIMS. I move the previous question on the passage of the resolution and amendments thereto.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman ask to strike the entire preamble from the resolution?

Mr. SIMS. Except the last two words, "be it."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to strike from the preamble everything except the last two words, "be it." Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SIMS. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution, preamble, and amendments.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I ask unanimous consent for one minute.

Mr. SIMS. I am perfectly willing and anxious for the gentleman to have it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield as to the form of the amendment which he has suggested to be eliminated from the preamble? I do not recall in the passage of a resolution the words "be it" preceding the word "resolved."

Mr. SIMS. Well—

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not believe that is proper practice.

The SPEAKER. That is absolutely a matter of taste.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is more than a matter of taste because it is included in the amendment.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma may have permission to speak for one minute.

The SPEAKER. You do not have to ask unanimous consent.

Mr. SIMS. I yield to the gentleman one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the control of time in his own hands. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] is recognized for one minute.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, when legislation was enacted into a law authorizing the Director General to take over the railroads of the country I am sure it was not the intention of Congress to discriminate against short lines. Everyone knows the necessity of short-line railroads, as, to a large extent, they are pioneers when it comes to developing new territory. In every section of the country where you find this kind of railroads you will see splendid towns and the territory which they go through developed in a way that compares favorably with the territory adjacent to trunk lines. If the Government should discriminate so as to cause these roads to not receive the same consideration that will be given the trunk lines, then it is only a matter of time when they will slowly perish. I mean by this if they are not allowed to have the same advantages in the way of traffic arrangements, terminal facilities, and other benefits, it will be impossible for them to receive a sufficient amount of business so as to enable them to be self-sustaining.

The argument has been advanced that some of these short-line railroads are now being operated at a loss. Even if this were true, it can not be disputed that they are rendering to the citizens of the country depending upon same a service that can not be estimated in dollars and cents. If our Government would refuse to operate such enterprises or departments that are being maintained at a loss, it would be necessary that we suspend some branches of the Government in less than 30 days. When you measure the good that is given to a territory and the citizens living therein in comparison with the small loss that might be brought about in the operation of a short-line railroad, it is only a drop in the bucket compared to the loss that goes on from year to year in some of the other enterprises that are being maintained for the benefit of the people and the various communities at large.

In the district I have the honor to represent there is a short-line railroad called the Clinton & Oklahoma Western. Along this road are several splendid, new, hustling little cities. The

people who have gone out there have pioneered, eager for the opportunity of developing that section in order that they may have a home which will enable them to live in peace and happiness. When it was reported that the Government would not extend its protecting arm over these short lines, then they began to be alarmed, and I have in my office more than 500 appeals asking that no action be taken that would destroy their rights and privileges. It so happens this little short-line railroad is making money. It has at its head an efficient set of officers, who are conducting their affairs along business lines. They have made pleasant, agreeable traffic arrangements, and now they say to me, "If we are to be deprived of our privileges, then it is only a matter of time until our road must be operated at a loss."

I am sure this is one of the most important resolutions that has ever been brought before this body for consideration. I know it is necessary that Congress show to this department of our Government its real intention when it comes to handling matters of this kind. Some time ago it was reported that this department of our Government would not allow a certain railroad over 700 miles long, which goes through the district I have the honor to represent, to receive the benefits that would be given to other railroads. Immediately appeals were made to me from practically every town along its right of way, and I secured such information as was available and filed the following statement with Mr. McAdoo, the Director General of Railroads, asking that no unjust discrimination be made against the Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railroad:

STATEMENT BY MR. MCCLINTIC TO HON. WM. G. McADOO, DIRECTOR GENERAL OF RAILROADS.

KANSAS CITY, MEXICO & ORIENT RAILROAD.

Every new railroad, as a rule, has to go through certain periods which cause its promoters to suffer from a financial standpoint. These conditions are brought about in various ways, and the same thing holds true with the Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railroad Co. According to the records, this railroad has gone through two periods of receivership, the first being caused by a financial depression, which resulted in its being placed in the hands of a receiver on March 7, 1912, and it remained in this condition until July 6, 1914. Later, and on April 16, 1917, it was again placed in the hands of a receiver; and this is the condition of the road at the present time.

FACTS CONNECTED WITH THE ROAD.

The Orient Railroad is at this time operating trains from Wichita, Kans., to Alpine, Tex., a distance of 737 miles. It has opened up a large territory that can not be served by any other transportation company, and many prominent towns, in addition to large sections of agricultural country, are dependent upon this road entirely for transportation facilities. The rolling stock consists of 61 locomotives, 22 passenger cars, and 1,726 freight cars. The road is fairly well graded, and 70-pound steel rails are used throughout. In addition to this equipment, adequate steam shovels, bridge-repairing equipment, and a splendid roundhouse and repair shop are available at Wichita.

BUSINESS OF THE ROAD.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Orient Railroad has been handicapped because it was not built into Kansas City and other terminal points, it has maintained through schedules and taken care of all the business entrusted to it in an efficient manner. In 1916 it carried 409,776 net tons originating on its own lines and 741,175 tons received from connecting lines, making a grand total of 1,150,952 tons, or 75,225 full carloads. In 1917 there was a reduction of tonnage originating on its own line, caused by the unprecedented droughts in practically all of the territory served by the road. The amount of tonnage originating for this year is 356,592 tons, and that received from connecting lines 831,128 tons, making a grand total of 1,187,721 tons, or 70,700 carloads. According to the information that has been given the authorities, this road has a sufficient amount of power and capacity to take care of more than double the business that it is at present handling; and with the present prospects for a good crop throughout the section of the country that it serves it can easily be seen that the road has passed through its most critical period and that in a very short time the added tonnage it will receive will be sufficient to enable it to pay more than the cost of operating expenses.

Judge Pollock, of Kansas, who is on the Federal bench, has had jurisdiction over the receivership of this road. He is probably as well posted as to the existing conditions as any other man in the country. Recently he granted permission to those in charge of this road to issue two and a half million of three-year receivership certificates, and from the information I have one and a half million of these have been subscribed for. The present financial conditions confronting the world have made it practically impossible to secure large amounts of money for construction purposes, and for this reason it has not been possible to complete this road to Kansas City, Mo., or to other places where connections are needed. The people of Texas are very much interested in seeing the Government retain supervision over this road, and resolutions have been passed by both branches of the Texas Legislature under date of March 16, 1918, asking that no discrimination be made against the Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railroad Co.

NEW TERRITORY OPENED.

The Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railroad was graded through many sections of Oklahoma and Texas for a number of years prior to the time it was completed. This resulted in the people starting many new enterprises years before the road was completed, thereby opening up much new territory for settlement. The building of this road has resulted in the establishment of many large irrigation plants in Texas; in fact, it can be said that the largest irrigated areas in some counties in Texas are those which are supplied by this road. In other sections, which depend entirely upon this road for transportation facilities, the live-stock industry is such that if this road should be discontinued it would bring about irreparable injury to the country and a great financial loss to those who are interested in this business.

There are some important towns with a population of 1,000 or more that depend entirely upon this road for its supplies. As an illustration, I respectfully call attention to the town of Canton, Okla., which has a population of approximately 1,000. This railroad in 1916 furnished to this town 251 carloads of various kinds of supplies, and in 1917, 348 carloads. When it is taken into consideration that the Post Office Department, the express companies, and many other kinds of business have at this time a satisfactory system of taking care of every condition, it can easily be seen that any movement that would cause this road to be discontinued would disturb the harmonious condition that exists and bring about untold hardships on the people who depend upon this railroad for transportation facilities.

CONCLUSION.

Under Government control the Orient Railroad has already demonstrated its usefulness in many ways. It has been handling 60 cars per day from Sweetwater, Tex., to Wichita, Kans., and many tons of freight have been diverted at different points for the use of the Government. Recent rains have caused thousands of heads of cattle to be brought into certain sections of Texas, which are taken care of by this railroad, and with good crop prospects in practically all of the territory, it can easily be seen that if no discrimination is made that the added business it will receive in the very near future will cause it to be able to take care of its financial obligations in a most satisfactory way.

I feel that no more meritorious railroad is now being operated than the Kansas City, Mexico & Orient. The construction of the system has resulted in the opening of large sections of the country, and thousands of people to-day are dependent upon it for the necessities of life. It has been a pioneer in blazing the way for civilization, and now, inasmuch as it has apparently reached the place where it can soon be operated without financial loss, it is hoped that the Government will not feel justified in making an order that will cause the same to be discontinued.

If the information given in this connection does not cover every phase of the situation, I respectfully ask that no action be taken until a committee representing the Government can inspect this road, the section of the country it goes through, and the industries that are dependent upon it for a livelihood.

Respectfully submitted.

JIM MCCLINTIC.

I am sure it is the desire of those in charge of this branch of our Government to deal fairly with all questions coming under their jurisdiction, and when this resolution is enacted into law then there will be no doubt as to what is the intention of Congress when it comes to dealing with matters of this kind. Mr. Speaker, I am hoping this measure can be enacted into law at the earliest date possible, as the entire country, more or less, is interested in this subject, and when it is known that the Government does not intend to make any discrimination in favor or against any of our industries then the people will have no cause for complaint.

MR. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to strike out the entire preamble.

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

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] asks unanimous consent to strike out the entire preamble. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

THE SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment of the House joint resolution.

MR. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, there is a committee amendment.

THE SPEAKER. The first vote, then, is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

THE SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the House joint resolution.

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

On motion of Mr. SIMS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

VETO MESSAGE—POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL (H. DOC. NO. 1206).

THE SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the veto message of the President.

MR. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes a point of order there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not.

MR. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

THE SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Austin	Britten	Campbell, Pa.	Classon
Baer	Brodbeck	Candler, Miss.	Coady
Bell	Brumbaugh	Cantrill	Collier
Bland	Burroughs	Cartier, Mass.	Copley

Costello	Hayes	McKinley	Scully
Crago	Heaton	McLemore	Sells
Curry, Cal.	Hefintz	Mann	Shackelford
Dale, N. Y.	Hensley	Martin	Sherley
Davidson	Holland	Mason	Sherwood
Davis	Hood	Montague	Slayden
Denison	Houston	Moore, Pa.	Slemp
Dent	Howard	Morin	Small
Dies	Husted	Mudd	Snell
Doremus	Hutchinson	Nelson	Snyder
Drukker	James	Norton	Stedman
Edmonds	Johnson, S. Dak.	Olney	Stephens, Nebr.
Emerson	Juil	O'Shaunnessy	Stevenson
Estopinal	Kahn	Overstreet	Strong
Ferris	Kearns	Palge	Sullivan
Flood	Kelley, Mich.	Parker, N. J.	Switzer
Foss	Kennedy, Iowa	Powers	Talbott
Frear	Kless, Pa.	Ramseyer	Templeton
Freeman	Knutson	Rayburn	Vare
Gallivan	Kreider	Reavis	Voigt
Glass	LaGuardia	Roberts	Walker
Goodall	Langley	Robinson	Walton
Gould	Lehlbach	Rodenberg	Ward
Graham, Pa.	Lesh	Rose	Watson, Va.
Gray, N. J.	Lever	Rowe	Welling
Gregg	Littlepage	Rowland	Whaley
Griest	McAndrews	Russell	White, Ohio
Hamill	McCormick	Schall	Wingo
Hamilton, N. Y.	McKenzick	Scott, Iowa	Wise
Harrison, Miss.		Scott, Pa.	Zihman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 294 Members, a quorum, have answered to their names.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The Chair lays before the House the message from the President of the United States, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I am taking the liberty of returning H. R. 7237, making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, without my signature, because the bill contains a provision which I venture to think it would be wisest to omit. I refer to the provision with regard to the rental of pneumatic tubes.

I am convinced that there is no moral or legal obligation resting on the Government to continue the use of these tubes by rental. At the time they were installed they may have had some value as a postal facility, but that was before the volume of mail had reached the enormous proportions which it has to-day and before the development of the use of motor vehicles. These developments have made the tubes practically obsolete, quite unnecessary, and in fact a hindrance to the efficient operation of the Postal Service. This is illustrated by the fact that in 1913 it was estimated that 5,373,147 letters were dispatched daily by the use of the tubes, while in 1917 only 2,837,638, or approximately one-half that number, were dispatched by that means. If this ratio of reduction continued, few, if any, letters would now be sent in that way. Less than 50 per cent of the letter mail, or 5 per cent of the entire volume of mail, handled at the stations using the pneumatic-tube service is transported by the tubes.

There seems to be an impression that if the tubes were abandoned these letters would be delayed. This is an unfounded impression, because practically all of this mail could be handled at less cost and more expeditiously by other means.

There are many reasons why the present pneumatic-tube systems are not efficient devices for the transmission of mail. Among these reasons is their limited capacity, which makes it impossible to use them to meet conditions of emergency. Furthermore, experience has demonstrated that the tubes are unreliable because of breakdowns and stoppages. During such breakdowns they cease operation for hours and even for days together, and it is often necessary to dig up the streets to obtain the mail clogged in the tubes. When these breakdowns occur it is necessary immediately to substitute vehicular service, which results in a confusion of schedules and disorganization of the transportation and delivery service and delay in the forwarding of large numbers of letters. Not only are letters delayed in this way, but because of defects in the tubes, carelessness on the part of operators, and accidents of various sorts the tubes soil or damage many thousand letters and in some instances destroy them.

The Post Office Department has found it necessary because of the unreliability and inefficiency of the tubes to divert a large quantity of mail formerly dispatched by their use to automobiles wherever close connections are required. It has been found that later closings of the mail can be arranged and closer

connections assured by this means. I am informed that this is true even in the congested sections of New York City.

Some of the principal objections to the tubes, in addition to those I have already enumerated, are their unsuitability to carry many special-delivery parcels; the necessary relaying of containers at way stations involving a loss of time and requiring that all intermediate stations be kept open with attendants on duty; their inability to dispatch mail to intermediate stations during continuous transmission between any two points; their unsuitability to the dispatch of mail to the point where it is received by or taken from the railroad companies without additional handling; and the impossibility of preventing dampness and oil in the tubes at certain times, which results in damage to the mail.

It will be noted that the tubes when working at their best perform only one step in the transmission of the mail from the sender to the addressee, and the advantage of their use is largely theoretical. This conclusion was reached by Stone & Webster, among others, a firm of engineers employed by the congressional commission which recently investigated this matter. In speaking of the services performed by the tubes, they state— but being only one step in the movement of the mail and being preceded and succeeded by other steps in which, by the exigencies of economical mail handling, intermittent movement is necessary, the advantage of the tubes is often lost, and at times the tubes become entirely inadequate to handle a bulk of mail which has been accumulated in some preceding step.

I have been guided in my conclusions by those who have expert postal knowledge and who seem to me the safest judges as to whether these tubes constitute a desirable postal facility. In the act of April 21, 1902, the Congress, realizing that the Postmaster General could not be expected to be an expert on postal affairs, prohibited him by law from issuing an advertisement for pneumatic mail service until a commission of postal experts had given their approval. When the last rental contract expired, such a commission was appointed in accordance with this law. Its report as well as subsequent reports by experts on the value of this service is before me, and no one who reads these reports can escape the impression that the conclusions reached by these experts are sound and that the use of the tubes should be abandoned.

I am informed that during the past 10 years many efforts have been made to extend the present system of pneumatic tubes, but that these extensions have invariably been advised against by the departmental commissions of postal experts who investigated the matter, and that the reports of these experts invariably called attention to the development of the automobile as a factor which would have to be considered at the close of the present rental contracts. The postmasters of various cities where the tubes are in use have spoken against them and urged that they be abandoned.

These reasons seeming to me conclusive and compelling, I have not felt at liberty to acquiesce in this feature of the bill, which I herewith reluctantly return.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
29 June, 1918.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House on reconsideration do agree to pass the bill notwithstanding the objection of the President.

The SPEAKER. I wish the gentleman would send the motion to the desk.

Mr. STEENERSON. And on that motion I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. STEENERSON: I move that the House on reconsideration do agree to pass the bill notwithstanding the objections of the President.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, on that motion I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota has already moved it. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] moves the previous question on this motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, does not that require the yeas and nays?

The SPEAKER. Of course. The Chair will order them just as quick as he can get to it. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] moves that the Post Office bill be reconsidered and passed, the President's objections to the contrary notwithstanding. On that the Constitution requires that the yeas and

nays be called. The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of passing this bill over the President's veto, which is the popular phrase, will, as their names are called, vote "yea," and those opposed will vote "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 114, nays 186, answered "present" 3, not voting 127, as follows:

YEAS—114.

Austin	Fairfield	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, C. B.
Bowers	Fess	McLaughlin, Pa.	Smith, T. F.
Browning	Flynn	Magee	Steenerson
Burroughs	Focht	Maher	Stiness
Butler	Fordney	Mapes	Sweet
Caldwell	Francis	Meeker	Swift
Campbell, Kans.	Fuller, Ill.	Merritt	Tagne
Cannon	Garland	Miller, Minn.	Temple
Carew	Gillett	Mott	Tilson
Chandler, N. Y.	Good	Nolan	Timberlake
Classon	Goodall	Oliver, N. Y.	Tinkham
Cooper, W. Va.	Green, Iowa	Parker, N. Y.	Towner
Cramton	Greene, Mass.	Peters	Treadway
Currie, Mich.	Greene, Vt.	Phelan	Vestal
Dale, Vt.	Hadley	Platt	Volstead
Dallinger	Hawley	Pratt	Waldo
Darrow	Hersey	Purnell	Walsh
Delaney	Ireland	Ramsey	Wason
Dempsey	Johnson, Wash.	Riordan	Watson, Pa.
Denison	Kennedy, Iowa	Robbins	Wheeler
Donovan	Kennedy, R. I.	Roberts	White, Me.
Dooley	Kraus	Rogers	Williams
Dunn	La Follette	Sanders, Ind.	Wilson, Ill.
Dyer	London	Sanders, N. Y.	Winslow
Elliott	Longworth	Sanford	Wood, Ind.
Ellsworth	Lufkin	Stegel	Woods, Iowa
Elston	Lundeen	Sinnott	Young, N. Dak.
Esch	McArthur	Sloan	
Fairchild, B. L.	McFadden	Smith, Mich.	

NAYS—186.

Alexander	Dominick	Johnson, Ky.	Ramseyer
Almon	Doolittle	Jones	Randall
Anderson	Doughton	Kenting	Rankin
Anthony	Drane	Kelly, Pa.	Rayburn
Ashbrook	Dupré	Kettner	Reed
Aswell	Egan	Key, Ohio	Romjue
Ayres	Eagle	Kincheloe	Rouse
Bankhead	Evans	Kinkaid	Rubey
Barkley	Fairchild, G. W.	Kitchin	Rucker
Barnhart	Farr	Larsen	Sabath
Beakes	Ferris	Lazaro	Saunders, Va.
Beshlin	Fields	Lea, Cal.	Scott, Mich.
Black	Fisher	Lee, Ga.	Sears
Blackmon	Flood	Linthicum	Shallenberger
Blanton	Foster	Little	Sherley
Booher	French	Lobeck	Shouse
Bozland	Fuller, Mass.	Loneragan	Sims
Brand	Gallagher	McAndrews	Sisson
Browne	Gandy	McClintic	Small
Buchanan	Gard	McCulloch	Snook
Burnett	Garner	McKeown	Stafford
Byrnes, S. C.	Garrett, Tenn.	Madden	Stegall
Byrnes, Tenn.	Garrett, Tex.	Mansfield	Steele
Caraway	Glynn	Mays	Stephens, Miss.
Carlin	Godwin, N. C.	Miller, Wash.	Stephens, Nebr.
Carter, Okla.	Goodwin, Ark.	Mondell	Sterling, Ill.
Cary	Gordon	Moon	Sterling, Pa.
Chandler, Okla.	Graham, Ill.	Moore, Ind.	Sumners
Church	Gray, Ala.	Morgan	Taylor, Ark.
Clark, Fla.	Griffin	Neely	Taylor, Colo.
Clark, Pa.	Hamilton, Mich.	Nicholls, S. C.	Thomas
Claypool	Hamlin	Nichols, Mich.	Thompson
Cleary	Harrison, Miss.	Oldfield	Tillman
Connally, Tex.	Haskell	Oliver, Ala.	Van Dyke
Connell, Kans.	Hastings	Osborne	Venable
Cooper, Ohio	Haugen	Overmyer	Vinson
Cooper, Wis.	Hayden	Padgett	Watkins
Cox	Heflin	Park	Weaver
Crisp	Helm	Polk	Webb
Crosser	Helvering	Porter	Welty
Decker	Hilliard	Pou	Wilson, La.
Denton	Hollingsworth	Price	Wilson, Tex.
Dewall	Huddleston	Quin	Woodward
Dickinson	Hull, Iowa	Ragsdale	Wright
Dill	Humphreys	Rainey, H. T.	Young, Tex.
Dillon	Igoe	Rainey, J. W.	
Dixon	Jacoway	Raker	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Hardy	Harrison, Va.	Sanders, La.
-------	---------------	--------------

NOT VOTING—127.

Bacharach	Dies	Helntz	La Guardia
Baer	Doremus	Hensley	Langley
Bell	Dowell	Hicks	Lehbach
Bland	Drukker	Holland	Leshner
Britten	Edmonds	Hood	Lever
Brodbeck	Emerson	Houston	Littlepage
Brumbaugh	Estopinal	Howard	Lynn
Campbell, Pa.	Foss	Hull, Tenn.	McCormick
Candler, Miss.	Frear	Husted	McKenzie
Cantrill	Freeman	Hutchinson	McKinley
Carter, Mass.	Gallivan	James	McLemore
Coady	Glass	Johnson, S. Dak.	Mann
Collier	Gould	Juul	Martin
Copley	Graham, Pa.	Kahn	Mason
Costello	Gray, N. J.	Kearns	Montague
Crago	Gregg	Keboe	Moore, Pa.
Curry, Cal.	Griest	Kelley, Mich.	Morin
Dale, N. Y.	Hamill	Kiess, Pa.	Mudd
Davidson	Hamilton, N. Y.	King	Nelson
Davis	Hayes	Knutson	Norton
Dent	Hcaton	Kreider	Oliver

O'Shaunessy	Russell	Snell	Walker
Overstreet	Schall	Snyder	Walton
Paige	Scott, Iowa	Stedman	Ward
Parker, N. J.	Scott, Pa.	Stevenson	Watson, Va.
Powers	Scully	Strong	Welling
Reavis	Sells	Sullivan	Whaley
Robinson	Shackleford	Switzer	White, Ohio
Rodenberg	Sherwood	Talbott	Wingo
Rose	Slayden	Templeton	Wise
Rowe	Slemp	Vare	Zihlman
Rowland	Smith, Idaho	Voigt	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. ROWLAND and Mr. KREIDER (for) with Mr. CANTRILL (against).

Mr. HICKS and Mr. WARD (for) with Mr. ESTOPINAL (against).

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania and Mr. OLNEY (for) with Mr. HARRISON of Virginia (against).

Mr. BACHARACH and Mr. LEHLBACH (for) with Mr. TALBOTT (against).

Mr. SNELL and Mr. SNYDER (for) with Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi (against).

Mr. ROSE and Mr. ROWE (for) with Mr. DENT (against).

Mr. HUSTED and Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts (for) with Mr. HULL of Tennessee (against).

Mr. VARE and Mr. GRIEST (for) with Mr. HEATON (against).

Mr. EDMONDS and Mr. EGAN (for) with Mr. MARTIN (against).

Mr. HAMILTON of New York and Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. HARDY (against).

Mr. PAIGE and Mr. GOULD (for) with Mr. REAVIS (against).

Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. TEMPLETON (for) with Mr. HOWARD (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. BELL with Mr. ZIHLMAN.

Mr. WISE with Mr. BLAND.

Mr. WINGO with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. BRODBECK with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. VOIGT.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio with Mr. CURRY of California.

Mr. WHALEY with Mr. TREADWAY.

Mr. WELLING with Mr. SWITZER.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania with Mr. STRONG.

Mr. COADY with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.

Mr. COLLIER with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia with Mr. FREEMAN.

Mr. WALTON with Mr. SCOTT of Iowa.

Mr. WALKER with Mr. EMERSON.

Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. FREAR.

Mr. STEVENSON with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. STEDMAN with Mr. FOSS.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. DOWELL.

Mr. HAYDEN with Mr. MCKINLEY.

Mr. SHERWOOD with Mr. PARKER of New Jersey.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. DAVIDSON.

Mr. SCHALL with Mr. GRAY of New Jersey.

Mr. ROBINSON with Mr. KNUTSON.

Mr. RUSSELL with Mr. LANGLEY.

Mr. DOBEMUS with Mr. HAYES.

Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. LESHNER with Mr. MCCORMICK.

Mr. LEVER with Mr. MCKENZIE.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. MASON.

Mr. LUNN with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. HAMIL with Mr. MUDD.

Mr. HOLLAND with Mr. NELSON.

Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. JAMES.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. JULI.

Mr. OVERSTREET with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. KEHOE with Mr. KAHN.

Mr. DIES with Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. HENSELEY with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.

Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOOD with Mr. KING.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana with Mr. RODENBERG.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with Mr. RODENBERG. I voted "no." I wish to withdraw that vote and answer "present."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall, listening?

Mr. LEVER. I was not, Mr. Speaker; I was over in the Senate.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. Two-thirds failing to vote to pass this bill the President's objection to the contrary notwithstanding, the bill is dead.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the President's veto message be referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the President's veto message be referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the veto.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the veto. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### DIVERSIONS OF WATER FROM NIAGARA RIVER.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House resolution 406.

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed to the consideration of S. J. Res. 158, entitled "Joint resolution further extending the time within which the joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to issue temporary permits for additional diversions of water from Niagara River shall remain in effect," under the general rules of the House.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from North Carolina yield to me?

Mr. POU. I do.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be taken up without the rule. It is absolutely necessary to pass it to-day, and I do not believe there will be any objection to taking it up by unanimous consent.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, if the resolution is taken up for consideration, will time be given for making inquiries as to the reasons why the House committee has departed from the prior authorizations in phraseology, extending the authority, and did not agree to the joint resolution as it passed the Senate which carried that authority into effect, and changed the language from that which has heretofore been carried in the extension of these grants?

Mr. FLOOD. Certainly, Mr. Speaker. It is not my purpose to cut off any inquiries which might be made within the hour.

Mr. STAFFORD. And with the opportunity to offer amendments in case anybody wishes to do so?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] asks unanimous consent, notwithstanding the rule that has been reported, for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution 158. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. FRENCH, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for the remainder of the afternoon to make addresses to soldiers at the dedication of the Young Men's Christian Association hut at Camp Humphreys.

#### DIVERSIONS OF WATER FROM NIAGARA RIVER.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution with the committee amendment, which is as follows:

#### Senate joint resolution 158.

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue permits revocable at will for the diversion of water in the United States from the Niagara River above the Falls for the creation of power to individuals, companies, or corporations which are now actually producing power from the waters of said river, in quantities which in no event shall exceed in the aggregate a daily diversion at the rate of 20,000 cubic feet per second: *Provided*, That this resolution shall remain in force until the 1st day of July, 1919, and no longer, at the expiration of which time all permits granted hereunder shall terminate unless sooner revoked. Any individuals, companies, or corporations violating any of the provisions of said permits or diverting water from said river above the Falls for the creation of power, except under a permit issued under the authority of this law, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine not exceeding \$2,000 nor less than \$500, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year nor less than 30 days, or both, in the discretion of the court; and each and every day on which such violation occurs or is committed shall be deemed a separate offense: *Provided*, That where such violation is charged against the company or corporate body the offense shall be taken and deemed to be that of any director, officer, agent, or employee of such company or corporate body ordering, directing, or permitting the same."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, this resolution gives the Secretary of War authority for a year to grant revocable permits for the diversion of water from the Niagara Falls, above the Falls,

to the extent that that diversion is authorized under the treaty with Great Britain, namely, 20,000 cubic feet per second. Under what was known as the Burton Act 15,600 cubic feet of water was authorized to be diverted. Congress passed a resolution in January, 1917, authorizing the Secretary of War to issue permits for the diversion of the remaining 4,400 feet. The Burton Act and the resolution that we passed later extending the Burton Act have expired by limitation. There is no authority of law now for the diversion of that 15,600 cubic feet. The joint resolution authorizing the diversion of the remaining 4,400 feet of the treaty water was extended by a resolution of June 3, 1917, to run to July 1, 1918, but with certain limitations. The limitations being that the companies using this water to develop power should not install more machinery than they then had for its use.

The authority of the Secretary of War to permit the diversion of this water under that resolution expires on the 1st day of July of this year, which is Monday. The resolution passed by the Senate authorized an extension of these permits for one year, but on the same terms as the resolution of January, 1917. The House committee reported this resolution as an amendment to the resolution, and the difference is that the power companies can install additional machinery if necessary to consume the water authorized to be diverted. This resolution also applies to the whole of the treaty water instead of only to the 4,400 cubic feet.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] indicated that he wanted to know our reasons for these changes. These are the changes the Foreign Affairs Committee made in the Senate resolution.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand it, if the gentleman will permit, the resolution that came over to the House from the Senate was in similar language to the resolution passed on January 19, 1917, which continued the prior authorization under the act of June 30, 1917, up to to-morrow.

Mr. FLOOD. The day after to-morrow—that is right.

Mr. STAFFORD. That Senate resolution was predicated upon the idea that these revocable permits issued by the Secretary of War should terminate when Congress should pass legislation regulating and controlling the diversion of the water. This whole question of the granting of the right to use this water, and particularly granting the right to use water in excess of that which the machinery then installed was capable of using, was always predicated upon the idea that Congress would pass some legislation which should supersede it. Now the amendment reported by the House committee does not make it contingent upon Congress passing any general legislation covering the use of water power, but grants a revocable permit that will expire a year hence, June 30, 1919. Therefore, if the water power bill that has recently been introduced should be enacted into law, these users of water power at Niagara Falls would be exempt from the provisions of that law until a year hence, whereas it has always been the policy of Congress merely to grant these temporary rights subject to the decision of Congress whenever it should pass some general law applying to water powers throughout the country.

Mr. FLOOD. No; the gentleman has not got that exactly right. This authorizes the Secretary of War to issue revocable permits for a year. He can revoke those permits any day he sees fit.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes; but heretofore the right to continue under these permits was terminable as soon as Congress should pass a general law that would apply to water power, the Secretary of War to the contrary notwithstanding, as to whether he would exercise his discretion; but now you are surrendering that right and leaving it only to the discretion of the Secretary of War to determine whether within a year he will revoke the permit or not.

Mr. FLOOD. There was nothing in the original resolution that differed in the respect the gentleman is talking about from this resolution. The original resolution simply gave the Secretary of War the right to issue revocable permits from the date of the passage of the resolution in January to June 30, 1917, but it did not have anything in it about the permit expiring when legislation was enacted by Congress. There was nothing in the resolution about that. The policy of this resolution is exactly the same as the policy of the original resolution, with the two exceptions I have mentioned. The gentleman will remember we passed the resolution of January, 1917, with the exception that between that time and the 1st of the next July we would enact permanent legislation on this question. The House did pass a well-considered measure dealing with this question comprehensively and permanently, but that measure failed to go through the Senate, and as a result of that we passed another resolution extending the authority of the

Secretary of War to issue permits for one year longer, until the 30th of June, 1918. But the policy was exactly the same as that of this resolution, with this exception: These resolutions did not permit the installation of more machinery. They authorized the use of the water, but the users could not use any more water than they then had machinery to consume. Now, it has developed that instead of using the 20,000 cubic feet of water that this country has the right to permit the use of, they are using only between 18,000 and 19,000 cubic feet per second, and there is something between 1,500 and 2,000 cubic feet per second of that water going to waste. These companies are willing to take their chances on installing more machinery and using this water and making 30,000 or 40,000 additional horsepower of electrical energy that is in great demand to make machinery and other articles that are necessary in the prosecution of the war, and so, in consideration of that fact, we eliminated from this resolution the limitation that they should not install any more machinery to use this water than they now have.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LONDON. Has the Secretary of War asked for the passage of this resolution in this form?

Mr. FLOOD. The Secretary of War desires it in the very form that the House committee reported it.

Mr. LONDON. In other words, it is desired to remove all limitations?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes. That is the only difference between this resolution and the resolution of 1917, except that this resolution applies to the whole 20,000 cubic feet of water per second, as it ought to, instead of the 4,400 cubic feet.

Mr. WALDOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I will.

Mr. WALDOW. Is it not true that the Secretary of War at the present time, under the authority vested in him, has the power to grant permission to companies to make improvements so that they can use the entire diversion of water?

Mr. FLOOD. I understand that a company is at work deepening and broadening its canal so that all the water can be used.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman acquaint the committee, because the report is a vacuum so far as giving reasons and arguments for the legislation—

Mr. FLOOD. We thought the committee knew so much about the matter that it was not necessary to put it all in the report.

Mr. STAFFORD. Like the reports generally from the Committee on Foreign Affairs which have been of a vacuistic character—

Mr. FLOOD. I do not think the gentleman ought to say that about the reports from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. They have generally been full and complete. I call the gentleman's attention to the report on the war resolutions, the last appropriation bill for the Consular and Diplomatic Service, and I could call his attention to many others where the reports have been very full. This resolution does not call for a lengthy report.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can cite instance after instance where the reports from the Committee on Foreign Affairs have contained no reasons or arguments. But we will lay that aside. I am going to inquire why the committee saw fit to leave out, in the amendment as reported by his committee, the restriction that was carried in the Senate resolution that permits would be only in force until Congress should enact legislation regulating and controlling the diversion of water generally.

Mr. FLOOD. Where does the gentleman find that?

Mr. STAFFORD. On page 2, lines 4 to 6, the Senate resolution says:

unless the Congress shall before that date enact legislation regulating and controlling the diversions of water from the Niagara River or from boundary streams generally, in which event this resolution shall cease to be of any further force or effect.

That contemplates the passing of some water-power legislation that unquestionably will cover the water power in Niagara River.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. No; it does not.

Mr. FLOOD. General water-power legislation does not embrace the boundary-line waters.

Mr. STAFFORD. As reported by the special committee, it may not.

Mr. FLOOD. They were not under the rule authorized to consider boundary waters.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. This is a treaty question.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Wisconsin says this is a treaty question, but the resolutions from time to time have been introduced because they were all of an expedient character and granted the use of power until the Congress should fix some permanent policy which would apply to Niagara Falls,

Mr. FLOOD. That is the purpose of this very resolution, and I will say that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has taken evidence for weeks and have been considering a measure dealing with this question permanently and thoroughly, and we have not got through with it yet.

Mr. STAFFORD. When the gentleman's committee does get through with it and it is taken up for consideration, why should not this temporary legislation be superseded by it, as intended by the Senate amendment?

Mr. FLOOD. That would be unobjectionable. I thought the gentleman said it was in the original resolution passed by Congress.

Mr. STAFFORD. To be frank with the gentleman, I did say that, but I was in error.

Mr. FLOOD. If the gentleman desires to offer an amendment of that kind, it will be perfectly satisfactory to all the members of the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. One more question. The gentleman may have taken evidence on the subject, but the Canadian water-power companies are hard pressed at the present time to supply the necessary power that is demanded in Canada for manufacturing plants on the Canadian side.

Mr. FLOOD. That is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the committee whether these companies are utilizing any greater amount of water diversion than they were using prior to the outbreak of the war?

Mr. FLOOD. They are establishing new machinery for using more water but they have not completed the installation yet.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the treaty with Great Britain whereby the two countries are to limit the amount of water diversion, how much was Canada authorized to use? I know that our country was authorized to use 20,000 cubic feet a second.

Mr. FLOOD. Canada was authorized to divert 36,000 cubic feet a second and we were authorized to divert 20,000 cubic feet a second.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the House how much of the 36,000 cubic feet per second is being used by the Canadian hydroelectric companies?

Mr. FLOOD. They are installing machinery to use it all, but at this time they are using a little less than 30,000 cubic feet a second.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand there are two companies utilizing 15,600 cubic feet per second, and they seek to have the privilege of taking the residuum of the 20,000 cubic feet.

Mr. FLOOD. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has heard of several companies that are considering this new general legislation. No other company has the machinery to generate power now. No other companies would be benefited by this resolution except the two companies because the other companies have no machinery and no plants.

Mr. STAFFORD. These two companies are engaged directly or indirectly in furnishing power in the making of supplies of a war character.

Mr. FLOOD. No; they make electric power out of this water.

Mr. STAFFORD. But this power is used by manufacturers, one of which is the Carborundum Co.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; the War Department has ascertained how much power the companies can generate, and they have distributed that power among the industries that are making material necessary for the prosecution of the war.

Mr. STAFFORD. I presume the House would be interested in knowing just the scope of the regulations the Secretary of War has prescribed under the revocable permits that he was authorized to grant for the use of power. Can the gentleman inform the House as to those regulations, whether there are any regulations as to the price to be charged to the consumer by the generating power companies?

Mr. FLOOD. That question is under the public-service commission of the State of New York, and the Secretary of War did not undertake to deal with it.

Mr. STAFFORD. So the Secretary of War has not attempted to regulate the price of power that will be paid by the consuming public?

Mr. FLOOD. No; but I will say to the gentleman that this power is all consumed by corporations that need just as little protection as these two generating companies need. They can take care of themselves; and some of them have contracts with these companies running for a long period of years, such as the aluminum company to furnish them power at \$8 per horsepower.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, as I understand the gentleman, all of the power that is generated by these two companies is sold to two large corporations.

Mr. FLOOD. No; not to two, but to quite a number.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understood the gentleman to say two large corporations were able to take care of themselves.

Mr. FLOOD. I said a number of corporations. I mentioned only one. I have a list of them here. There is the carbide company, the metallurgical company, the chemical company, the alkali company, and different carbon companies. There is quite a list of them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman got the rate per kilowatt at which the hydropower is sold?

Mr. FLOOD. No. It varies because some of these companies get power from the generating companies under contracts that were entered into years ago when electric power was not in such demand. They made contracts for very low prices, and, as I stated, some of them get the power for \$8 per horsepower and some of them have to pay as high as \$40.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then the gentleman has no objection to an amendment of similar import to that embodied in the Senate resolution?

Mr. FLOOD. None in the world.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman tell me whether any of this increase of power will go to the use of any of the Niagara brewing companies?

Mr. FLOOD. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. They are all being converted into near-beer companies, and I take it the gentleman from Washington would not object to its being used for that purpose.

Mr. SABATH. And for Coca-Cola.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. I am very glad the gentleman from Milwaukee, the home of the amber fluid, can advise me on this.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman needs advice.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. I am glad I have found the oracle to whom to appeal.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia says that Canada was using 36,000 cubic feet from Niagara River. Is any of the power produced by that water being transmitted into the United States?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; some of it; but it is being cut off as fast as possible.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend, in line 16, on page 2, by inserting the phraseology which is found in lines 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, page 2, as follows:

unless the Congress shall before that date enact legislation regulating and controlling the diversions of water from the Niagara River or from boundary streams generally, in which event this resolution shall cease to be of any further force or effect.

I question, however, whether that is the best place to insert that amendment.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I think it ought to come in after the word "revoked," in line 20.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I modify the amendment by having the phraseology just read inserted after the word "revoked," in line 20, changing the period to a comma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WENB). The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 20, after the word "revoked," strike out the period and insert a comma and the following language: "unless the Congress shall before that date enact legislation regulating and controlling the diversions of water from the Niagara River or from boundary streams generally, in which event this resolution shall cease to be of any further force or effect."

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman that the words "or from boundary streams generally" ought to be omitted. I do not think we want the waters of the cataract of Niagara in any way taken away from the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting in pursuance of a treaty with a foreign country.

Mr. FLOOD. I will say to the gentleman that in the formation of the Water Power Committee and the rule that provided for it there was taken from its jurisdiction or there was never given to it the jurisdiction of the waters of Niagara River and other boundary streams, so that the Niagara River and other boundary streams are left to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw from the amendment the words "or from boundary streams generally" and modify it further by inserting the word "and" before the word "unless."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 20, after the word "revoked," strike out the period and insert a comma and the following language: "and unless the Congress shall before that time enact legislation regulating and controlling the diversions of water from the Niagara River, in which event this resolution shall cease to be of any further force or effect."

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] a question. Assuming that Congress has enacted legislation and that this resolution had ceased to be of any force, that would not in itself revoke a license issued for the period of one year?

Mr. STAFFORD. This resolution is predicated upon the idea that Congress has not passed any legislation, but the amendment that is now being considered is that this resolution be superseded upon Congress passing some general legislation regulating the water flow at Niagara.

Mr. LONDON. But I question—

Mr. FLOOD. The permits issued by the Secretary of War are revocable at will.

Mr. LONDON. Are these permits revocable at will?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; this gives the Secretary of War authority to issue permits for 12 months, and they are revocable at his will.

Mr. LONDON. And they will be for one year, but they may be revoked at any time prior to the expiration of the year?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the gentleman's attention to this last amendment. In reference to this proviso, commencing line 16:

*Provided*, That this resolution shall remain in force until the 1st day of July, 1919, and no longer, at the expiration of which time all permits granted hereunder shall terminate unless sooner revoked.

Now, you put in this proviso—

Mr. STAFFORD. A further limitation.

Mr. RAKER. No; there is a question whether it is a further limitation.

And unless the Congress shall before that date enact legislation regulating and controlling the diversions of water from the Niagara Falls from the Niagara River, etc.

It is a question or not whether that will not extend these permits beyond that period. What you are trying to do is to put a limitation to the expiration, namely, July 1, 1919.

Mr. STAFFORD. If Congress passes legislation regulating the control of the Niagara River, that legislation will supersede these permits of a year notwithstanding the Secretary of War does not exercise his discretion to revoke the same within that year.

Mr. RAKER. That does not seem to be certain, because that proviso without the amendment being in there is sufficient that the permit would end and cease.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, to make it clear I wish to modify my amendment from the conjunctive to the disjunctive and ask that the word "or" instead of the word "and" be placed at the beginning of the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the modified amendment will be reported.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield for just a suggestion? The purpose of the removal of this restriction is to induce power companies to install additional machinery with which to develop this additional power for war purposes. Suppose the legislation should be such—and it is conceivable—that other power companies than the two power companies who are to take water under this resolution should obtain this water, and the companies look at it that way and say: "It is a question whether we are justified in going to the expense of installing this additional machinery to develop this power when it may be taken away from us within a year." The Government might lose much of the advantage this resolution seeks to obtain for it.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman presupposes that the Congress—

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is very easily possible. You have not any conception of the situation. I simply say it is a practical matter, and it is not only possible but it is very likely. These companies have already expended \$500,000 without any guaranty that they have this extension. Whether they are going to continue to expend money when legislation may be enacted which may take the power away from them is a very questionable thing, and there is need for this power.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman believe these companies have expended a half a million dollars without some understanding? They have not expended \$500,000 unless they felt perfectly sure it would not be thrown away.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman conceive of a situation where Congress would pass legislation which would prevent this necessary power when it is to be used for war purposes in order to prevent its being used for the benefit of the country—

Mr. DEMPSEY. I can see no other purpose of the amendment suggested by the gentleman except it is limited in this way I have suggested.

Mr. STAFFORD. Except Congress ought to have the regulatory power in case it wished to exercise it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. As I understood the gentleman from Virginia, these permits are always granted by the department, revocable absolutely at will. It is going to be absolutely within the control of the Secretary of War, in any event, and it does not seem to me that it ought to be done by this legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. We have had this question up, and this is a most reasonable amendment in order to safeguard the interests of the Government.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman does not suppose that there is any danger on the part of the Congress refusing to pass an amendatory resolution?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield one minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

Mr. RAKER. In this last amendment, suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], if this proviso is carried that it is revocable, and if not revoked ends on the 1st of July, 1919, the Government is clearly safe. There is not any doubt if within a month or within two months Congress enacts legislation controlling the waters of the river of Niagara, fixing the rules and regulations and the length of the term of the lease and the privileges to be granted, the Secretary of War has the power to immediately terminate that lease, and they would then come under the law. So there would be no question of complication.

Mr. FLOOD. May I make a suggestion to the gentleman from California?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. Congress will likely pass that general legislation in six or eight months.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield to me one minute?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LONDON. I do not like this legislation. Somehow they bring in all this water-power legislation at the end of a session, at the very last moment, and you do not get a chance to discuss it at all. You do not know what it is all about. I sent for a copy of the hearings and there have been no hearings, although it is a water-company matter, and some water-power legislation has had the effect of smearing over the men who have been battling with it. I do not think it is a fair thing to bring in this legislation at the last moment. That is the only thing I have to say about it.

Mr. FLOOD. Well, Mr. Speaker, if you want to break up an aggregation of industries that are supplying the necessities for this war, I would say you would want to oppose this legislation. Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] is entirely wrong about no hearings. We have had hearings for weeks.

Mr. LONDON. I asked for a copy and they told me there were no hearings on this resolution.

Mr. FLOOD. There were not on this resolution, but on the permanent measure before the committee; and this resolution is merely an extension of the law, and that we have passed twice before for the purpose of allowing those people to go on and utilize this water that would otherwise go to waste in order to make electric energy and carry on the war activities.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBB). The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin where he wishes the disjunctive "or" instead of the conjunctive "and"?

Mr. STAFFORD. It is the first word in the amendment, so that it shall read "or unless the Congress shall before that date," and so forth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is on adopting the House committee amendment to the Senate joint resolution.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

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

On motion of Mr. FLOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS (H. REPT. NO. 725).

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads I introduce a bill making appropriations for the services of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes. And in this connection I want to ask the permission of the House—

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12599) making appropriations for the services of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House I desire to make a brief statement, and then make a motion in reference to this bill.

The House, of course, is aware that the President vetoed the Post Office and Post Roads bill on account of the pneumatic-tube provision of the bill, and the House, I am glad to say, sustained the veto. It is also aware that the House and the Senate reached, in a conference on the bill H. R. 7237, an agreement on all of the other amendments and incorporating the legislation that is provided for in the Senate and agreed to in the House, as shown in the conference report. In other words, the bill was agreed upon by both bodies. Now, the bill which I have introduced by the direction of the committee—and I want to say it was by a unanimous vote of the committee, a quorum being present—is identical with the original bill, H. R. 7237, as agreed on, except, of course, the pneumatic-tube provisions are left out. It is very important that we pass this legislation. It is very fully considered, and is agreed to by both Houses in the conference report in the bill mentioned.

There are provisions of that bill that are new law, providing for increases in the salary of rural carriers and for railway mail clerks and post-office clerks, and the classification of clerks and fourth-class postmasters, and a number of other provisions which you gentlemen are familiar with, and which I need not repeat.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the measure should pass before the end of the fiscal year ending June 30, by direction of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, unanimously given, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to take up this bill now, with an agreement that all of its provisions shall be in order, that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that there shall be no debate upon the bill, and that the previous question shall be considered as ordered after the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to take this bill up immediately in the House as in Committee of the Whole, dispense with the first reading of the bill, have no debate, make in order everything that is in it, and have the previous question ordered on it, and pass it. Is there objection?

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I hope there will be no objection to that.

Mr. WALSH rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—and I do not intend to object—I think the gentleman inadvertently said that the President had vetoed the tube provision of the bill. He vetoed the entire bill, and based his veto on the tube provision.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman is entirely correct about that. That is what I meant, of course.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? It is a very large order, to be sure. [Laughter.]

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12599) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I suppose that the bill ought to be read. We have dispensed with the first reading.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so, too. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12599) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and they are hereby, appropriated for the service of the Post Office Department, in conformity with the act of July 2, 1836, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.

For gas, electric power and light, and the repair of machinery, United States Post Office Department equipment shops building, \$4,500.

For salaries of post-office inspectors: For salaries of 15 inspectors in charge of divisions, at \$3,000 each; 30 inspectors, at \$2,400 each; 20 inspectors, at \$2,250 each; 32 inspectors, at \$2,100 each; 20 inspectors, at \$2,000 each; 30 inspectors, at \$1,900 each; 90 inspectors,

at \$1,800 each; 60 inspectors, at \$1,700 each; 60 inspectors, at \$1,600 each; and 65 inspectors, at \$1,500 each; in all, including increases hereinafter provided, \$968,100.

For per diem allowance of inspectors in the field while actually traveling on official business away from their homes, their official domiciles, and their headquarters, at a rate to be fixed by the Postmaster General, not to exceed \$4 per day: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, allow inspectors per diem while temporarily located at any place on business away from their homes or their designated domiciles for a period not exceeding 20 consecutive days at any one place, and make rules and regulations governing the foregoing provisions relating to per diem: *And provided further*, That no per diem shall be paid to inspectors receiving annual salaries of \$2,000 or more, except the 32 inspectors receiving \$2,100 each, \$350,000.

For compensation to clerks at division headquarters, 15, at \$1,800 each; 15, at \$1,600 each; 20, at \$1,400 each; 30, at \$1,200 each; 10, at \$1,000 each; and 10, at \$900 each; in all, including increases hereinafter provided, \$154,100.

For traveling expenses of inspectors without per diem allowance, inspectors in charge, and the chief post-office inspector, and expenses incurred by inspectors not covered by per diem allowance, unusual and extraordinary expenses necessarily incurred for maintenance by inspectors over and above per diem allowance while traveling on official business in connection with the postal service of Alaska, and for the traveling expenses of 4 clerks performing stenographic and clerical assistance to post-office inspectors in the investigation of important fraud cases, \$43,850.

For livery hire incurred by inspectors not covered by their per diem allowance, including livery hire in connection with the installation and inspection of rural routes, \$45,000.

For necessary miscellaneous expenses at division headquarters, \$7,500.

For payment of rewards for the detection, arrest, and conviction of post-office burglars, robbers, and highway mail robbers: *Provided*, That rewards may be paid, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, when an offender of the class mentioned was killed in the act of committing the crime or in resisting lawful arrest: *And provided further*, That of the amount herein appropriated not to exceed \$5,000 may be expended, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, for the purpose of securing information concerning violations of the postal laws and for services and information looking toward the apprehension of criminals, \$25,000.

For compensation of a special assistant to the Attorney General to assist in the defense of cases against the United States arising out of the transportation of the mails, and in other cases and matters affecting the postal revenues, \$6,000.

For travel and miscellaneous expenses in the Postal Service, office of the Postmaster General, \$1,000.

#### OFFICE OF THE FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

For compensation to postmasters, \$25,000,000.

For compensation to assistant postmasters at first and second class post offices, 5, at not exceeding \$4,000 each; 50, at not exceeding \$3,000 each; 10, at not exceeding \$2,500 each; 10, at not exceeding \$2,000 each; 15, at not exceeding \$1,900 each; 50, at not exceeding \$1,800 each; 100, at not exceeding \$1,700 each; 170, at not exceeding \$1,600 each; 215, at not exceeding \$1,500 each; 175, at not exceeding \$1,400 each; 360, at not exceeding \$1,300 each; 600, at not exceeding \$1,200 each; 550, at not exceeding \$1,100 each; 350, at not exceeding \$1,000 each; 130, at not exceeding \$900 each; 70, at not exceeding \$800 each; in all, including increases hereinafter provided, \$4,075,000. And the appointment and assignment of assistant postmasters hereunder shall be so made during the fiscal year as not to involve a greater aggregate expenditure than this sum.

For compensation to clerks and employees at first and second class post offices:

Superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, and superintendents of registry, 10, at not exceeding \$3,200 each;

Auditors, and superintendents of mails, 15, at not exceeding \$3,000 each;

Assistant superintendents of mails, superintendents of delivery, and superintendents of mails, 23, at not exceeding \$2,700 each;

Assistant superintendents of mails, cashiers, superintendents of delivery, and superintendents of mails, 30, at not exceeding \$2,600 each;

Assistant superintendents of mails, cashiers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, and superintendents of stations, 35, at not exceeding \$2,500 each;

Assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of money order, assistant superintendents of registry, bookkeepers, cashiers, finance clerks, stenographers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, and superintendents of registry, 60, at not exceeding \$2,400 each;

Assistant superintendents of mails, bookkeepers, cashiers, chief mailing clerks, chief stamp clerks, finance clerks, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, superintendents of registry, and superintendents of stations, 70, at not exceeding \$2,200 each;

Assistant cashiers, assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of money order, assistant superintendents of registry, bookkeepers, cashiers, examiners of stations, finance clerks, superintendents of carriers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, superintendents of registry, superintendents of second-class matter, superintendents of inquiry, and superintendents of stations, 190, at not exceeding \$2,000 each;

Assistant cashiers, assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of money order, assistant superintendents of registry, assistant superintendents of stations, bookkeepers, cashiers, chief mailing clerks, chief stamp clerks, examiners of stations, finance clerks, stenographers, superintendents of carriers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, superintendents of registry, superintendents of second-class matter, and superintendents of stations, 180, at not exceeding \$1,800 each;

Assistant cashiers, assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of money order, assistant superintendents of registry, assistant superintendents of stations, bookkeepers, cashiers, chief mailing clerks, chief stamp clerks, examiners of stations, finance clerks, stenographers, superintendents of carriers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, superintendents of registry, superintendents of second-class matter, and superintendents of stations, 190, at not exceeding \$1,700 each;

Assistant cashiers, assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of money order, assistant superintendents of registry, assistant superintendents of stations, bookkeepers, cashiers, chief mailing clerks, chief stamp clerks, examiners of stations, finance clerks, foremen of crews, stenographers, superintendents of carriers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, superintendents of registry, superintendents of second-class matter, and superintendents of stations, 425, at not exceeding \$1,600 each.

Assistant cashiers, assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of money order, assistant superintendents of registry, assistant superintendents of stations, bookkeepers, cashiers, chief mailing clerks, chief stamp clerks, examiners of stations, finance clerks, foremen of crews, stenographers, superintendents of carriers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, superintendents of registry, superintendents of second-class matter, and superintendents of stations, 1,050, at not exceeding \$1,500 each.

Assistant cashiers, assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of money order, assistant superintendents of registry, assistant superintendents of stations, bookkeepers, cashiers, chief mailing clerks, chief stamp clerks, special clerks, examiners of stations, finance clerks, foremen of crews, stenographers, superintendents of carriers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, superintendents of registry, superintendents of second-class matter, and superintendents of stations, 2,600, at not exceeding \$1,400 each.

Assistant cashiers, assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of money order, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of registry, assistant superintendents of stations, bookkeepers, cashiers, chief mailing clerks, chief stamp clerks, examiners of stations, finance clerks, foremen of crews, special clerks, stenographers, superintendents of carriers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, superintendents of registry, superintendents of second-class matter, and superintendents of stations, 7,100, at not exceeding \$1,300 each.

Assistant cashiers, assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of money order, assistant superintendents of registry, assistant superintendents of stations, bookkeepers, chief stamp clerks, clerks, finance clerks, foremen of crews, stenographers, superintendents of carriers, superintendents of second-class matter, and superintendents of stations, 18,360, at not exceeding \$1,200 each.

Assistant superintendents of stations, clerks, stenographers, superintendents of carriers, superintendents of second-class matter, and superintendents of stations, 7,700, at not exceeding \$1,100 each.

Assistant superintendents of stations, clerks, clerks in charge of stations, stenographers, superintendents of carriers, and superintendents of second-class matter, 2,500, at not exceeding \$1,000 each.

Clerks, clerks in charge of stations, and stenographers, 2,000, at not exceeding \$900 each.

Clerks and clerks in charge of stations, 2,169, at not exceeding \$800 each.

Substitutes for clerks and employees absent without pay.

And to provide for the promotion of 85 per cent of the clerks in first-class post offices from the fifth to the sixth grade, and for the promotion of 15 per cent of the clerks in the sixth grade, and for the designation of "special clerk" in the \$1,300 grade, and for the promotion of 15 per cent of the designated "special clerks" in the \$1,300 grade to the designation of "special clerks" in the \$1,400 grade, and to provide for the promotion of 85 per cent of the clerks in second-class post offices from the fourth to the fifth grade, and for the promotion of 15 per cent of the clerks in second-class post offices from the fifth to the sixth grade: *And provided further*, That there may also be employed at first-class post offices foremen and stenographers at a salary of \$1,300 or more per annum; in all, including increases hereinafter provided, \$62,750,000.

*Provided*, That hereafter the appointment and assignment of clerks hereunder shall be so made during each fiscal year as not to involve a greater aggregate expenditure than the sum appropriated; and to enable the Postmaster General to carry out the provisions of this act and also the act of March 2, 1907, classifying clerks and city letter carriers in first and second class post offices, he may hereafter exceed the number of clerks appropriated for for particular grades: *Provided*, That the number of clerks in the aggregate as herein authorized be not exceeded: *Provided further*, That hereafter when any employee in the Postal Service under the law is entitled to compensatory time for Sunday or holiday service, if he so elects, he may be paid for overtime in lieu thereof.

For compensation to printers, mechanics, and skilled laborers, 22, at \$1,200 each; 4 at \$1,100 each; and 31 at \$1,000 each; in all, including increases hereinafter provided, \$71,070.

For compensation to watchmen, messengers, and laborers, 1,925, at \$900 each; in all, including increases hereinafter provided, \$1,939,500.

For compensation to clerks in charge of contract stations, \$1,180,000.

For temporary and auxiliary clerk hire and for substitute clerk hire for clerks and employees absent with pay at first and second class post offices and temporary and auxiliary clerk hire at summer and winter resort post offices, \$3,428,572.

For separating mails at third and fourth class post offices, \$730,000.

For unusual conditions at post offices, \$150,000.

For allowances to third-class post offices to cover the cost of clerical services, \$2,400,000.

*Provided*, That hereafter no allowance in excess of \$300 shall be made where the salary of the postmaster is \$1,000, \$1,100, or \$1,200; nor in excess of \$400 where the salary of the postmaster is \$1,300, \$1,400, or \$1,500; and that no allowance in excess of \$500 shall be made where the salary of the postmaster is \$1,600 or \$1,700; nor in excess of \$800 where the salary of the postmaster is \$1,800 or \$1,900.

*And provided further*, That the Postmaster General may, in the disbursement of this appropriation, expend not exceeding \$400,000 for the employment, at a maximum salary of \$600 per annum, of assistant postmasters at post offices of the third class where the salary of the postmaster is \$1,800 or \$1,900 per annum.

For rent, light, and fuel for first, second, and third class post offices, \$6,500,000.

*Provided*, That hereafter the Postmaster General may, in the disbursement of the appropriation for such purposes, apply a part thereof to the purpose of leasing premises for the use of post offices of the first, second, and third classes at a reasonable annual rental, to be paid quarterly for a term not exceeding 10 years; and that there

shall not be allowed for the use of any third-class post office for rent a sum in excess of \$500, nor more than \$100 for fuel and light, in any one year.

For miscellaneous items necessary and incidental to post offices of the first and second classes, \$400,000.

For pay of letter carriers at offices already established, including substitutes for letter carriers absent without pay, and for the promotion of 85 per cent of the letter carriers in first-class post offices from the fifth to the sixth grade, and for the promotion of 85 per cent of the letter carriers in second-class post offices from the fourth to the fifth grade, and for the promotion of 15 per cent of the letter carriers in second-class offices from the fifth to the sixth grade, City Delivery Service, \$49,100,000.

For pay of substitutes of letter carriers absent with pay, and of auxiliary and temporary letter carriers at offices where city delivery is already established, \$4,685,715.

For pay of letter carriers, substitute and auxiliary letter carriers at offices where City Delivery Service is established during the year, \$94,000.

For vehicle allowance, the hiring of drivers, the rental of vehicles, and the purchase and exchange and maintenance, including stable and garage facilities, of wagons or automobiles for and the operation of, screen-wagon and city delivery and collection services, \$6,700,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$300,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for the payment of this service during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918: *Provided further*, That the Postmaster General may, in his disbursement of this appropriation, apply a part thereof to the leasing of quarters for the housing of Government-owned automobiles at a reasonable annual rental for a term not exceeding 10 years.

For mail-messenger service, \$2,700,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$100,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for the payment of this service during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

For car fare and bicycle allowance, \$625,000.

For street car collection service, \$9,000.

For Detroit River postal service, \$7,250.

For car fare for special-delivery messengers in emergency cases, \$13,000.

For fees to special-delivery messengers, \$3,200,000.

For travel and miscellaneous expenses in the Postal Service, office of the First Assistant Postmaster General, \$1,000.

#### OFFICE OF THE SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

For inland transportation by star routes in Alaska, \$430,000: *Provided*, That out of this appropriation the Postmaster General is authorized to provide difficult or emergency mail service in Alaska, including the establishment and equipment of relay stations, in such manner as he may think advisable, without advertising therefor.

For inland transportation by steamboat or other power-boat routes or by aeroplanes, \$1,185,000: *Provided*, That the contract now in force for carrying the mail on Lake Winnepesaukee from the post office at Laconia, N. H., shall be readjusted so that the yearly salary paid the carrier, who furnishes his own equipment, shall be \$1,800 per annum: *Provided further*, That hereafter, when there is no competition on a route and the rate of compensation asked is excessive, or no proposal is received, the Postmaster General may require that the mails be carried as freight or express, and it shall be unlawful for any common carrier by water to refuse to carry the mails when so required, and the penalty for such offense shall be a fine of \$500. Each day of refusal shall constitute a separate offense: *Provided further*, That out of this appropriation the Postmaster General is authorized to expend not exceeding \$100,000 for the purchase, operation, and maintenance of aeroplanes for an experimental aeroplane mail service between such points as he may determine.

For inland transportation by railroad routes, \$60,645,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$1,000,000 of this appropriation may be expended for pay of freight and incidental charges for the transportation of mails conveyed under special arrangement in freight trains or otherwise.

For pay of freight or expressage on postal cards, stamped envelopes, newspaper wrappers, and empty mail bags, \$95,000.

Railway Mail Service: For 15 division superintendents, at \$3,250 each; 2 assistant superintendents, at \$2,350 each; 15 assistant division superintendents, at \$2,250 each; 115 chief clerks, at not exceeding \$2,100 each; 465 clerks, grade 10, at not exceeding \$1,800 each; 2,032 clerks, grade nine, at not exceeding \$1,700 each; 393 clerks, grade 8, at not exceeding \$1,600 each; 8,299 clerks, grade 7, at not exceeding \$1,500 each; 1,078 clerks, grade 6, at not exceeding \$1,400 each; 1,788 clerks, grade 5, at not exceeding \$1,300 each; 3,801 clerks, grade 4, at not exceeding \$1,200 each; 65 clerks, grade 3, at not exceeding \$1,100 each; 1,974 clerks, grade 2, at not exceeding \$1,000 each; 1,837 clerks, grade 1, at not exceeding \$900 each; in all, including increases herein-after provided, \$32,500,000: *Provided*, That railway postal clerks shall be credited with full time when deadheading under orders of the department, and the appointment and assignment of clerks hereunder shall be so made during the fiscal year as not to involve a greater aggregate expenditure than this sum; and, to enable the Postmaster General to reclassify the salaries of railway postal clerks and make necessary appointments and promotions, he may exceed the number of clerks in each of the grades as may be necessary: *Provided*, That the number of regular clerks in the aggregate as herein authorized be not exceeded.

For travel allowances to railway postal clerks, acting railway postal clerks, and substitute railway postal clerks, including substitute railway postal clerks for railway postal clerks granted leave with pay on account of sickness, \$1,613,959.

For actual and necessary expenses, general superintendent and assistant general superintendent, division superintendents, assistant division superintendents, and chief clerks, Railway Mail Service, and railway postal clerks, while actually traveling on business of the Post Office Department and away from their several designated headquarters, \$48,000.

For rent, light, heat, fuel, telegraph, miscellaneous and office expenses, schedules of mail trains, telephone service, and badges for railway postal clerks, including rental of offices for division headquarters, and chief clerk, Railway Mail Service, in Washington, D. C., and rental of space for terminal railway post offices for the distribution of mails when the furnishing of space for such distribution can not under the Postal Laws and Regulations properly be required of railroad companies without additional compensation, and for equipment and miscellaneous items necessary and incidental to terminal railway post offices, \$732,156.

For per diem allowance of two assistant superintendents while actually traveling on official business away from their home, their official domicile, and their headquarters, at a rate to be fixed by the

Postmaster General, not to exceed \$4 per day, and for their necessary official expenses not covered by their per diem allowance, not exceeding \$500; in all, \$2,420.

For inland transportation of mail by electric and cable cars, \$555,000: *Provided*, That the rate of compensation to be paid per mile shall not exceed the rate now paid to companies performing such service, except that the Postmaster General, in cases where the quantity of mail is large and the number of exchange points numerous, may, in his discretion, authorize payment for closed-pouch service at a rate per mile not to exceed one-third above the rate per mile now paid for closed-pouch service, and for mail cars and apartments carrying the mails not to exceed the rate of 1 cent per linear foot per car-mile of travel: *Provided further*, That the rates for electric car service on routes over 20 miles in length outside of cities shall not exceed the rates paid for service on steam railroads: *Provided, however*, That not to exceed \$25,000 of the sum hereby appropriated may be expended, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, where unusual conditions exist or where such service will be more expeditious and efficient and at no greater cost than otherwise, and not to exceed \$100,000 of this appropriation may be expended for regulation screen or motor screen wagon service which may be authorized in lieu of electric or cable car service: *Provided further*, That the Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby empowered and directed as soon as practicable to fix and determine from time to time the fair and reasonable rates and compensation for the transportation of mail matter by urban and interurban electric railway common carriers and the service connected therewith, prescribing the method or methods by weight or space, or both, or otherwise, for ascertaining such rate or compensation and to publish same, and orders so made and published shall continue in force until changed by the commission after due notice and hearing: *And provided further*, That it shall be unlawful for any urban or interurban electric railroad to refuse to perform mail service at the rates or methods of compensation thus provided for such service when required by the Postmaster General so to do, and for such offense shall be fined \$100. Each day of refusal shall constitute a separate offense.

For transportation of foreign mails, \$5,800,000: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General shall be authorized to expend such sums as may be necessary, not exceeding \$103,000, to cover the cost to the United States of maintaining sea post service on steamships conveying the mails.

For censorship of foreign mails, \$1,620,000, of which amount \$200,000 shall be available immediately: *Provided*, That the authority under this appropriation shall cease to be in effect when the existing state of war shall have passed, the date of which shall be ascertained and proclaimed by the President. *And provided further*, That it shall be the duty of the Postmaster General to submit to Congress at the beginning of its regular session in December of each year a detailed statement of all persons appointed and the salary or compensation paid or allowed to each: *And provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended to pay the expense of censoring mail from the military forces connected with the American Expeditionary Force, which mail has been censored in Europe.

For balances due foreign countries, \$681,700.

For travel and miscellaneous expenses in the Postal Service, office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General, \$1,000.

#### OFFICE OF THE THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

For manufacture of adhesive postage stamps, special-delivery stamps, books of stamps, and for coiling of stamps, \$1,100,000.

For manufacture of stamped envelopes and newspaper wrappers, \$3,000,000.

For pay of agent and assistants to examine and distribute stamped envelopes and newspaper wrappers, and expenses of agency, \$18,400.

For manufacture of postal cards, \$580,000.

For ship, steamboat, and way letters, \$150.

For payment of limited indemnity for the injury or loss of pieces of domestic registered matter, insured, and collect-on-delivery mail, \$670,000.

For payment of limited indemnity for the loss of registered articles in the international mails, in accordance with convention stipulations, \$10,000.

For travel and miscellaneous expenses in the Postal Service, office of the Third Assistant Postmaster General, \$1,000.

For travel and miscellaneous expenses in the service of the Postal Savings System, office of the director, \$500.

#### OFFICE OF THE FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

For stationery for the Postal Service, including blanks, books, printed and engraved matter, binding and carbon paper, and other miscellaneous items for the money-order and registry systems; the preparation, publication, and free distribution by postmasters to the public of pamphlet containing general postal information; the pay of one envelope inspector at \$1,800 per annum, and one assistant at \$900 per annum; and also for the purchase of supplies for the Postal Savings System, including blank books, forms, pamphlets, rubber stamps, canceling devices, certificates and cards and stamps for use in evidencing deposits, and free penalty envelopes; and for the reimbursement of the Secretary of the Treasury for expenses incident to the preparation, issue, and registration of the bonds authorized by the act of June 25, 1910, \$725,000.

For postmarking, rating, money-order stamps, and electrotype plates, and repairs to same, metal, rubber, and combination type, dates and figures, type holders, ink and pads for canceling and stamping purposes; and for the purchase, exchange, and repair of typewriting machines, envelope-opening machines, and computing machines, copying presses, numbering machines, time recorders, letter balances, scales, test weights, and miscellaneous articles purchased and furnished directly to the Postal Service, \$275,000.

For wrapping twine and tying devices, \$370,000: *Provided*, That of this amount the Postmaster General is authorized to expend not to exceed \$30,000 for the purchase of and experiments with tying devices or cords for the Postal Service.

For miscellaneous equipment and supplies, including the purchase and repair of furniture, letter boxes, package boxes, posts, trucks, baskets, satchels, straps, letter-box paint, baling machines, perforating machines, duplicating machines, printing presses, directories, cleaning supplies, and the manufacture, repair, and exchange of equipment, the erection, manufacture, repair, and painting of letter-box equipment, and for the purchase and repair of presses and dies for use in the manufacture of letter boxes; and other expenditures necessary and incidental to post offices of the first, second, and third classes, including offices of the fourth class having or to have rural delivery service, \$400,000.

For defraying expenses incident to the shipment of supplies, including hardware, boxing, packing, cartage, freight, and the pay of one carpenter, at \$1,200 per annum, and nine requisition fillers, at \$1,000 each per annum, for assignment in connection therewith, \$193,900.

For miscellaneous expenses in the preparation and publication of post-route maps and rural delivery maps or blue prints, including tracing for photolithographic reproduction, \$20,000; and the Postmaster General may authorize the sale to the public of post-route maps and rural delivery maps or blue prints at the cost of printing and 10 per cent thereof added, the proceeds for such sale to be used as a further appropriation for the preparation and publication of post-route maps and rural delivery maps or blue prints; of this amount \$1,500 may be expended in the purchase of atlases and geographical and technical works.

For rentals, purchase, exchange, and repair of canceling machines and motors, mechanical mail-handling apparatus and other labor-saving devices, including cost of power in rented buildings, and miscellaneous expenses of installation and operation of same, \$405,000: *Provided*, That of this amount the Postmaster General is authorized to expend \$100,000 for the installation of experimental mail-distributing machines.

For the purchase, manufacture, and repair of mail bags and other mail containers and attachments, mail locks, keys, chains, tools, machinery, and material necessary for same, and for incidental expenses pertaining thereto; also material, machinery, and tools necessary for the manufacture and repair in the equipment shops at Washington, D. C., of such other equipment for the Postal Service as may be deemed expedient, \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That out of this appropriation the Postmaster General is authorized to use as much of the sum, not exceeding \$5,000, as may be deemed necessary for the purchase of material and the manufacture in the equipment shops of such small quantities of distinctive equipment as may be required by other executive departments; and for service in Alaska, Porto Rico, Philippine Islands, Hawaii, or other island possessions.

For compensation to labor employed in the equipment shops at Washington, D. C., \$285,000.

For inland transportation by star routes (excepting service in Alaska), including temporary service to newly established offices, \$8,675,000: *Provided*, That hereafter no part of this appropriation shall be expended for continuance of any star-route service the patronage of which shall be served entirely by the extension of Rural Delivery Service, nor shall any of said sum be expended for star-route service for a patronage a major portion of which has been served by Rural Delivery Service, unless the services of a qualified rural carrier can not be secured.

For pay of rural carriers, substitutes for rural carriers on annual leave, clerks in charge of rural stations, tolls and ferrage, Rural Delivery Service, and for the incidental expenses thereof, \$65,800,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$20,000 of the amount hereby appropriated may be used for the compensation of clerks in charge of rural stations: *Provided further*, That on and after July 1, 1918, rural carriers assigned to horse-drawn vehicle routes on which daily service is performed shall receive \$24 per mile per annum for each mile said routes are in excess of 24 miles or major fraction thereof, based on actual mileage, and rural carriers assigned to horse-drawn vehicle routes on which triweekly service is performed shall receive \$12 per mile per annum for each mile said routes are in excess of 24 miles or major fraction thereof based on actual mileage: *Provided further*, That the pay of carriers who furnish and maintain their own motor vehicles and who serve routes not less than 50 miles in length may be fixed at not exceeding \$2,160 per annum.

For village delivery service in towns and villages having post offices of the second or third class, \$720,000.

For travel and miscellaneous expenses in the Postal Service, office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, \$1,000.

Sec. 2. That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the annual salaries fixed by law for assistant postmasters at first and second class post offices, and supervisory officials, whose compensation is \$2,200 and less per annum, shall be increased \$200, and those whose compensation is in excess of \$2,200 shall be increased 5 per cent; that clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service shall be divided into six grades, as follows: First grade, salary \$1,000; second grade, salary \$1,100; third grade, salary \$1,200; fourth grade, salary \$1,300; fifth grade, salary \$1,400; sixth grade, salary \$1,500. Clerks and carriers shall be promoted successively to the sixth grade: *Provided*, That on July 1, 1918, clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service who are in grades 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, under the act of March 2, 1907, as amended, shall pass automatically from such grades and the salaries they receive thereunder to the new grades, 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively, with the salaries provided for such grades in this act: *Provided further*, That the salaries of railway postal clerks shall be graded as follows: Grade 1, at \$1,100; grade 2, at \$1,200; grade 3, at \$1,300; grade 4, at \$1,400; grade 5, at \$1,500; grade 6, at \$1,600; grade 7, at \$1,700; grade 8, at \$1,800; grade 9, at \$1,900; grade 10, at \$2,000.

The Postmaster General shall classify and fix the salaries of railway postal clerks, under such regulations as he may prescribe, in the grades provided by law; and for the purpose of organization and establishing maximum grades to which promotions may be made successively, as hereinafter provided, he shall classify railway post offices, terminal railway post offices, and transfer offices with reference to their character and importance in three classes, with salary grades as follows:

Class A, \$1,100 to \$1,400; class B, \$1,100 to \$1,500; and class C, \$1,100 to \$1,700. He may assign to the offices of division superintendents and chief clerks such railway postal clerks as may be necessary, and fix their salaries within the grades provided by law without regard to the classification of railway post offices: *Provided*, That on July 1, 1918, railway postal clerks shall pass automatically from the grades they are in and the salaries they receive under the act of August 24, 1912, to the corresponding grade, with salaries provided for in this act: *Provided*, That the classifications and increases of salaries provided for in this section shall not be continued beyond the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919: *Provided further*, That the salary of clerks, carriers, and railway postal clerks shall be increased during the fiscal year 1919 not more than \$200: *Provided further*, That the classifications herein provided for shall not become effective until July 1, 1918: *Provided further*, That the salaries of such other employees fixed by law or paid from lump-sum appropriations provided for in this act, including laborers in the Railway Mail Service, who receive \$800 per annum or less shall be increased 20 per cent per annum; those who receive in excess of \$800 and not more than \$1,500 shall be increased 15 per cent per annum; and those who receive in excess of \$1,500 and not more than \$2,200 shall be increased 10 per cent per annum. Rural carriers assigned to horse-drawn vehicle routes now receiving a compensation of \$1,200 or less per annum, exclusive of mileage allowance for miles on routes over 24 miles in length, shall receive in addition thereto 20 per cent of the amount of such compensation. Such increases shall not apply to the special assistant to the Attorney General appropriated for in this act and to postmasters at offices of the first, second, and third classes: *Provided further*, That postmasters of

the fourth class shall receive the same compensation as now provided by law, except that they shall receive 100 per cent of the cancellations of the first \$80 or less per quarter: *Provided further*, That if the compensation does not exceed \$50 for any one quarter fourth-class postmasters shall be allowed an increase of 20 per cent of the compensation allowed under existing law: *Provided further*, That no office shall be advanced to third class by reason of the temporary increases herein provided: *Provided further*, That hereafter substitute, temporary, or auxiliary clerks and letter carriers at first and second class post offices shall be paid at the rate of 40 cents an hour: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to employees who receive a part of their pay from any outside sources under cooperative arrangement with the Post Office Department or to employees who serve voluntarily or receive only a nominal compensation: *And provided further*, That the increased compensation at the rate of 5 per cent and 10 per cent for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, shall not be computed as salary in construing this section. So much as may be necessary for the increases provided for in this act is hereby appropriated.

Sec. 3. That hereafter watchmen, messengers, and laborers in first and second class post offices, and railway postal clerks assigned to terminal railway post offices and transfer offices, shall be required to work not more than 8 hours a day, and that the 8 hours of service shall not extend over a longer period than 10 consecutive hours, and that in cases of emergency or if the needs of the service require they may be required to work in excess of 8 hours a day, and for such additional services they shall be paid in proportion to their salaries as fixed by law: *Provided*, That hereafter when the needs of the Postal Service require the employment on Sundays and holidays of railway postal clerks assigned to terminal railway post offices and transfer offices, they shall be granted compensatory time in the same manner as provided by law for clerks and carriers in first and second class offices.

Sec. 4. That the Postmaster General is authorized to investigate conditions arising from contracts in the star route, screen wagon, and other vehicle service entered into prior to June 30, 1917, and from contracts for furnishing envelopes, blanks and blank books, and the Official Postal Guide, for contracts entered into prior to June 30, 1917, with a view to determining whether any adjustment should be made in the compensation and to adjust the same for materials or services hereafter to be furnished or rendered in cases where the facts disclose the necessity for such adjustment, or, in his discretion, with the consent of the contractor and his bondsmen, the Postmaster General may cancel such contracts.

Sec. 5. That the provisions of section 3 of the act of March 3, 1917, entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes," providing increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate of more than \$480 and not exceeding \$1,000 per annum, shall apply during the fiscal year 1918 to all requisition fillers, watchmen, messengers, and laborers.

Sec. 6. The Postmaster General may, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, accept United States liberty loan bonds in lieu of either corporate or personal surety from contractors, officers, and employees of the Postal Service to indemnify the Government against losses resulting from the failure of any contractor, officer, or employee of the Postal Service to properly discharge his official duty.

Sec. 7. That to promote the conservation of food products and to facilitate the collection and delivery thereof from producer to consumer, and the delivery of articles necessary in the production of such food products to the producers, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to conduct experiments in the operation of motor-vehicle track routes in the vicinity of such cities of the United States as he may select, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, and the cost of such experiments, not exceeding \$300,000, may be paid by the Postmaster General out of any unexpended appropriations of the Postal Service, and the Postmaster General shall report the result of such experiments to the Congress at the earliest practicable date.

Sec. 8. That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, deliver and turn over to the Postmaster General from time to time, and without charge therefor, for use in the Postal Service, such aeroplanes and automobiles or parts thereof as may prove to be, or as shall become, unsuitable for the purposes of the War Department but suitable for the use of the Postal Service; and the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to use the same, in his discretion, in the transportation of the mails and to pay the necessary expenses thereof out of the appropriation for inland transportation by steamboat or other power boat or by aeroplanes or star route.

Sec. 9. Employees, including substitute employees, of the Postal Service who have entered the military or naval service of the United States or who shall hereafter enter it during the existence of the present war, shall, when honorably discharged from such service, be reassigned to their duties in the Postal Service at the salary to which they would have been automatically promoted had they remained in the Postal Service, provided they are physically and mentally qualified to perform the duties of such positions.

Sec. 11. That the act approved January 21, 1914 (38 Stat., p. 278), authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty be so amended as to include United States war-savings certificate stamps, United States Government thrift stamps, war-tax revenue stamps, and funds received from the sale of such stamps: *Provided*, That this act shall not embrace any claim for losses as aforesaid which accrued prior to September 24, 1917, and all such claims must be presented within six months from the time the loss occurred.

Sec. 12. The provision of the act of June 3, 1916, an act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense and for other purposes, and the act of August 29, 1916, an act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes, authorizing the payment of \$5 to postmasters at second, third, and fourth class offices for each recruit secured by them and accepted by the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, is hereby repealed.

Sec. 13. That hereafter the balance to the credit of any one person in a postal-savings depository, exclusive of accumulated interest, shall not exceed \$2,500. Noninterest-paying deposits shall not be accepted. All laws inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

Sec. 14. That section 6 of the act approved June 25, 1910, is hereby further amended so that the proviso in said section shall read as follows:

"*Provided*, That in order that smaller amounts may be accumulated for deposit, any person may purchase for 10 cents, from any postal-savings depository, specially prepared adhesive stamps to be known as

'postal-savings stamps,' and attach them to a card which shall be furnished for the purpose. A card with 10 postal-savings stamps affixed shall be accepted as a deposit of \$1 either in opening an account or in adding to an existing account, or may be redeemed in cash."

Sec. 15. That if the revenues of the Post Office Department shall be insufficient to meet the appropriations made by this act, a sum equal to such deficiency of the revenue of said department is hereby appropriated, to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply said deficiencies in the revenues for the Post Office Department for the year ending June 30, 1919, and the sum needed may be advanced to the Post Office Department upon requisition of the Postmaster General.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

Mr. FRANCIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the war legislation of this session.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### UNIFORMS OF FRIENDLY NATIONS.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following bill, which I ask the Clerk to report.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11247) providing for the protection of the uniform of friendly nations, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any persons within the United States or Territories, possessions, waters, or places subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, to wear any naval, military, police, or other official uniform, decoration, or regalia of any State, nation, or Government with which the United States is at peace, or any uniform, decoration, or regalia so nearly resembling the same as to be calculated to deceive, unless such wearing thereof be authorized by such State, nation, or Government.

Any person who violates the provisions of this act shall upon conviction be punished by a fine not exceeding \$300 or imprisonment for not exceeding six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I notice some phraseology there which I regard as rather awkward. In line 4 of page 1 I find this language, "within the United States or Territories." That is a phrase that I am not acquainted with.

Mr. WEBB. "United States or Territories, possessions, waters, or places subject to the jurisdiction of the United States." I think that is the way the phrase goes.

Mr. STAFFORD. There should be at least a comma after the word "States."

Mr. WEBB. I think that would be better punctuation.

Mr. STAFFORD. And "territories" with a small "t." The way it reads now, "United States or Territories" might refer—

Mr. WEBB. That is the Printing Office style. A comma may correct that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I want to inquire, in case this bill is adopted, whether on the stage in theatrical performances, where the scene is laid perhaps in a foreign country, a person taking some rôle where he has occasion to use the uniform would be barred?

Mr. WEBB. I think not. We put in the words "with intent to deceive or mislead" for the purpose of protecting that character of people. It is a unanimous report, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read for amendment.

The bill was read for amendment, with committee amendments as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "persons," insert the words "with intent to deceive or mislead."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "any," insert the word "foreign."

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. There is a Senate bill designed to accomplish the same result, is there not?

Mr. WEBB. I do not know that it is pending before our committee.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; there is.

Mr. ROGERS. I think a bill has passed the Senate, and I wondered if this bill was practically identical with the Senate bill it would not expedite the final conclusion if by unanimous consent the Senate bill was substituted for this.

Mr. WEBB. I do not know that the Senate bill is identical with this, because the committee has made some amendments.

Mr. ROGERS. I think it is identical, barring the two committee amendments.

Mr. WEBB. That may be correct.

Mr. ROGERS. Under those circumstances, could it not be arranged that we should pass the Senate bill?

Mr. WEBB. As far as I am concerned, I thought that the House bill might be passed and go to the Senate, and they could pass it as quickly as they could to agree to the amendments we might put on the Senate bill.

Mr. ROGERS. But the problem of getting the bill up in the Senate would be easier if we amended the Senate bill.

Mr. WEBB. I have no objection if the Senate bill has these amendments put upon it.

Mr. CALDWELL. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. WEBB. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Is this the bill that was rereferred from the Military Committee to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. WEBB. No.

Mr. CALDWELL. I think there was a bill rereferred from the Military Committee to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. There is no Senate bill like this over here.

Mr. WALSH. If the Chair will permit, I have a distinct recollection of a bill of this nature, practically identical in language, coming over from the Senate and being referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and, upon my request, was rereferred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WEBB. The Senate bill was not before our committee when we considered this bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

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

#### CHEMICAL SECTION, BUREAU OF MINES.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter from President Wilson to Dr. Manning, Director of the Bureau of Mines, and one from Secretary Baker to the President.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the documents referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letters are as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, June 25, 1918.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In connection with the proposed transfer of the chemical section at American University from the Bureau of Mines to the newly constituted and consolidated gas service of the War Department, which you are considering, I am specially concerned to have you know how much the War Department appreciates the splendid services which have been rendered to the country and to the Army by the Department of the Interior, and especially by the Bureau of Mines, under the direction of Dr. Manning. In the early days of preparation and organization, Dr. Manning's contact with scientific men throughout the country was indispensably valuable. He was able to summon from the universities and the technical laboratories of the country men of the highest quality, and to inspire them with enthusiastic zeal in attacking new and difficult problems which had to be solved with the utmost speed. I do not see how the work could have been better done than he did it, and the present suggestion that the section now pass under the direction and control of the War Department grows out of the fact that the whole subject of gas warfare has assumed a fresh pressure and intensity, and the director of it must have the widest control so as to be able to use the resources at his command in the most effective way possible. The proposal does not involve the disruption of the fine group of scientific men Dr. Manning has brought together, but merely their transfer to Gen. Sibert's direction.

Respectfully, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER.

The PRESIDENT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, 26 June, 1918.

MY DEAR DR. MANNING: I have had before me for some days the question presented by the Secretary of War involving the transfer of the chemical section established by you at the American University from the Bureau of Mines to the newly organized Division of Gas Warfare, in which the War Department is now concentrating all the various facilities for offensive and defensive gas operations. I am satisfied that a more efficient organization can be effected by having these various activities under one direction and control, and my hesitation about acting in the matter has grown only out of a reluctance to take away from the Bureau of Mines a piece of work which thus far it has so effectively performed. The Secretary of War has assured me of his own recognition of the splendid work you have been able to do, and I am taking the liberty of inclosing a letter which I have received from him in order that you may see how fully the War Department recognizes the value of the services.

I am to-day signing the order directing the transfer. I want, however, to express to you my own appreciation of the fine and helpful piece of work which you have done, and to say that this sort of team-

work by the bureaus outside of the direct war-making agency is one of the cheering and gratifying evidences of the way our official forces are inspired by the presence of a great national task.

Cordially, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

DR. VAN H. MANNING,  
Chief Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior.

EXECUTIVE ORDER.

It is hereby ordered that the experiment station at American University, Washington, D. C., which station has been established under the supervision of the Bureau of Mines, Interior Department, for the purpose of making gas investigations for the Army, under authority of appropriations made for the Ordnance and Medical Departments of the Army, together with the personnel thereof, be, and the same is hereby, placed under the control of the War Department for operation under the Director of Gas Service of the Army.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
25 June, 1918.

FOURTEENTH DECENNIAL CENSUS.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11984, providing for the Fourteenth decennial census.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question? I think the House would be interested to know what the program is for this evening, whether there are other matters that require our staying here late, and if so, how late, because I suppose the gentleman would not wish to continue this bill if there was some such purpose.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I can state that information has come to some of us that the Senate will be ready to send the military bill here by 7 o'clock. There are something like 300 amendments, and they have to be engrossed; but I understand they will be here by 7 o'clock. It is thought wise to at least remain in session until that time.

Mr. GILLETT. It might be wise to take a recess and come back and have an evening session. We do not want to stay until midnight without a recess.

Mr. HELM. Those gentlemen not interested in the census bill have my consent to go and stay as long as they please.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman will not get consent to have less than a quorum to consider the census bill.

Mr. GILLETT. If we are going to have an evening session, it would be wise to take a recess for two hours, so that some of us who want to be here can come back.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11984, to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALSH) there were 32 ayes and 27 noes.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. FOSTER in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 15. That the Director of the Census may authorize and direct supervisors of census to employ interpreters to assist the enumerators of their respective districts in the enumeration of persons not speaking the English language, but no authorization shall be given for such employment in any district until due and proper effort has been made to employ an enumerator who can speak the language or languages for which the services of an interpreter would otherwise be required. It shall be the duty of such interpreters to accompany the enumerators and faithfully translate the latter's inquiries and the replies thereto, but in no case shall any such interpreter perform the duties of enumerator unless commissioned as such by the Director of the Census. The compensation of such interpreters shall be fixed by the Director of the Census in advance and shall not exceed \$5 per day for each day actually and necessarily employed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I believe there has been some change in the phraseology of this section from that carried in prior laws. I wish to inquire as to the special need for this mandatory direction that is now carried for the first time, requiring the interpreters to accompany the enumerators. Have there been any abuses heretofore, whereby the translators did not correctly enumerate the statistics that were to be submitted for tabulation?

Mr. HELM. The purpose is to correct anything of that kind.

Mr. STAFFORD. Merely to improve the record of the statistics.

Mr. HELM. Yes; to avoid inaccuracies and abuses.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the committee whether there are many instances where translators are obliged to accompany the enumerators?

Mr. HELM. Not very many, so I am advised.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Here is the statement in the hearing as to the abuse that this is intended to correct:

In its original form this section authorized the employment of interpreters to assist the enumerators, but did not define the assistance they were to render, although Congress undoubtedly intended

that they should assist by interpreting only, and that they should not do any actual enumerating. In the enumeration of the population of a western city during the taking of the Thirteenth decennial census, however, certain interpreters were employed who "assisted" the enumerators by making the actual enumeration of the Chinese and Japanese population. Although extensive frauds were discovered in their schedules, they could not be prosecuted because of the failure of the law to define their duties. This defect in the law will, it is believed, be remedied by the above-proposed amendment, which not only prescribes the duties of interpreters, but also specifically prohibits their acting as enumerators unless commissioned as such by the director.

In other words, it is intended that they shall act solely as interpreters.

Mr. STAFFORD. And their acts must be part of the acts of the enumerator, by accompanying him, so as to make any irregularity a misdemeanor or a misfeasance of their official duties?

Mr. HELM. Yes; so I understand it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOSTER, 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. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, and had come to no resolution thereon.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report and statement on the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 10854).

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman any request to make?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of it. It is a complete report. The Senate receded on all of the remaining amendments, and that completes the bill.

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

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Did the Senate recede on amendments 37, 47, 52, and 170?

Mr. PADGETT. It did.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the report and statement be printed in the Record?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; they will be printed. The Senate receded on all the disputed matters that we had up yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of this conference report, notwithstanding the rule about first printing it in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. STAFFORD. The report ought to be read.

Mr. PADGETT. The Senate receded on all of the amendments.

Mr. GILLETT. Either the report or the statement ought to be read.

Mr. PADGETT. The report is very short.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement of the House conferees are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 728).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10854) making appropriations for the Naval Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, 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 37, 47, 52, and 170.

L. P. PADGETT,  
J. FRED. C. TALBOTT,  
D. J. RIBDAN,  
THOMAS S. BUTLER,  
WM. J. BROWNING,

Managers on the part of the House.

B. R. TILLMAN,  
CLAUDE A. SWANSON,  
JOHN WALTER SMITH,  
BOIES PENROSE,  
H. C. LODGE,

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 bill (H. R. 10854) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and submitted by the accompanying report on the amendments of the Senate, namely:

The Senate recedes from its amendments Nos. 37, 47, 52, and 170.

On amendment No. 37: Gives the rank and title of lieutenant general to the commandant of the Marine Corps during the period of the war.

On amendment No. 47: Gives the rank of major general to the heads of existing staff corps of the Marine Corps.

On amendment No. 52: Authorizes the transfer of staff officers of the Marine Corps to the line of the Marine Corps.

On amendment No. 170: Relates to the payment of premiums or bonuses from the appropriations carried in this act to employees of the Government, in addition to their regular wages.

L. P. PADGETT,  
J. FRED. C. TALBOTT,  
D. J. RIORDAN,  
THOMAS S. BUTLER,  
WM. J. BROWNING.

*Managers on the part of the House.*

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

The conference report was agreed to.

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

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a brief survey of the work of the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of the war measures of this Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## DISPOSITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS IN POSSESSION OF UNITED STATES COURTS.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 10851) to provide a method for disposing of intoxicating liquors now or hereafter in the possession of United States court officials, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 10851, of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, let us have the bill read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That all intoxicating liquors now in the possession of the officials of any United States court which have been seized and held as evidence in any prosecution in such court, which prosecution is no longer pending, shall be destroyed by the official having the custody of the same unless claimed by the owner within 60 days from the passage of this act, and all such liquors held for use as evidence in cases now or hereafter pending which shall be disposed of without conviction shall likewise be destroyed if not claimed by the owner within 30 days after the case shall be disposed of.

Sec. 2. That hereafter when any person shall be convicted upon a charge of violating the laws of the United States against causing intoxicating liquors to be transported into States or Territories the laws of which prohibit the manufacture or sale of such liquors, the judgment of the court shall include an order directing the marshal to destroy all such liquors as may have been used or held for use as evidence on the trial: *Provided*, That in cases now pending the order to destroy shall be conditioned upon the failure of the owner to claim said liquors within 30 days after conviction.

Sec. 3. That hereafter all intoxicating liquors seized under the provisions of section 240 of the Penal Code in any State, Territory, or District the laws of which forbid the sale of such liquors for beverage purposes shall be destroyed instead of sold.

Sec. 4. That in all cases in which intoxicating liquors may be subject to be destroyed under the provisions of this act the court shall have jurisdiction upon the application of the United States attorney to order them delivered to any department or agency of the United States Government for medicinal, mechanical, or scientific uses.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "liquors," insert the words "said liquors shall be forfeited to the United States, and"

Page 2, line 9, strike out the word "shall" and insert the word "may."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts whether or not this bill contains a provision whereby the Government can utilize that liquor for its own purpose in the manufacture of munitions or for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Yes. The last section of the bill provides that all liquors which are subject to be destroyed under the provisions of the act may by the court be ordered turned over to any department or agency of the Government for medicinal, mechanical, and scientific purposes.

Mr. GARNER. That does not exactly turn it over to the Government. It leaves the matter in the discretion of the court as to whether it shall be turned over to the Government or poured out on the street. Why does not the gentleman lodge with the executive branch of the Government the right to utilize this property for its own use, scientific or otherwise?

Mr. WALSH. There is a good deal of fiction about there being a wide range for the use of intoxicating liquors besides drinking it. A great deal of that which is seized is of very poor quality and it would be more expensive to try to utilize it for any scientific purpose than it would be to use pure alcohol. With other grades of the product it can be used and the Attorney General or his representatives can make application to the court and of course the court can order that turned over to any department of the Government.

Mr. GARNER. I understand that, but if a clause were inserted in the bill absolutely providing that this liquor or alcohol might be used by the Government for scientific purposes it would automatically go to some branch of the Government which had the duty to use alcohol in the manufacture of ammunition or other products where alcohol is used.

Mr. WALSH. If that were done, it would simply mean the storage of vast quantities of liquors that are now cluttering up various buildings and warehouses throughout the country. It would have to be stored until it could be used. There are such great quantities of this that some place would have to be provided to take care of it until it is redistilled, or whatever the process is that it is put through.

Mr. GARNER. I understand from the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, that this bill was drawn in pursuance of a request from the Attorney General?

Mr. WALSH. Yes. I so stated at the beginning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. 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 Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

On motion of Mr. WALSH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

## FOURTEENTH AND OTHER DECENNIAL CENSUSES.

Mr. HELM. 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 census bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BARKLEY. Pending that, I want to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on what subject?

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to have printed a couple of short resolutions—one passed by the Southern Methodist conference and another by the executive committee of the Anti-Saloon League on the subject of war prohibition.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object to extending remarks by printing resolutions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky 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 bill H. R. 11984.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further con-

sideration of the bill (H. R. 11984), the census bill, with Mr. FOSTER 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 H. R. 11984, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses.

SEC. 16. That the compensation of enumerators shall be determined by the Director of the Census as follows: In subdivisions where he shall deem such remuneration sufficient, an allowance of not less than 2 nor more than 4 cents for each inhabitant; not less than 20 nor more than 30 cents for each establishment of productive industry reported; not less than 20 nor more than 30 cents for each farm reported; not less than 20 nor more than 50 cents for each irrigation or drainage enterprise reported; and 10 cents for each barn and inclosure containing live stock not on farms. In other subdivisions the Director of the Census may fix a mixed rate of not less than \$1 nor more than \$2 per day and, in addition, an allowance of not less than 1 nor more than 3 cents for each inhabitant enumerated, and not less than 15 nor more than 20 cents for each farm and each establishment of productive industry reported. In other subdivisions per diem rates shall be fixed by the director according to the difficulty of enumeration, having special reference to the regions to be canvassed and the sparsity of settlement or other considerations pertinent thereto. The compensation allowed to an enumerator in any such district shall not be less than \$3 nor more than \$6 per day of eight hours' actual field work, and no payment shall be made for time in excess of eight hours for any one day. The subdivisions or enumeration districts to which the several rates of compensation shall apply shall be designated by the Director of the Census at least two weeks in advance of the enumeration. No claim for mileage or traveling expenses shall be allowed any enumerator in either class of subdivisions, except in extreme cases, and then only when authority has been previously granted by the Director of the Census; and the decision of the director as to the amount due any enumerator shall be final.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to make an inquiry of the chairman of the committee. Is there anything in this bill that requires supervisors or enumerators to be actual residents of the districts or localities in which their work is to be done?

Mr. HELM. No, sir; there never has been so far as I know.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Does not the chairman think there ought to be such a provision?

Mr. HELM. I can not see anything to be accomplished by it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I am not sure that the chairman is right in saying there has been no law, but the practice has been uniform of requiring that a supervisor shall be a resident of his district and that the enumerator shall be an actual resident of the territory in which he does the work. As that has been the practice and custom and accepted as that which is right and should be followed, should not a provision be inserted requiring it?

Mr. HELM. Well, there is no particular objection to it. I think the Director would unquestionably follow the uniform practice, but if the gentleman wants to offer an amendment that they shall be residents he can do so; but the gentleman must bear in mind that at this particular time there might be some difficulty in some particular locality in getting the right type of men for enumerators. Certainly you want a person who understands or who has had some experience in doing this kind of work. There are probably several sections of the country where it is difficult to get the best type, and you are looking for efficiency and the getting of the best results, so I believe it would be wise to leave it as it is.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I think the chairman is entirely right. There is some important work to be done, but I am not willing to believe in each district of the United States there is not some one abundantly able to do it.

Mr. HELM. I am convinced that in the gentleman's district, that in my district, that there will be no difficulty whatever, but I can imagine out in the far West, in Alaska, Hawaii, or some sections of the island of Porto Rico, there would. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan there has been no instance brought to the attention of the committee by any official from the bureau where the necessity as indicated by the gentleman from Michigan has arisen.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I have no intention of reflecting on the Director of the Census or anyone else in authority. I trust those gentlemen, of course, but there are a thousand and one ways in which this House ought to express itself and not leave so much to the discretion of officials.

Mr. HELM. The gentleman is aware of the fact that we are to take the census of the islands of Guam and Samoa?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. HELM. And it might be possible in some of the districts in those remote islands it would be impossible to find a suitable person in that particular district to do the work. I believe it is the safe side of the proposition to leave it as it is.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That may be true as to those outlying possessions. I am not familiar enough with them

to express an opinion, but in continental United States I think Congress ought not to hesitate to put in such a provision as I suggest.

Mr. HELM. If I did not entertain a doubt as to the ability to comply with the section in Alaska, Guam, Samon, Porto Rico, and some of the outlying possessions I would agree with the proposition of the gentleman at once. I am not especially opposed to it as it is, but I believe we get the best results by leaving it as it is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of making a brief statement. I presume that the Members have noticed during the consideration of this bill, H. R. 11984, the efforts made by our colleague, the lady from Montana [Miss RANKIN], to perfect the measure. I note that she added an important amendment with reference to the employment of women enumerators and clerks, and I presume the membership here generally will hope that that amendment will stay in the bill. In connection with the work of the lady from Montana I should like to make a further brief statement, to the effect that it has come to my knowledge that some persons in the western part of the country are actually charging that our colleague is a member of the I. W. W., basing their charges on an inquiry that I made of the lady during the progress of one of her speeches on this floor.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In a minute I shall be pleased to yield. Of course, all who know the Representative from Montana [Miss RANKIN] would know that any such charge or even suspicion of it would be preposterous, and I would be glad of an opportunity, if any remarks of mine have led to such suspicion, to make a statement to the contrary on the floor. It is not even fair to intimate that Miss RANKIN is sympathetic with the organization.

Now, if I have a little time remaining, I would like to say to the Members that this matter of the development of the I. W. W. has been a serious one indeed in the far West. It has led to many misunderstandings, of course. But in all communities where it has asserted itself the people who employ labor have had to come to a determination as to whether they would deal with organized labor, which makes contracts and keeps contracts, or deal with this mob, which makes contracts only to break them, which goes into mills only to watch the chance to burn and destroy them, and into the mines for the same purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I have been watching with much interest the progress of the bill S. 4471, "to declare unlawful associations purposing by physical force, violence, or injury to bring about any governmental, social, industrial, or economic change in the United States and prescribing punishment for persons engaged in the activities of such associations, and for other purposes." That bill is necessary, and I am sorry that this session seems to be about approaching a recess period without this bill having reached the calendar of the House. I sincerely hope that when we will have returned to resume the work of this Congress this bill will find its place on the calendar with a unanimous report from the Committee on the Judiciary, and that it will receive prompt consideration on the floor and be passed.

I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. I am not very familiar with the bill, but it strikes me that if an amendment is to be adopted along the line I suggested it should be in connection with this section 16. It is a very proper place, at least, and I wish to offer an amendment, but I have not one prepared. Therefore I ask unanimous consent for leave to return to this section later for that purpose.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Make the request later. When you get the amendment ready let us know.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I make the request now. I do not think it is unreasonable.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] asks unanimous consent for leave to return to this section later for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BORLAND having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 158) further extending the time within which the joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to issue temporary permits for additional diversions of water from the Niagara River shall remain in effect.

## FOURTEENTH AND SUBSEQUENT DECENNIAL CENSUSES.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 17. That in the event of the death of any supervisor or enumerator after his appointment and entrance on his duties, the Director of the Census is authorized to pay to the widow or legal representative of such supervisor or enumerator such sum as he may deem just and fair for the services rendered by such supervisor or enumerator.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think this is very curious language. I do not know whether it has been in the law before or not. Take, for example, the employment of enumerators, and they are employed for the purpose of getting the names within a few blocks and might not be employed for more than two or three days, or a week at the outside, and there ought not to be any provision in this bill to authorize anybody to pay to their widows or families, in case of their decease during that three or four days of employment or a week's employment, any compensation.

Mr. ASWELL. That means for the work already done.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not understand it that way. I thought it was compensation, provided that they should die in the service.

Mr. ASWELL. It is for the work done.

Mr. MADDEN. Then I will withdraw everything that I have said.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 18. That special agents may be appointed by the Director of the Census to carry out the provisions of this act and of the act to provide for a permanent Census Office, approved March 6, 1902, and acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto; and such special agents shall perform such duties in connection with the enforcement of said acts as may be required of them by the Director of the Census. The special agents thus appointed shall receive compensation at rates to be fixed by the Director of the Census, such compensation, however, not to exceed \$6 per diem except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That during the decennial census period the Director of the Census may fix the compensation of not to exceed 25 special agents, who shall be persons of known and tried experience in statistical work, at an amount not to exceed \$10 per diem: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Census may, in his discretion, fix the compensation of special agents on a piece-price basis without limitation as to the amount earned per diem: *And provided further*, That the special agents appointed under this section shall be entitled to necessary traveling expenses and an allowance in lieu of subsistence not to exceed \$4 per diem during necessary absence from their usual places of residence; but no pay or allowance in lieu of subsistence shall be allowed special agents when employed in the Census Office on other than the special work committed to them, and no appointments of special agents shall be made for clerical work: *And provided further*, That the Director of the Census shall have power, and is hereby authorized, to appoint special agents to assist the supervisors whenever he may deem it proper, in connection with the work of preparation for, or during the progress of, the enumeration or in connection with the reenumeration of any district or a part thereof; or he may, in his discretion, employ for this purpose any of the permanent or temporary employees of the Census Office; and the special agents and employees of the Census Office so appointed or employed shall perform such duties in connection with the enforcement of this act as may be required of them by the Director of the Census or by the supervisors of the districts to which they are assigned, and when engaged in the work of enumeration or reenumeration shall have like authority with and perform the same duties as the enumerators in respect to the subjects committed to them under this act.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Comparing section 18 of this bill with the old law, it seems to be a very radical and marked departure from the provisions of section 18 of the old law. It provides among other things that the compensation shall be increased from \$6 in the old bill to \$10 in this bill, and that is quite a radical departure. I would like to have the chairman explain the cause of this difference between the existing law and this proposed act.

Mr. HELM. The gentleman, I suppose, has reference to the language in lines 20 to 24?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes. That is entirely new, as I gather by comparison with existing law.

Mr. HELM. Of course those special agents are limited to a compensation of \$6 a day. Now, the 25 special agents whose compensation is not to exceed \$10 a day are types of men who are professors of colleges, experts in compiling and publishing the data in readable form. The special agent who goes out to take the data of manufactures receives \$6 a day. The special agents who are experienced in statistical work are the men who write the reports.

Mr. ROBBINS. Well, I see here in lines 8, 9, and 10 there is a provision for special agents appointed under this section also. What is the difference between the 25 agents and those other classes of special agents who are to be given \$4 a day for subsistence? The gentleman has been speaking of the 25 special agents, who are to be college men and who are allowed \$10 a day. When you come to the proviso in lines 8, 9, and 10, there is a line of special agents to be appointed under this act who are to be entitled to traveling expenses and allowance for subsistence not exceeding \$4 a day. You say one class is to be college professors. What are the others to be?

Mr. HELM. All classes of special agents are to receive necessary traveling expenses and an allowance in lieu of subsistence not to exceed \$4 a day. All grades of special agents are to receive traveling expenses and subsistence.

Mr. ROBBINS. What is the difference between the 25 special agents and those others in line 8?

Mr. HELM. I have just explained the difference between the two. The \$6 special agent is the agent who visits a factory and ascertains the volume of work done, the number of men employed, and the capital invested, and makes an invoice of the manufacturing establishment. The \$10 a day special agent is the man who writes the bound volumes of reports that you see in the director's office. They are college men; men who have had special training and experience in writing and compiling all the work that is done in the office of publication.

Mr. ROBBINS. Well, if you look in line 24 you will see that there are special agents who are connected with the Census Office, presumably the permanent employees, who are not to be paid anything, so that you have three lines of special agents covered in this paragraph.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It says "special agents of the Census Office so appointed and employed."

Mr. ROBBINS. So you have three lines of special agents in this paragraph.

Mr. HELM. All of them are under the direction of the director.

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

Mr. ROBBINS. I would like to have just a minute more to clear that up.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASWELL. I would like to make a statement as to that.

Mr. ROBBINS. Certainly.

Mr. ASWELL. The Census Bureau is always referred to as the "Census Office." That is the cause of the confusion. The official title is the "Census Office."

Mr. ROBBINS. Well, the employees in the Census Office are another set of employees who are permanently there, making in all three classes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in the purpose of the committee in increasing the allowance for these 25 special agents beyond that authorized in the last census act. My attention was diverted—

Mr. HELM. I think it is an entirely new provision. I do not think this type of special agent has heretofore been employed.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have just sent to the Committee on Appropriations for a copy of the legislative appropriation act, to see the number of special agents and the per diem allowed.

Mr. HELM. There is a limited number. They are employed principally in gathering tobacco and cotton statistics and data of that kind.

Mr. STAFFORD. My attention was diverted by a gentleman drafting an amendment and I was not able to follow the debate or to note the gentleman's answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS]. Will the gentleman advise the committee as to the reason for increasing the per diem amount to \$10?

Mr. HELM. I do not think that is an increase. As I said a moment ago, this is a new type of special agent that is provided for in this bill. They differ from the ordinary or usual special agents that have heretofore been employed. I think probably \$5 and expenses and subsistence at \$3 a day.

Mr. STAFFORD. What reason prompted the committee in making the rate as high as \$10 a day? My reason for asking that question is that in the Internal-Revenue Office we have deputy collectors whose per diem is \$8, \$7, \$6, \$5, and very few, perhaps, at a higher rate. Now, you are placing these 25 at \$10 a day, or, rather, not to exceed \$10 a day, but in the administration of the office we know, of course, that they will undoubtedly receive the maximum compensation of \$10. What was the reason that prompted the committee in fixing that high per diem allowance, which would be at the rate of \$3,600 a year?

Mr. HELM. I think there was a gentleman by the name of Prof. Wilcox, who was connected with Cornell University, who assisted the director and the chiefs of divisions in writing and publishing the bound volumes of the census reports. It is a work that requires the services of men who are of the type of Prof. Wilcox and of the president of a college in West Virginia

who also assisted in this work. It is to induce men of this kind to assist in preparing these volumes in the manner in which they should be prepared. Of course, you have to offer them some reasonable compensation. It does not mean that they get \$10 per day for a year, or anything of that kind. They are employed for quite a limited period and necessarily have to leave their homes and come to Washington and work in the office.

Mr. ASWELL. I should like to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that after these statistics have been gathered they are not of very great value unless they are interpreted—that is, so to speak, made to talk—and this particular class of experts are the men who take the statistics that have been gathered and make them mean something. It requires a very high class of intelligence and training to do that, and you can not get those men for less than that amount now.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, I have just had handed to me a volume that I have been trying to get for the last 15 minutes giving the rates of pay of the present special agents.

Mr. ASWELL. They are men of a different type.

Mr. STAFFORD. This gives the estimates of the department for the coming fiscal year. I think we should ponder a moment on this subject as to whether we should increase this to \$10.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Has the gentleman there the estimate for the per diem for these special agents?

Mr. STAFFORD. Not these particular special agents, but the men now employed in the bureau.

Mr. ASWELL. Oh, well, they are employed continuously, while these men work only a few weeks.

Mr. STAFFORD. In response to the gentleman from Louisiana, we utilize the services of educators in other work.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. These men are paid by the educational institutions that employ them, and their salaries continue.

Mr. FLOOD. Not always.

Mr. ASWELL. Not always at all. They do not continue during vacation at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. Most of these educators are on an annual salary; perhaps not those in the South—

Mr. ASWELL. Many of them are not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Every professor or instructor in any leading institution is on an annual salary.

Mr. FLOOD. They are on an annual salary; but when they get leave of absence to do work for other people, or for the Government, the salary is discontinued.

Mr. ASWELL. Of course.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let me say to the gentleman from Virginia that there are many educational institutions that grant what is known as a sabbatical year to their professors or instructors—that is, leave of absence for a year every seventh year—for which they are paid their full salaries. This per diem allowance is a requisite in addition to their regular salaries.

Now, I wish to go back to the matter I was speaking about, that in the estimates for the next fiscal year for the Bureau of the Census we find no higher estimate for these special agents than \$8 a day. Five are estimated for, and five were employed in 1917. There are four estimated for at \$7 per day, of whom none were employed in 1917.

There are 18 men estimated for at \$6 per day, of which 6 were in the employment of the Government in 1917. There are 2 estimated for at \$5.50 a day, and 2 employed in 1917. There are 4 estimated for at \$5 a day, and 3 employed in 1917. And so on down to \$4. Thirty-one estimated for this year, being the lowest grade of these special agents. I am considering it in connection with the permanent force in the legislative bill as to whether it is advisable to provide a higher salary for the per diem employees than those on the statutory roll.

Mr. HELM. In all these increases in both classes of special agents, from 5 to 6 in one class and 8 to 10 in the other, with traveling expenses, subsistence, all are increased on the idea of the increased cost of living.

Mr. STAFFORD. I may say that the legislative, executive, and judicial subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations did not provide any increase in the higher-paid officials. That is the reason why I am making inquiry so as to have a consonance of legislation in both bills.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The first appropriation bill that will carry an appropriation to cover the special agents will be the one for the fiscal year beginning in 1919. The report says:

The maximum salary for special agents is, in general, the same as it was before, namely, \$6 per diem. The insertion of the proviso that a limited number of special agents, who shall be persons of known and tried experience in statistical work, may be appointed at higher salaries simply incorporates in the main census act a provision which at the last census was covered by an amendatory clause introduced in the urgent deficiency act of 1909. It is not, therefore, a new feature. The maximum number of such expert special agents has, however, been increased from 20 to 25, and their maximum compensation from \$8 to \$10 per diem, this increase in number and compensation being deemed necessary in order to make it possible to secure under existing conditions the amount and grade of assistance required for the class of expert work on which these agents are to be employed.

In view of the increased cost of living, the allowance in lieu of subsistence for special agents has been increased from \$3 to \$4 a day.

That is the suggestion made by the special committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand the committee has followed the recommendations of the special committee. That is a question which I sought to propound to the gentleman yesterday when he did not have time to yield—as to whether these gentlemen that constituted the special committee are any or all Government employees. I notice the name of Mr. Steuart, who, I believe, has been in the employ of the Bureau of Census.

Mr. HELM. I think he is on the Tariff Board now.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think all of these are in the employ of the Bureau of Census, unless one of them has become secretary of the Tariff Commission; and I am not sure of that.

Mr. HELM. That is Mr. Steuart, a former chief statistician of the bureau, and he is now with the Tariff Board.

Mr. STAFFORD. I question the advisability of increasing the per diem to \$10, in view of the fact that the bureau did not ask more than \$8 for the permanent force.

Mr. ASWELL. The work is entirely different.

Mr. STAFFORD. No.

Mr. ALEXANDER. These men have been carried heretofore; these are not new experts, and the number is increased from 20 to 25. The chairman is in error as to this being a new service.

Mr. STAFFORD. I recognize that it may be supported in the policy to have a higher rate because of the increased cost of living; but when we pay a man \$8 a day, that would seem to be ample, because we have commissioners of the Government who negotiate treaties that do not receive \$10 a day. It is allowing professors on the pay rolls of colleges an honorarium of \$10 in addition.

Mr. ALEXANDER. They are high-class men. They prepare special articles that appear in volumes on manufactures, mines, and mining. They are college men and do the work aside from their regular work in the institutions of learning. They may be engaged a few days or a few weeks.

Mr. STAFFORD. I know the Government in many activities utilizes the educators in special work.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 20. That the enumeration of the population required by section 1 of this act shall be taken as of the 1st day of January, and it shall be the duty of each enumerator to commence the enumeration of his district on the day following, unless the Director of the Census in his discretion shall defer the enumeration in said district by reason of climatic or other conditions which would materially interfere with the proper conduct of the work; but in any event it shall be the duty of each enumerator to prepare the returns hereinafter required to be made and to forward the same to the supervisor of his district within 30 days from the commencement of the enumeration of his district: *Provided*, That in any city having 2,500 inhabitants or more under the preceding census the enumeration of the population shall be completed within two weeks from the commencement thereof.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. How do they ascertain the number of inhabitants in a city so that it can be stated that the enumeration must be completed within two weeks. They say 2,500 or more. There are very few cities in the sense in which the term is used that have only 2,500 inhabitants. What I am trying to ascertain is how they have fixed this as to population so that they can require the enumeration within two weeks.

Mr. HELM. The object of the director is to lay off a certain portion of the cities, so that the enumerator can complete the work within the prescribed time. I suppose in a city the size of New York the entire population, according to the last census, would be divided in such a way that enough enumerators would be appointed to canvass a given district within a given period.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but here, we will say, is a town of some 2,000 inhabitants. They can take more than two weeks to make the enumeration of that town. It provides in the bill here that, having 2,500 or more inhabitants, the enumeration shall be completed within two weeks, so that if they have less the implication is that they may have a longer time in which to complete the enumeration.

Mr. HELM. The population is necessarily more congested in the cities than in the country.

Mr. WALSH. That all depends upon what you call a city. Take a city of 2,500—

Mr. ASWELL. That is not a city.

Mr. WALSH. Which is not a city according to the usual acceptance of the word "city" and according to the laws of some States, as in some States communities can not be made cities until they have 10,000 or 12,000 or possibly 6,000 or 8,000 inhabitants. The point I make is this: Here is a community with 2,400 or 2,300 people. You permit by implication a longer period than two weeks in which to complete the enumeration of that particular community, whereas, if it should have 2,600 people they have to complete it within two weeks.

Mr. HELM. In the city of Washington, in the heart of the city, a person can within a much shorter time take the enumeration of any block, which would have perhaps 3,000 or 4,000 people in it, if it is the congested part of the city, whereas an enumerator out in the rural districts has to travel about over the country and it consumes more time. A man can go in an office building, like the Woolworth Building in New York City, and possibly he would find more people in that building in the city of New York than are in my home town.

Mr. WALSH. Do they enumerate people in office buildings?

Mr. HELM. I suspect that some of them live in the office buildings.

Mr. WALSH. I expect they do not except possibly the janitor or watchman.

Mr. HELM. They have, of course, to go to the homes of the heads of the families.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Will not this permit the districting of a city into areas of in the vicinity of 2,500 people or even more and the employment of a great many more enumerators for that community than if the same length of time was permitted for completing the census that would be permitted for a smaller settlement?

Mr. HELM. There is no difference in the compensation.

Mr. WALSH. I know that, but you permit more people to be compensated.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will give the gentleman the reason assigned for this by the committee. I read to you a provision of the existing law:

That in any city having 5,000 inhabitants or more under the preceding census the enumeration of the population shall be commenced on the 15th day of April aforesaid and shall be completed within two weeks thereafter.

The only amendment to that is this: That "5,000" be stricken out and "2,500" inserted, and the time is changed from the 15th of April to the 1st of January, and here is what the committee says:

The minimum population limit for cities in which the enumeration is to be completed within two weeks has been lowered from 5,000 to 2,500. The enumeration of all areas of fairly compact population should be completed in the shortest possible time, and it seems entirely feasible to have the stipulation as to two weeks apply in 1920 to all places of 2,500 inhabitants or more as shown by the census of 1910.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, that will be just what I stated. By lowering the minimum limit of population it would permit a city or large community to be carved up into districts and therefore would require more enumerators.

Mr. ALEXANDER. In these small cities or towns of less than 2,500 inhabitants there is no reason why the enumeration should extend during 30 days.

Mr. WALSH. There is no reason why it should extend over two weeks, but you seemingly permit it to extend over two weeks under the provisions of this bill. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out "2,500" and inserting "5,000," in order to conform with existing law.

Mr. HELM. I accept the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. The chairman of the committee accepts my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lines 4 and 5, page 20, strike out "2,500" and insert "5,000."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question about a provision omitted from existing law. The old law of July 2, 1909, has a provision providing for the enumeration of those unfortunates designated as paupers, prisoners, juvenile delinquents, insane, feeble-minded, blind, deaf and dumb, and inmates of benevolent institutions. Now, those are entirely omitted from section 20. What provision is made in this bill for these persons so designated?

Mr. HELM. That work is done by special agents sent to the institutions where these people are confined, either by correspondence or by special agent.

Mr. ROBBINS. Well, ought not there be some provision of this kind with relation to that which was carried in the old law, which seemed to have worked satisfactorily?

Mr. ALEXANDER. The people who administered the old law think not, and hence suggested the change.

Mr. ROBBINS. What provision is to be made in lieu of the provision now in existing law?

Mr. ALEXANDER. They get it from the institutions through special agents provided for in the law. There is not any trouble about that. This is a better way to do it.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the returns be made by special agents of these institutions?

Mr. ALEXANDER. By special agents provided for in this bill.

Mr. ROBBINS. Special agents in the last paragraph are to visit these institutions and get the lists?

Mr. HELM. The superintendents of asylums would write to the Director of the Census and tell how many inmates there were in those institutions.

Mr. ROBBINS. Enumerators who do the work of special agents?

Mr. HELM. Certainly, outside the correspondence.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, under the unanimous-consent agreement I ask to return to section 16 to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the former permission the gentleman asks to return to section 16 to offer an amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Page 17, line 6, at the end of line 6 add the following: "Provided, That within the limits of continental United States each supervisor to be appointed or selected under this act shall be an actual resident of the district, and each enumerator to be appointed or selected under this act shall be an actual resident of the subdivision within which his duties are to be performed, but an enumerator may be appointed if he be an actual resident of the city of which the subdivision in which his duties are to be performed is a part."

Mr. HELM. We agree to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 23. That it shall be the duty of all persons over 21 years of age when requested by the Director of the Census, or by any supervisor, enumerator, or special agent, or other employee of the Census Office, acting under the instructions of the said director, to answer correctly, to the best of their knowledge, all questions on the census schedules applying to themselves and to the families to which they belong or are related, and to the farm or farms of which they or their families are the occupants; and any person over 21 years of age who, under the conditions hereinbefore stated, shall refuse or willfully neglect to answer any of these questions, or shall willfully give answers that are false, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not exceeding \$100.

And it is hereby made unlawful for any individual, committee, or other organization of any kind whatsoever, to offer or render to any supervisor, supervisor's clerk, enumerator, interpreter, special agent, or other officer or employee of the Census Office engaged in making an enumeration of population, either directly or indirectly, any suggestion, advice, or assistance of any kind, with the intent or purpose of causing an inaccurate enumeration of population to be made, either as to the number of persons resident in any district or community or in any other respect; and any individual, or any officer or member of any committee or other organization of any kind whatsoever, who directly or indirectly offers or renders any such suggestion, advice, information, or assistance, with such unlawful intent or purpose, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not exceeding \$5,000.

And it shall be the duty of every owner, proprietor, manager, superintendent, or agent of a hotel, apartment house, boarding or lodging house, tenement, or other building, when requested by the Director of the Census, or by any supervisor, enumerator, special agent, or other employee of the Census Office, acting under the instructions of the said director, to furnish the names of the occupants of said hotel, apartment house, boarding or lodging house, tenement, or other building, and to give thereto free ingress and egress to any duly accredited representative of the Census Office, so as to permit of the collection of statistics for census purposes, including the proper and correct enumeration of all persons having their usual place of abode in said hotel, apartment house, boarding or lodging house, tenement, or other building; and any owner, proprietor, manager, superintendent, or agent of a hotel, apartment house, boarding or lodging house, tenement, or other building who shall refuse or willfully neglect to give such information or assistance under the conditions hereinbefore stated shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not exceeding \$500.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the words "twenty-one," in line 4, page 22, and insert in place thereof the word "eighteen."

Mr. HELM. I will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 4, strike out "twenty-one" and insert in lieu thereof "eighteen."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words in section 23, and I do this for the purpose of eliciting some information from those in charge of the bill. In lines 8, 9, and 10 it provides for certain questions to be answered by people who have farms.

Now, the existing law provides for the collection of statistics in a much broader sense, which would include factories, stores, or any other buildings, or any place where statistics and information must be obtained. Where is that in this bill? Why is section 23 limited to farms? Why do not you say stores, mills, forests, cattle, and other things?

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is the language of the existing law.

Mr. ROBBINS. The existing law has this statement:

Shall have free ingress and egress so as to permit the collection of statistics for census purposes, including the proper and correct enumeration of all persons.

Mr. ALEXANDER. You are reading section 23, are you not?

Mr. ROBBINS. I am reading section 23 of the act of 1909, and when applying it to section 23 of the act now under consideration it does not give anything about these statistics. It goes on to say that certain information is to be divulged by people who own farms, and there it stops.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Oh, no.

Mr. ROBBINS. I am reading section 23 of the old law and comparing it with the proposed law, which I say is much more limited. Now, then, where do you get this information? Of course, you retreat behind the special agents you create in this bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I may not get the gentleman's point inasmuch as there has been so much confusion here.

Mr. ROBBINS. That is true; and I will state briefly this: I am reading from section 23, lines 8, 9, and 10, on page 22, that we are now considering. These lines provide here for instructions being given said director, that all persons shall answer correctly to the best of their knowledge all questions on the census schedules applying to themselves or to the families to which they belong or are related, and to the farm or farms of which they or their families are the occupants. Now, if you turn to the same provision in the old law it goes on and specifies in the same section, on page 9, that free ingress and egress shall be given to any duly accredited representative of the Census Office, so as to permit of the collection of statistics for census purposes, including the proper and correct enumerations of all persons having their usual place of abode—

Mr. HELM. That is on page 23, line 8.

Mr. ROBBINS. Is it covered in lines 18 and 19? Is that your idea of it—by the special agents visiting the premises for that purpose?

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. All right, then, that covers it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words to direct the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that the same amendment which I offered to line 4, page 22, should be inserted in line 12.

Mr. HELM. I accept it.

Mr. WALSH. I offer the amendment to strike out, on page 22, line 12, the words "twenty-one" and insert in place thereof the word "eighteen." The chairman, I understand, accepts the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WALSH: Page 22, line 12, strike out "twenty-one" and insert "eighteen."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 24. That it shall be the duty of every owner, official, agent, person in charge, or assistant to the person in charge, of any company, business, institution, establishment, religious body, or organization of any nature whatsoever, to answer completely and correctly to the best of his knowledge all questions relating to his respective company, business, institution, establishment, religious body, or other organization, or to records or statistics in his official custody, contained on any census schedule prepared by the Director of the Census under the authority of this act, or of the act to provide for a permanent Census Office, approved March 6, 1902, or of acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto; and any person violating the provisions of this section by refusing or willfully neglecting to answer any of said questions, or by willfully giving answers that are false, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not exceeding \$10,000, or imprisoned for a period not exceeding one year, or both so fined and imprisoned, at the discretion of the court.

Mr. WALSH. I move to strike out the last six words in the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last six words in the section. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. These words, "at the discretion of the court," are mere surplusage and seldom found in any statute imposing a penalty. Why, of course, it is at the discretion of the court; but I wanted to direct the attention of the chairman of the committee to the wide variance in the fine which may be imposed and the imprisonment. Usually, when a person commits an offense for which he may be liable to a fine of \$10,000 the alternative punishment of imprisonment is much longer than one year. And as this is a maximum I submit that either the fine ought to be reduced or the imprisonment ought to be increased.

Mr. HELM. This is the language of the existing law. I appreciate the criticism made by the gentleman, but it is out of the ordinary and I do not think it is worth while.

Mr. WALSH. You prefer not to change the existing law in that respect?

Mr. HELM. No court, I suppose, would ever impose a fine of \$10,000.

Mr. WALSH. Then if they are not going to do that we ought to make the punishment in some degree in cases of conviction fit the crime.

Mr. MEEKER. In view of the fact of the high cost of living, is not that reasonable now?

Mr. WALSH. I do not think just because we have increased the compensation we ought to increase the amount which persons may be fined, but I do submit to the gentleman that the words "at the discretion of the court" are mere surplusage and ought to be eliminated.

Mr. HELM. It is wholly immaterial, and I will accept it if the gentleman insists on it.

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

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 27. That the Director of the Census may authorize the expenditure of necessary sums for the actual and necessary traveling expenses of the officers and employees of the Census Office, including an allowance in lieu of subsistence not exceeding \$5 per day during their necessary absence from the Census Office; and he may authorize the incidental, miscellaneous, and contingent expenses necessary for the carrying out of this act, as herein provided, and not otherwise, including advertising in newspapers, the purchase of manuscripts, books, of reference, and periodicals, the rental of sufficient quarters in the District of Columbia and elsewhere and the furnishing thereof, and expenditures necessary for compiling, printing, publishing, and distributing the results of the census, the purchase of necessary paper and other supplies, the purchase, rental, exchange, construction, and repair of mechanical appliances, the compensation of such permanent and temporary clerks as may be employed under the provisions of this act and the act establishing the permanent Census Office and acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto, and all other expenses incurred under authority conveyed in this act.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the section in line 14, page 25, by striking out "\$5" and inserting "\$4."

Mr. HELM. I accept the amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 25, line 14, strike out "\$5" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire if it would not be advisable to insert the language of the existing law, which limits the amount of the allowance to \$5 a day for their actual subsistence? You will notice in the draft of the existing law the words stricken out, "or, instead of such an allowance, their actual subsistence expenses, not exceeding \$5 a day."

Mr. HELM. I thought we had agreed upon \$4 instead of \$5.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is an allowance that is the alternative supplementary to the \$4 allowance, and is the language of the existing law. The existing law provides "That the Director of the Census may authorize the expenditure of the necessary sums for the actual and necessary expenses of the officers and employees of the Census Office, including an allowance in lieu of subsistence, not exceeding \$4 a day during their necessary absence from the Census Office, or, instead of such allowance, their actual subsistence expenses, not exceeding \$5 a day." The point I am making to the chairman is this: The first allowance is a flat allowance of a per diem, regardless of the amount they

expend. The other authorization was to permit the Director of the Census to authorize their actual expenses, which in no event should exceed \$5 a day. For instance, here is an agent or employee of the Census Bureau who is sent out and, at the discretion of the Director of the Census, is allowed a flat per diem of \$4 a day, whether he spends that much or not.

Mr. HELM. Does the gentleman doubt that it is the universal practice?

Mr. STAFFORD. In this instance the Director of the Census has the option of either granting the flat allowance of \$4 a day or else sending them out and stating that he would allow actual expenses as shown in the voucher returns, but not to exceed in any one instance \$5 a day.

Mr. HELM. I agree to it right now.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is the general practice to allow a flat sum of \$4. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, my attention was diverted for a moment, but I wish to strike out, in section 29, the language "or weight."

Mr. HELM. That section has been passed.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am well aware that it is passed, but it is new language.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is very important that it should be in, the committee thought.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit—not with the intention of taking up unnecessary time—the Post Office Department has for years been trying to warn against matter which is purely merchandise being sent in the mails.

Mr. HELM. The gentleman well knows that this section has been passed.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was through an inadvertence on my part. I had the matter marked. Of course, I thought the gentleman would permit at least the consideration of this bona fide suggestion on my part as to weight. I am presenting the view of the Post Office Department as to whether it is advisable.

We do not grant it to other departments.

Mr. HELM. It is just as broad as it is long. If these things were sent back by express it would cost just as much as by mail.

Mr. STAFFORD. They are not to be sent by express. They are to be sent by freight. Now, you authorize the Director of the Census to send it by registered mail. The Post Office Department has protested against that.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Section 29, which refers to census mail matter, has been amended in one important particular, as follows:

That all mail matter of whatever class or weight, relating to the census and addressed to the Census Office, or to any official thereof, and indorsed "Official business, Census Office," shall be transmitted free of postage, and by registered mail if necessary, and so marked: *Provided*, That if any person shall make use of such indorsement to avoid the payment of postage or registry fee on his or her private letter, package, or other matter in the mail, the person so offending shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and subject to a fine of \$300, to be prosecuted in any court of competent jurisdiction.

Referring to the insertion of the words "or weight" in the first line of the above section, it must be explained that heretofore the schedules and other supplies used in the work of enumeration have been packed in large boxes, regardless of weight or bulk, and sent to the supervisors by mail, and, similarly, the mails have been used by the supervisors in forwarding to the enumerators the portfolios containing the schedules and supplies required in their work. The completed schedules, time reports, vouchers, etc., of the enumerators have likewise been returned by mail to the supervisors and then forwarded by them to Washington packed in the large boxes in which they were originally received. This method of transmitting the census schedules and supplies has worked well in practice, and should be made again possible with respect to the Fourteenth Census; but while the present limits of the postal laws and regulations as to size and weight of packages do not apply apparently to outgoing official mail from Washington, they do apply to the return of completed work by field employees or agents. The conduct of the census enumeration will be greatly hampered, in fact rendered almost impossible, unless this restriction is removed. It is believed that the insertion of the words "or weight" in the first line of the above section will accomplish this purpose.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the words be permitted to remain in the bill as printed.

The CHAIRMAN. That request is not necessary. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order.

Mr. ALEXANDER. We object at this time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 31. That there shall in the year 1925, and once every 10 years thereafter, a census of agriculture and live stock, which shall show the acreage of farm land, the acreage of the principal crops, and the number and value of domestic animals on the farms and ranges of the country. The schedule employed in this census shall be prepared by the Director of the Census. Such census shall be taken as of January 1, and shall relate to the preceding calendar year. The Director of the Census may appoint enumerators or special agents for the purpose of this census, in accordance with the provisions of the permanent census act.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out section 31. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK: Page 27, strike out all of section 31.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, the adoption of my amendment would have the effect to eliminate section 31 of the bill, which provides that a live-stock and agricultural census shall be taken in 1925 and for each 10 years thereafter. The main body of the bill is to authorize the taking of the next decennial census in 1920. Section 31 has no relation to the taking of the 1920 census, and I do not think it has any proper place in this bill. What we should do now is to provide fully and adequately for the taking of the Fourteenth decennial census and then we ought to stop at that point.

When the census act of 1909 was passed it contained a section identical with this section 31 and was numbered section 31 in the census act of 1909, same as in this act.

At the second regular session of the Sixty-third Congress the Director of the Census, who was then Mr. William J. Harris, appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and submitted estimates for the taking of this proposed live-stock and agricultural census in 1915, and the estimates submitted amounted to \$2,286,100. When the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill came before the House in 1914, a point of order was made against the particular section which carried the appropriation on the ground that it contained some new legislation relating to enumerators and other similar legislation. The point of order was sustained and the paragraph was stricken from the bill, whereupon the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] offered a new paragraph providing that the census authorized by said section 31 should be taken, and containing the same amount of appropriation, to wit, \$2,286,100. Thereupon the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] proposed an amendment as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee to repeal section 31 of the census act of 1909, and when the substitute came to a vote it was adopted by the House by a vote of 179 to 137, and section 31 of the census act of 1909 was thereby repealed.

The question arises, suppose that substitute amendment had not been adopted, and the \$2,286,100 had been spent for the taking of a live-stock and agricultural census in 1915, does any man in this House think that the country would have been in any better shape? What good would it have done?

Existing law already makes ample provision for ascertaining each year the amount of cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, potatoes, and so forth, raised in the United States each year, and the figures are accurate and reliable. Also careful estimates are made each year by the Department of Agriculture as to the number of live stock in the United States, such as horses, mules, swine, milch cows, and other cattle.

What in the world do we want to spend several millions of dollars for duplicating work which is already being done by existing agencies? I am positively and emphatically against it, and am going to do what I can to prevent it.

Mr. BLANTON. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not a fact that if this provision is left in the bill, instead of taking a census of agriculture and live stock every 10 years, there will be one taken every 5 years?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; I was coming to that. The gentleman has stated the case correctly.

Now, I submit that a census of this kind in 1925 and each 10 years thereafter is wholly unnecessary, because the Department of Agriculture now has facilities and agencies for furnishing the country with accurate estimates upon these lines each year between the taking of the regular decennial censuses. It must be remembered that the census of 1920, for which the main body of this bill provides, will take a careful and accurate enumeration of all live stock in the United States and all agricultural products, farms, farm houses, and matters of that kind. I think that is a wise thing to do, and ought to be done while we are taking the census of population; but I see no reason in the world for repeating it in 1925.

Between the years of taking the Fourteenth Census in 1920 and the taking of the Fifteenth Census in 1930, the Department of Agriculture, through its very efficient agencies, can furnish us all the information we need as to agriculture and live stock. I have here a letter that I received from the Bureau of Crop Estimates in the Department of Agriculture on January 1 of this year. The letter contained some interesting and valuable data and information, and so when I received it I put it away in my files for future reference. I will not take the time to read it, but suffice it to say that it gives the number of horses, mules,

cattle, swine, sheep, milch cows, and also the average price of this live stock for the years 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, and 1918, and shows the increase or decrease, as the case may be, of the different kinds of live stock for the respective years.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. HELM. Does the gentleman consider the cotton reports worth anything?

Mr. BLACK. I have not mentioned the cotton reports, but certainly they are valuable; they are very accurate.

Mr. BLANTON. Will this census benefit a single cowman or farmer in this country?

Mr. BLACK. I do not think so, because it will be unnecessary except at each decennial census when we are taking the census of population.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Does the gentleman consider these cotton censuses every year a benefit to the cotton farmers?

Mr. BLACK. I will say to the gentleman that I am not assailing the value of statistics now assembled by either the Department of Agriculture or the Census Department under existing law. What I am trying to prevent is an unnecessary duplication of work and a consequent waste of public money.

Mr. ASWELL. The department does not take the census; it bases its reports on the estimates.

Mr. BLACK. I have already said that some of the work of the Department of Agriculture is based on estimates, but it has the benefit of the more or less accurate enumerations that are made every 10 years, and taking that as a basis, with the work of its numerous agents in the field and facilities at its command, it furnishes the country annually with estimates upon these subjects which are remarkably accurate and trustworthy. I submit that they are entirely sufficient for all practical purposes.

Now, what will this proposed live-stock and agricultural census be taken in 1925 cost? In his testimony before the committee Director Samuel L. Rogers says it will cost \$3,500,000.

Now, gentlemen, if you think it is a necessary expenditure, if you think it is one which will justify its cost and the labor of numerous agents which will be used in taking it, then you should vote against my amendment and retain section 31. But if you think as I do, that it will be an unnecessary and unprofitable and well-nigh useless expenditure, then I appeal to you to support my amendment and strike out the section from the bill and save the money to the Public Treasury.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I want to consume only three or four minutes in the discussion of this amendment. I am from an agricultural district. I am from a tobacco-growing district. Before we had these reports from the census, which are quarterly, the tobacco farmers were selling tobacco at 3 or 4 and 5 cents a pound. Since we had the report from the Census Bureau every three months tobacco has gone up before the war to 12 and 20 cents a pound. The farmers who fatten cattle in my district tell me, and I hear it generally talked, that when they take the fat cattle and ship them to market the packers say the country is flooded with cattle, and that they can buy the finest expert New York cattle, that ought to be bringing around 7 or 8 cents, for 5 or 6 cents. Now, if you have a live-stock report which is accurate every five years, stating how many cattle, how many hogs there are in the country, these packers can not swindle the farmers out of the value of their stock.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Do not the hearings show that the Director of the Census states that it will be years from the time the census is taken before it is available for the people?

Mr. HELM. Oh, that is the same old talk. When these reports come in from the enumerators to the Census Bureau they get out something like these Farmers' Bulletins that you send to your farmers. This information is issued in pamphlet form and published and sent out. What the gentleman is referring to is the bound volumes of the reports that are finally compiled with the concentrated statistics, and that does take considerable time. But the country early gets the information and the benefit of the knowledge of these statistics, which are of great consequence to the farmers, because they want to know the number of hogs, the number of cattle, the number of sheep, the number of mules, the number of horses in the country—more especially that class of stock that enters into food. It is important that this census should be taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLACK) there were 26 ayes and 33 noes.

Mr. BLACK. I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM].

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 39 ayes and 39 noes.

So the amendment was lost.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, 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. 10854) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 12599) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 12541. An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution to extend the time within which the President may relinquish control of any railroad or system of transportation, as provided in section 14 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, to January 1, 1919.

#### FOURTEENTH AND SUBSEQUENT DECENNIAL CENSUSES.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BLACK. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLACK. Did the Chair announce the vote on my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair announced the vote—39 in the affirmative and 39 in the negative—and the amendment was lost.

Mr. BLACK. I understood that there was another one who wanted to vote in the affirmative.

The CHAIRMAN. No one can vote after the tellers have announced the result.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. MEEKER (interrupting the count). Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I renew it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order that there is no quorum.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOSTER, 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. 11984 and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### EXTENSION OF TIME OF FEDERAL CONTROL OF RAILROADS.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution 159 with reference to short-line railroads and pass the same. It is exactly what the House has already passed, with a little addition at the end with reference to interurban railroads, to which there is no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution 159 and concur in a Senate amendment.

Mr. SIMS. It is not a Senate amendment. This is a Senate resolution, which they passed before our resolution got over there or after it got there. I want to take the Senate resolution from the Speaker's table and pass the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution 159. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have some statement as to what the additions are.

Mr. SIMS. There is no difference in the resolution from the House resolution except in the last proviso, with reference to interurban railroads, which I will ask the Clerk to report.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Provided further*, That nothing in this resolution or in the said act of March 21, 1918, shall be construed as requiring the President either to take or retain the possession, use, and control of any street railway, whether the same be owned, controlled, or operated by another carrier company or not, nor to require the President to take or retain the possession, use, and control of any interurban or other similar railroad which does not receive at least 25 per cent of its operating revenue from the transportation of freight, and which prior to December 29, 1917, did not have through routes or joint routes with one or more steam road carriers.

Mr. SIMS. That is all there is to it, and everyone is in favor of it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is to be noted that in this addition which the Senate has put in there is no provision stating what the intent of Congress is in tacking it on.

Mr. SIMS. The resolution is exactly as it passed the House, with this addition that has just been read.

Mr. WALSH. I know this addition has been put on there; but nothing has been put into the resolution declaring what our intent is in passing it, and some one will construe it so as to vitiate the other provisions of the resolution.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman knows that if this resolution does not pass to-night there is no use in passing it.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, I do not agree with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the time within which the President may relinquish control of all or any part of any railroad or system of transportation, further Federal control of which the President shall deem not needful or desirable, as provided in section 14 of said act, be, and it is hereby, extended to and including January 1, 1919: *Provided, however*, That the right conferred upon the President to relinquish prior to July 1, 1918, control of all or any part of any railroad or system of transportation without consent of the carrier as provided in section 14 of an act approved March 21, 1918, entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," which right is herein extended to and inclusive of January 1, 1919, shall not be construed to include any railroad engaged as a common carrier in general transportation such as mentioned in section 1 of said act not owned, controlled, or operated by another carrier company and which has heretofore competed for traffic with any railroad or railroads of which the President has taken and retained the possession, use, and control; it being the intent of Congress that every railroad not owned, controlled, or operated by another carrier company and which has heretofore competed for traffic with a railroad or railroads which the President has taken and retains the possession, use, or control or which connects with such railroad and is engaged as a common carrier in general transportation shall be held and considered as within Federal control as defined in said act and to be entitled to the benefits of all the provisions of said act so long as the railroad or railroads with which it has heretofore competed for traffic or with which it connects shall be retained under Federal control: *Provided further*, That nothing in this resolution or in the said act of March 21, 1918, shall be construed as requiring the President either to take or retain the possession, use, and control of any street railway, whether the same be owned, controlled, or operated by another carrier company or not, nor to require the President to take or retain the possession, use, and control of any interurban or other similar railroad which does not receive at least 25 per cent of its operating revenue from the transportation of freight, and which prior to December 29, 1917, did not have through routes or joint rates with one or more steam-road carriers.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SIMS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

#### DEPARTMENTAL EMPLOYEES SUBJECT TO MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House resolution 392, a privileged resolution, providing for an inquiry as to the number of men within the draft age in the Food and Fuel Administrations and other bureaus created by the Government. The resolution was sent to the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, and that committee has unanimously reported it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House resolution 392.

*Resolved*, That the President be requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Food Administrator, Fuel Administrator, and all boards and commissions appointed by Executive order since April 6, 1917, who were on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years, for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such administrators, boards, or commissions and allowed; the name and home address of each such person; the character of work he is performing in the service of such administrators, boards, or commissions, and the length of time he has been in such service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. DENT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

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

H. R. 12441. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

S. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to issue permits for the diversion of water from the Niagara River.

#### MOVING PICTURES, ETC., AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask to call up House resolution 402, making inquiry as to the method of taking moving pictures of our expeditionary forces in France and of our troops in this country.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, is that necessary to be considered to-night? Many of us have not had our dinners yet. Monday is unanimous-consent day.

Mr. DENT. I will say to the gentleman that the Committee on Public Information is perfectly willing to furnish the information, and I think this is the quickest way to dispose of it. The Committee on Public Information wishes to furnish all the information for which the resolution calls.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### Resolution 402.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of War be requested to report to the House of Representatives the following information:

How many persons in the Signal Corps have been ordered to take still or moving pictures of the American Expeditionary Forces?

What disposition is made of such negatives and films when returned to this country?

In what manner, under what terms, and under what regulations are the pictures distributed for public exhibition?

With whom and by whom are contracts made for such exhibition purposes, and what are the conditions of the same?

What persons other than members of the Signal Corps have been authorized to take still or moving pictures of the American Expeditionary Forces, and in what manner is control exercised over exhibition of the pictures so taken?

Are members of the Signal Corps ordered to take still or moving pictures of military preparations in this country, including activities in the cantonments, ordnance, and airplane production and the production of articles used in the war, and what disposition is made of same?

Are pictures so taken exhibited in public places? If so, by whose authority and under what terms?

Have civilian photographers been authorized to take still or moving pictures of the American Expeditionary Forces or of war preparations in this country, including activities in the cantonments, ordnance, and airplane production and the production of articles used in the war? If so, what disposition is made of such negatives and films; in what manner, upon what terms, and under what regulations are such pictures distributed for public exhibition; with whom and by whom are contracts made for such exhibition purposes, and what are the conditions of the same?

What revenue is derived from such contracts, and what disposition is made of the same?

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. DENT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

#### FORTIFICATIONS BILL.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 12541) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, to disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 12541. An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill just reported, to disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will announce the conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Messrs. BORLAND, BYRNS of Tennessee, and GOOD.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a petition to the House of the National Liberty Congress, Colored Americans, that has been sitting here this week. It is not long.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a petition from the National Liberty Congress, Colored Americans, which has been sitting here this week. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

## RECESS UNTIL MONDAY AT 11 A. M.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 11 a. m. Monday.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker—  
The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?  
Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In order to reserve the right to object, after the Chair states the request of the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to have the House stand in recess until 11 o'clock a. m. Monday.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from North Carolina whether taking a recess—that is, standing in recess instead of adjourning—will affect the legal situation that exists?

Mr. KITCHIN. No. One of the reasons for it is that the Senate stands in recess until Monday, and, of course, their legislative day will be one ahead of us, and although we may actually pass a bill or a conference report on Monday, it would appear in the RECORD that they were a day or two days before us. It is just a matter of keeping the RECORD straight. The gentleman will recall we had some difficulty with one of the revenue bills in regard to this matter two or three years ago.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object for a moment, it seems to me that we are confronted with a very embarrassing situation, and with a situation that is likely to prove very serious, indeed. I see no remedy for it by objecting to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KITCHIN. There is no remedy.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The legislative day, of course, in the House is one thing, but these appropriation bills that we passed for the present fiscal year all end on the 30th day of June; that is, to-morrow night at midnight.

Now, a very serious question presents itself to my mind. So far as I recall in my experience here, and so far as I know historically, we have never closed a fiscal year without having either passed the appropriation bills or passed joint resolutions to continue the appropriations, for a number of years.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, the gentleman is mistaken in fact in that regard. I desire to state to the House that in the event it becomes apparent upon Monday that the annual supply bills will not become a law, if necessary I shall offer such joint resolution as will not only take care of the situation but will cure any expenditure that may be necessary to be made by providing that such expenditure, if within the authorized purposes of supply bills, shall be ratified by the passage of such bills and be considered as having been so authorized.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Very well, Mr. Speaker. I may say that I had understood that that was the thought of the gentleman, but it seemed to me that it was not improper to have some discussion or statement with respect to that here this evening. The gentleman says I am mistaken in my recollection. I may be mistaken in my historical recollection, but in my personal experience during the time I have served in the House we have never adjourned without either passing the appropriation bills or a joint resolution. Now, there may be some cases, but, if so, I do not recall. But I think it important for something to be said about that before we take this course. Of course, we are about to take it. The Senate has recessed. But I think it right that something be said about it, and that it be said at this time, because if I were in a place of executive responsibility in one of the departments I should say very frankly that I would be at sea on Monday morning as to what to pay or authorize to be paid.

Mr. STAFFORD. Take, for instance, the Agricultural Department, and the Agricultural appropriation bill for the next fiscal year is held up. There is no authorization whatsoever on the part of any administrative officials connected with the Agricultural Department to authorize them to pay salaries that are based upon authorizations carried in the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will yield, I desire to say it is my understanding that the Senate will have a vote on the Agricultural bill, on that phase of it which is dividing the

Houses, on Monday. It is my belief it is possible to put through all the supply bills that are fiscal bills in the true sense of the term Monday.

Personally, I would have been glad if the Senate and the House had seen fit to sit to-morrow. While the memory of the gentleman from Tennessee as to his own experience may be entirely accurate, I am reliably informed there have been instances in the past in which the Government has run for several days, instead of simply for part of a day, without any such resolution as the gentleman refers to. And I repeat that if on Monday it becomes apparent that any of the supply bills will not be agreed to on that day I shall offer to the House, and I have no doubt it will be passed by it and the Senate, such joint resolution as necessary to absolutely safeguard the situation.

Mr. STAFFORD. A case was called to my attention last night by an employee of this Government of many years standing, that on one occasion, years back, when the sundry civil appropriation bill had not passed before the end of the fiscal year the Government Printer refused to go ahead with the operation of the Government Printing Plant because there was no authorization for him to do so. And that same condition confronts the Secretary of Agriculture at the present time.

Mr. SHERLEY. The answer to that is simply this, that if we had blocked all the activities of this Government since the war broke until there was legal authorization for the doing of a lot of things, half the activities would have been stopped. I have a proper appreciation, I believe, of what is necessary in this situation. I have labored day and night, and I am glad to say that, so far as the work of the Committee on Appropriations of the House is concerned, there is nothing that it has done or failed to do that is responsible for any supply bill that it has charge of not becoming a law before the end of the fiscal year. And I repeat that there is nothing that anyone needs to be alarmed about, but that the situation can be and, if necessary, will be taken care of on Monday.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky as to the activities of the Committee on Appropriations, and its zeal, is correct, and it is true as to all committees, and it is true as to the House. The fault does not rest with the House, if fault there be; but it did seem to me—and, of course, I am not going to object, as there is nothing to do but what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] proposes—that there ought to be some statement made here.

Gentlemen who are in executive positions, who are going to be charged with responsibility in connection with expenditures on Monday next or Tuesday next, ought to have some sort of assurance. For that reason I gave the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] the opportunity to make the statement that he has made.

Mr. SHERLEY. I assure the House that before Monday shall have passed the situation will be taken care of by the passage of these bills, and if not, it will be taken care of by resolution, offered and passed.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not think anything has been developed here that makes it necessary for us to discuss this matter further. If there are any departments that are in trouble on Monday morning, that trouble will not last long. We will cure it by appropriate resolution. The situation has been brought before us, and now I ask for the regular order.

Mr. GILLETT. Just a word, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. There is no necessity for discussing this any further.

Mr. GILLETT. I do not want to talk any longer than the gentleman from Virginia did.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I serve notice on the House that after the gentleman from Massachusetts gets through I will call for the regular order.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I hope the gentleman will permit me to remind him that the Senate has recessed until Monday.

Mr. GILLETT. If we were not at war and if this side of the House had not really adjourned politics, I should enjoy very much making some comments on the present awkward situation of the appropriation bills; but inasmuch as we on this side have adjourned politics I shall restrain myself and will, without criticism, assist in every way I can to extricate ourselves from our embarrassing situation, and as the Senate has recessed until Monday I do not see how we can do anything here until then.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. SHERLEY. I want to bear witness to this fact, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia demands the regular order.

Mr. SHERLEY. After all, the world was not made in a day. The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia demands the regular order. The regular order is, Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]?

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I will reserve that for a moment, to give the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] an opportunity to say a word.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, the situation is this about the railroad bill: If it is not signed by yourself or by the Vice President, the law that amends it or extends it expires by to-morrow. Now, by waiting for a reasonable time the enrolled bill can be gotten back here. But if the House recesses until Monday, all that I want to know is whether the bill can be signed then in time to become a law before it is too late.

Mr. GILLETT. How can the Vice President sign it before Monday when the Senate is not in session?

Mr. KITCHIN. They have adjourned over there until Monday.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina to the fact that the Senate recessed over to Monday, and it will not be in the same legislative situation as the House.

#### RECESS UNTIL MONDAY AT 11 A. M.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the House recess until 11 o'clock a. m. next Monday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 22 minutes) the House stood in recess until Monday, July 1, 1918, 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 Navy, transmitting a proposed draft of a bill for the relief of Pay Director Livingston Hunt, United States Navy (H. Doc. No. 1204); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Department of Commerce, inviting attention to certain items of public works relating to the Lighthouse Service, with a view to their inclusion in the next deficiency appropriation bill (H. Doc. 1205); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. McKENZIE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4814) for the relief of Jonathan Milburn, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 724), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HULL of Iowa, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12233) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint William H. Armstrong a captain in the Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry of the United States Army, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 726), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 12598) to recast the statue of Frederick the Great into a liberty bell; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 12599) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes; considered, passed, and ordered to be printed.

By Mr. LUNN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 310) providing a prize for the first aviator or aviatrix who makes a successful flight from the United States to England; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WALDOW: Resolution (H. Res. 408) authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to sit during the session of the House or during a recess, at Washington or elsewhere, in the consideration of the Niagara Falls water-power bill, H. R. 11871, and providing for the payment of necessary expenses of said committee; to the Committee on Accounts.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 12601) granting an increase of pension to Daniel C. Darlington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 12602) granting a pension to Seth Cornelius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 12603) granting an increase of pension to Maria J. Gorman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 12604) for the relief of William Rogers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 12605) granting a pension to Louisa C. Root; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT of Texas: A bill (H. R. 12606) for the relief of William J. Drucks; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12607) for the relief of Freddie Scofield; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12608) for the relief of Mrs. A. R. Carstens; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12609) for the relief of T. Binford; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12610) for the relief of W. H. Burkett; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12611), for the relief of Mrs. C. W. Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12612) for the relief of Mrs. E. J. Meineke; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12613) for the relief of Mrs. Ira D. Raney; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12614) for the relief of Mrs. E. A. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12615) for the relief of Miss Almer Reichart; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12616) for the relief of Charles T. Clayton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12617) for the relief of Mrs. E. M. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12618) for the relief of Mrs. F. H. Shertbert; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12619) for the relief of James Edward Lyon; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12620) for the relief of G. W. Butcher; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12621) for the relief of W. A. Wise; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12622) for the relief of Mary E. Winkler; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12623) for the relief of Mrs. D. R. Patton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12624) for the relief of Mrs. S. Satton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12625) for the relief of Mrs. Horace Moody; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 12626) granting a pension to Nancy A. Lawther; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 12627) granting a pension to Emil J. Olsen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 12628) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Houston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 12629) granting an increase of pension to Elihu Simpson; 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. CLARK of Pennsylvania: Petition of Thomas Swift, R. B. Swift, Dudley Yapple, A. T. Owens, Anna Yapple, T. L. Henry, and Pearl Henry, all of Waterford, Pa., for a war prohibition measure; also resolutions of the Woman's Club of Erie, Pa., by Mrs. J. V. Yelgerhouse, secretary, favoring prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of sundry citizens of South Dakota, urging the enactment of prohibition legislation as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLING: Resolutions adopted by the Rotary Club of New York, asking for an adequate Federal program of road building and maintenance; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of citizens of Wisconsin, favoring war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Homer Simpkins, secretary of Federal Labor Union No. 15034, of Streator, Ill., for postponement of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of R. H. Herring, of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Henry Hoag and other residents of Fayetteville Depot, N. Y., favoring war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Belus F. North and other residents of Marcellus, N. Y., favoring war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Maynard H. Gates and other residents of Homer, N. Y., favoring war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of D. B. Woodford and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Susie M. Aeyer and other residents of Warner, N. Y., favoring war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mr. E. H. Wheaton and other residents of Camillus, N. Y., favoring war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Fayetteville, N. Y., favoring war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of labor organizations of Boston, Mass., against prohibition as applied to light wines and beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Resolutions adopted by the fifth annual meeting of the Minnesota Red River Valley Development Association, pledging unswerving loyalty to every act and purpose of those clothed with the proper constitutional authority in their endeavors to successfully meet the problems confronting our Nation in its present crisis, signed by C. H. Zealand, secretary, Crookston, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, remonstrance of Mrs. M. Wahlgren, of Fergus Falls, Minn., against the second-class postage provisions of the revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILLMAN: Petition of citizens of Siloam Springs, Ark., asking for prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ASHURST. I withdraw the demand.  
Mr. PENROSE. 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	Guion	McNary	Simmons
Beckham	Hale	Martin	Smith, Ariz.
Borah	Hardwick	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Calder	Henderson	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	New	Smith, S. C.
Colt	Hollis	Norris	Smoot
Culberson	Johnson, Cal.	Nugent	Sterling
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Penrose	Thomas
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Thompson
Fall	Kellogg	Pittman	Trammell
Fernald	Kendrick	Polndexter	Underwood
Fletcher	Kenyon	Pomerene	Vardaman
France	King	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	Knox	Robinson	Walsh
Gallinger	Lenroot	Shafroth	Watson
Gore	McCumber	Sheppard	
Gronna	McKellar	Sherman	

Mr. KING. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] is detained by illness and that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] is detained on official business.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to state that my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], is absent on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

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

LIST OF JUDGMENTS (S. DOC. NO. 250).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims amounting to \$64,573.01, which have been presented to the Treasury Department and require an appropriation for their payment, which, with the accompanying paper, will be printed in the RECORD, printed, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The communication is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, July 1, 1918.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: In accordance with the provisions contained in the act of September 30, 1890 (26 Stat., 537), and the deficiency act of April 27, 1904 (33 Stat., 422), I have the honor to transmit herewith, for the consideration of Congress, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims amounting to \$64,573.01, which have been presented to this department and require an appropriation for their payment, as follows:

Under the War Department.....	\$11,168.18
Under the Navy Department.....	37,122.62
Under the Post Office Department.....	731.31
Under the Interior Department.....	15,550.90

Total..... 64,573.01

Respectfully,

L. S. ROWE.

SENATE.

MONDAY, July 1, 1918.

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 27, 1918.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, out of order I ask leave to introduce several bills and a joint resolution.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will not the Senator yield that I may introduce the bills?

Judgments rendered by the Court of Claims.

No.	Claimant.	Date of judgment.	Amount.	When presented for payment.	When payable, if not appealed.	Nature of claim.
WAR DEPARTMENT.						
33750	Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co.....	June 3, 1918	\$2,924.74	June 20, 1918	Sept. 1, 1918	Land-grant deductions from transportation of Army officers' effects.
33658	Central of Georgia Ry. Co.....	June 24, 1918	214.82	June 24, 1918	Sept. 22, 1918	Do.
33669	Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co.....	do	1,702.06	do	do	Do.
22436	William L. Killebrew, surviving partner of J. B. & W. L. Killebrew.....	June 4, 1917	6,076.56	June 8, 1917	Sept. 2, 1917	Under contract for furnishing stone for improvement of Mississippi River.
32682	Jay H. Northrup.....	June 19, 1918	250.00	June 28, 1918	Sept. 8, 1918	Under contract for construction of Lock and Dam No. 1, Big Sandy River, Ky.
	Total.....		11,168.18			
NAVY DEPARTMENT.						
24757	P. J. Carlin & Co.....	Apr. 22, 1918	36,877.10	May 21, 1918	July 21, 1918	Under contract for construction of sea wall Naval Academy, Annapolis.
33949	Mason E. Mitchell.....	June 24, 1918	245.52	June 28, 1918	Sept. 22, 1918	Mileage.
	Total.....		37,122.62			
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.						
31550	Texas & Pacific Ry. Co.....	Mar. 25, 1918	731.31	June 18, 1918	June 23, 1918	Mail transportation.
INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.						
31954	Dana E. Brinck, receiver.....	Feb. 25, 1918	15,550.90	July 1, 1918	May 26, 1918	Under reclamation contract for Minidoka project, Idaho.
	Grand total.....		64,573.01			