

Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. J. B. Kent, Mr. and Mrs. O. T. Hardy, Mrs. Gayle M. Kenn, and J. Raymond Seaver, all of Stockholm, N. Y., favoring war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rev. F. E. Loan, D. C. Palmer, Myrtle Walker, Earl Walker, Mr. and Mrs. C. G. Leonard, Mrs. Palmer, Mrs. Earl Bush, Adelina Smith, Edna G. Gardner, Edna Overacker, Annie Reynolds, Elizabeth Reynolds, Edith Loan, Eliza Kennedy, and C. M. Jones, all of Richville, N. Y., favoring war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of A. M. Moore, Bombay, N. Y., favoring war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mabel L. Miller, Ceeste A. Bidgood, Hannan L. Peck, Mr. and Mrs. Orlin Russell, Mr. and Mrs. Julius Gale, and Mrs. E. H. Sturgess, all of Moira, N. Y., favoring war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Neal D. Harrison, John F. White, Francis Smith, Frank Hughes, William Boyce, Willis Wells, Ed Marshall, George Ware, Frank F. Alford, and Wilbur Hurlburt, all of North Elba, N. Y., favoring war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of R. C. Landon, Ella A. Landon, I. E. Bartholomew, George W. Carvill, A. L. Spring, and R. J. Scott, all of Ticonderoga, N. Y., favoring prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of W. P. Morrison, Port Henry, N. Y., favoring war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Presbyterian Church of Brasher Falls, N. Y., favoring war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, July 9, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pray for such measure of Thy grace and truth as that every action taken by this Senate may be justified by the test of time, that we may feel that we are working together with God, that we are building not only a great empire in this West but an eternal habitation wherein dwelleth righteousness and peace and truth. We pray Thee to fit us for the high and holy obligations of this office and of this Senate. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### LIST OF CASES (S. DOC. NO. 263).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a list of cases dismissed by the court on May 7, 1918, on motion of the defendants, for want of prosecution, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by G. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12099) to confer on the President power to prescribe charter rates and freight rates and to requisition vessels, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HARDY, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Mr. EDMONDS, and Mr. HADLEY managers at the conference on the part of the House.

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 3009) granting the consent of Congress to the P. M. C. Coal Co. to construct and maintain a bridge across Tug River, connecting Pike County, Ky., and Mingo County, W. Va., and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

### CONTROL OF TELEGRAPH LINES.

Mr. MYERS presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from sundry employees of the Western Union Telegraph Co., of Helena, Mont., and a telegram in the nature of a memorial from sundry employees of the Western Union Telegraph Co., of Billings, Mont., remonstrating against Government control of telegraph lines, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. CURTIS (for Mr. GOFF):

A bill (S. 4812) granting an increase of pension to Amos C. Scott; and

A bill (S. 4813) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Dovener (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BECKHAM:

A bill (S. 4814) granting a pension to Charles W. Vogler;

A bill (S. 4815) granting an increase of pension to William W. Ferguson; and

A bill (S. 4816) granting a pension to John C. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 4817) granting a pension to David W. Beaver; to the Committee on Pensions.

### DATA RELATIVE TO MILK PRODUCTS.

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 282), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved*, That the United States Food Administration be directed to furnish to the Senate the following information:

1. What steps it has taken to fix or regulate the prices for the products of the milk condensaries of the United States.

2. What steps it has taken to fix or regulate the prices to be paid by the condensaries to the milk producers for their milk.

3. What action has been taken by the condensaries with the knowledge or approval of the United States Food Administration, to fix or control the prices of their products or the profits they shall make during the war.

4. If no steps have been taken by the United States Food Administration to regulate or control the prices charged or the profits made by the condensaries, why such action has not been taken.

5. What steps have been taken to ascertain whether the prices paid the milk producers is ample to pay the cost of production; and if no such steps have been taken, why it has not been done.

### CHARTER RATES AND FREIGHT RATES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12099) to confer on the President power to prescribe charter rates and freight rates and to requisition vessels, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. RANDELL, and Mr. NELSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

### CALLING OF THE ROLL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no further morning business, the morning business is closed.

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

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

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

Baird	Henderson	Nelson	Sherman
Bankhead	Hitchcock	New	Shields
Beckham	Johnson, Cal.	Norris	Smith, Ariz.
Benet	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Smith, Md.
Colt	Kendrick	Penrose	Smoot
Culberson	Kenyon	Phelan	Sterling
Curtis	King	Pittman	Sutherland
Fernald	Knox	Poindexter	Swanson
Fletcher	Lewis	Reed	Thomas
France	McCumber	Saunders	Trammell
Gerry	McKellar	Shafroth	Vardaman
Harding	Martin	Sheppard	Walsh

Mr. BECKHAM. My colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], is detained by illness.

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] are detained on official business.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I desire to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], is detained by illness in his family.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I wish to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] is detained on official business. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is necessarily absent on account of illness in his family. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I desire to state that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], the Senator

from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] are engaged in a meeting of the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, may I be permitted to supplement the announcement of the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] to say that the committee desire also not to be sent for unless there be some urgency, and that they prefer to sit until the present matter which they have before them is concluded, which may be in a couple of hours? I desire to have the President of the Senate send any message to them should anything arise in the Senate of sufficient importance to bring them here.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator asks that the committee be authorized to sit during the session of the Senate? Mr. LEWIS. To-day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed by the Secretary that they have been given that authority.

Mr. LEWIS. I did not know that, Mr. President. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

#### MILITARY SERVICE OF BRITISH AND CANADIAN SUBJECTS.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to a circumstance that came under my observation.

A British subject in my own employ received a notice within the last few days to appear before the British recruiting office, giving him the opportunity to enlist, according to the notice, in either the British or the Canadian Army. The matter was by him referred to me. I inquired and ascertained, so far as I was able, that there has been no ratification of the treaty recently entered into between the United States and the Government of Great Britain, and that even after ratification there are allowed 60 days, if I am correctly informed, within which it is possible for a British subject to avoid enlistment in either the British or the Canadian Army and to enlist in the Army of the United States.

This particular person expressed a preference for service in the Army of the United States, in which I encouraged him, because, as he stated, his object after service is to return to the United States and to enjoy the benefit of our Army act. Furthermore, it means a replenishment of our man power after the war.

The purpose of my rising now is to ascertain whether I am correctly informed, so far as the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations can advise me.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I think the Senator from California is substantially correct. Until the exchange of ratifications occurs between the United States and Great Britain the matter is as it has been heretofore. After that exchange of ratifications any British subject in the United States between the ages of 20 and 44 years, both inclusive, has 60 days within which to decide whether he will proceed to Great Britain or to Canada and enlist voluntarily in the Canadian or British Army, and if he fails during that 60 days to exercise his privilege, he then becomes subject to be drafted into the Army of the United States.

At the present time he is subject neither to draft in the American Army nor is he forced to decide the question at all. A man less than 20 years of age has 30 days to decide after becoming 20 years of age.

Mr. PHELAN. I understand, then, that if he does not decide within the 60 days after an exchange of ratifications he is subject to draft in the country of his present residence; that is, the United States.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is correct.

Mr. PHELAN. I am very glad that this matter has been elucidated, because I think it is valuable public information. Doubtless there are many others besides the particular person to whom I refer who are in doubt as to the effect of the treaty recently entered into between the two high contracting parties, and by the dissemination of this information such a person may be able to exercise—which would be perfectly, I am sure, in harmony with the great purposes of the war—his right to enlist in the American Army, and thus after the war be in a position to return to this country with the American Army and possibly take up the duties of American citizenship and be an accession of man power to the United States.

#### STIMULATION OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 11945.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11945)

to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 5, after the word "stock," to strike out "\$30,000" and insert "\$7,500"; in line 8, after "\$10,000," to strike out "field supervision of war-garden work, \$7,500"; and in line 22, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$811,300" and insert "\$721,300," so as to make the clause read:

Third. For the prevention, control, and eradication of insects and plant diseases injurious to agriculture, and the conservation and utilization of plant products; for the following stated purposes and in amounts as follows: Cereal-smut eradication, \$50,000; peanut conservation and utilization, \$15,000; control of cotton, truck, and forage-crop diseases, \$117,550; farm storage of sweet potatoes, \$30,000; location of Irish-potato seed stock, \$7,500; plant-disease survey, \$23,000; castor-bean production and utilization, \$20,000; maintenance of field-bean seed supply, \$10,000; production of cereals and grain sorghums, \$53,250; sugar-beet nematode work, \$10,000; pathological inspection of fruits during processes of marketing, \$18,000; control of a new sugar-cane disease, \$20,000; production of rice, \$5,000; control of cereal and forage insects, \$55,000; control of stored-product insects, \$22,000; control of vegetable and truck-crop insects, \$35,000; control of sweet-potato weevil, \$30,000; control of deciduous-fruit insects, \$45,000; control of citrus-fruit insects, \$10,000; control of insects injurious to live stock, \$20,000; control of rice insects, \$3,000; control of sugar-cane insects, \$9,000; general supervision of emergency insect-control work, \$3,000; prevention of plant-dust explosions and fires, \$75,000; fruit and vegetable utilization, \$35,000; in all, \$721,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 25, after the word "food," to insert "including eatable nuts," so as to read:

Fourth. For increasing food production and eliminating waste and promoting conservation of food, including eatable nuts, by educational and demonstrational methods through county, district, and urban agents and others; for the following stated purposes and in amounts as follows: General administration of extension work, \$35,000; home-economics work, \$25,000; extension work in the Northern and Western States, \$134,200; county-agent work, \$1,893,000; boys' and girls' club work, \$382,900; home-demonstration work, \$1,327,400; extension work in the Southern States, \$90,000; county-agent work, \$1,333,815; boys' club work, \$75,300; home-demonstration work, \$803,385; in all, \$6,100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 11, after "\$6,100,000," to strike out:

No part of this appropriation shall be available for any purpose unless there shall have been previously issued the proclamation authorized by section 15 of the act of August 10, 1917, entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products," such proclamation being the prohibition of the use of foods, fruits, food materials, or feeds in the production of malt or vinous liquors for beverage purposes.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

That after December 31, 1918, until the conclusion of the present war, for the purpose of conserving the man power of the Nation and to increase efficiency in the production of arms, war munitions, ships, food, and clothing for the Army and Navy, it shall be unlawful to sell for beverage purposes any distilled spirits, and during said time no distilled spirits held in bond shall be removed therefrom for beverage purposes except for export. After November 1, 1918, until the conclusion of the present war, no grain, cereal, fruit, or other food product shall be used in the manufacture or production of beer, wine, or other intoxicating malt or vinous liquor for beverage purposes. After December 31, 1918, until the conclusion of the present war, no beer, wine, or other intoxicating malt or vinous liquor shall be sold for beverage purposes except for export. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue is hereby authorized and directed to prescribe rules and regulations, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, in regard to the removal of distilled spirits held in bond after December 31, 1918, for other than beverage purposes, also in regard to the sale and distribution of wine for sacramental, medicinal, or other nonbeverage uses. After the approval of this act no distilled, malt, vinous, or other intoxicating liquors shall be imported into the United States.

Any person who violates any of the foregoing provisions shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$1,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, as I understand, the Secretary has completed the reading of an amendment reported by the committee on yesterday to the amendment contained in the bill as reported from the committee. I suggest it would be well for the Secretary to read the committee amendment in the bill. Has that yet been read?

The SECRETARY. It is in the bill now, and it was put in on yesterday.

Mr. PENROSE. I understand, but it has not been read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will inform the Senator that by unanimous consent, the Chair thinks, on yesterday, certainly under the ruling of the Chair, the present occupant being then in the chair, this amendment was substituted

by the committee for the amendment which had been theretofore proposed by the committee.

Mr. PENROSE. Well, Mr. President, I should like to have in the Record the original amendment proposed by the committee, and I will ask that the Secretary read the amendment for which this is a substitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I inquire whether the substitute offered by the committee has ever been printed? I do not see a copy of it on my desk.

Mr. PENROSE. The printed copies of the amendment are available.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the original amendment reported by the committee.

The SECRETARY. The part proposed to be inserted originally by the committee reads as follows:

That after June 30, 1919, until the conclusion of the present war, for the purpose of conserving the man power of the Nation and to increase the efficiency in the production of arms, war munitions, food, and clothing for the Army and Navy, it shall be unlawful to sell for beverage purposes, except for export, any distilled spirits, and no distilled spirits held in bond after June 30, 1919, shall be removed therefrom for beverage purposes except for export. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue is hereby authorized and directed to prescribe rules and regulations, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, in regard to the removal of distilled spirits held in bond after June 30, 1919, for other than beverage purposes or for export. After three months from the approval of this act until the conclusion of the present war, no grain, cereal, or other food product shall be used in the manufacture or production of beer or other intoxicating malt liquors, and after the approval of this act no beer or other intoxicating malt liquors shall be imported into the United States for beverage purposes. After June 30, 1919, until the conclusion of the present war, no foods or fruits shall be used in the manufacture or production of vinous intoxicating liquors except for export. Any person who violates any of the foregoing provisions or any of said rules and regulations made to carry the same into effect shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding two years, or both.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I desire to enter a point of order on the amendment as reported in the bill from the committee and on the amendment reported on yesterday as a substitute therefor, that both amendments, and more particularly the recent one, are general legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rule of the Senate. I shall not ask the Chair to rule immediately on the point, because I think a fuller attendance of the Senate is desirable, and I am informed that several Senators desire to speak on the general phases of the bill. I desire, however, to enter the point of order now and will ask the Chair to make the ruling at the proper time.

Mr. NORRIS. May I interrupt the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Under the unanimous-consent agreement under which we are proceeding, as I understand, all the amendments which are objected to will go over. Personally I have no objection to the point of order on the amendment being entered now, but I would suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania that if under the unanimous-consent agreement he objects to the amendment, it would automatically go over until the unobjected amendments should be disposed of. The only point I want to make is that if we are going to take up this amendment now—personally, I do not care which course is pursued—then we ought to finish it finally, and not have some Senator object after we have considered it for two or three hours.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order, if made, the Chair will treat as an objection under the unanimous-consent agreement, and therefore the amendment will go over until the unobjected amendments shall have been disposed of.

Mr. PENROSE. I want to say to the Senator from Nebraska that that was the idea I meant to convey.

Mr. NORRIS. That suits me. Now, I should like to clear the matter up a little, Mr. President. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania will agree with me that if he makes the point of order against the amendment as printed in the bill—of course that in reality is not in the bill—

Mr. PENROSE. And also against the substitute.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; it is the substitute, if you call it a substitute, though it is not a substitute, as I understand the ruling of the Chair under what took place yesterday; it is a committee amendment, and the point of order against that is properly made, of course; but there is not any such thing as making the point of order against the other amendment that has gone out.

Mr. PENROSE. Well, Mr. President, I was not looking at the parliamentary status of the matter with a microscope. I did not know but that, if this amendment should be defeated, perchance then there would be before the Senate the original amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. PENROSE. But I do not care anything about that detail; that is immaterial.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not either. The committee has offered another amendment, and this is the committee amendment.

Mr. PENROSE. I enter the point of order against the last amendment of the committee, which I now understand is contained in the bill as the report of the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. PENROSE. And I will let the matter go over, if it is objected to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the next committee amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, with the understanding that the point of order is reserved—a question about which I desire to make no comment at this time—I wish to address myself to the general features of the bill.

The bill that is immediately pending before the Senate, being House bill 11945, has a multitude of supplemental items running up into a considerable sum of money. These are additional items to those contained in House bill 9054, which itself carries a total of \$28,491,253. I presume it is almost regarded as sacrilegious to lay profane hands upon a bill referring to agriculture. For some 12 or 15 years this character of bill has been immune from criticism, and under the cover of that immunity items have crept in from year to year and from session to session until, like the proverbial mantle of charity, an Agricultural appropriation bill covers a multitude of sins. It is about time that a proper rebuke to some of those items should be administered. I know that many of us have sat in our seats here without evidencing any protest against a multitude of such expenditures. Possibly we have been derelict in our duty; we may be sharing in the moral responsibility of permitting those appropriations that have been made from the Treasury in the sessions or the years past, because we have voiced no audible protest against them. However, even if we may by our critics be put in the attitude of Satan rebuking sin, nevertheless it is better late than never.

I understand that years ago when heretics used to be tried—and the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] referred to this several days ago—or when an evil cause was pending before Papal authority, even the devil had an advocate to present, as best he could, the cause of that evil influence in the world. So even in the case of this Agricultural bill, I presume, items of an apparently indefensible character will have their advocates here on the floor, as they ought to have, for, if there is any good in them, let it be brought out. These items, however, have risen to that number so that in the aggregate they involve such a sum of money that it is about time that we called a halt.

I know that everything that is intended to be for the benefit of the farmer is supposed to be thereby sanctified, without any regard to what the nature of the item may be. I will refer, therefore, to these items in turn in order that a distinction may be sharply drawn between those items which are actually beneficial to agriculture, horticulture, live stock, and other branches of the agricultural industry, and those that are merely of a speculative character, designed more to pad pay rolls, in my judgment, than anything else.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a suggestion?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that in its title this bill is described as a bill to stimulate agriculture for war purposes, and it is important to bear in mind in analyzing the bill whether the items are of a character pertaining to this war crisis.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; that only makes—

Mr. PENROSE. It makes stronger the statement made by the Senator.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; it only gives it a more limited scope than it ordinarily would have, for unless these items can fairly be connected with something that will strengthen us for the war, then there can be no excuse for many of the items in the supplemental bill or in the regular bill heretofore referred to.

The title of the bill declares that it is "to carry out \* \* \* the purposes of the act entitled 'An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products.'" The first purpose is the stimulation of agriculture to strengthen us for war. There is no use to talk about the distribution of something we have not. So the more limited scope of this bill would confine it to the stimulation which is justifiable by the declared purpose of the measure. This would limit it to a much narrower scope than the ordinary bill which is omnibus

in character and designed to apply in that undefined territory known as agriculture and the production of food products of all kinds.

There are lurking in all these bills, as there have been for some four or five years, a great variety of items providing for the eradication of all kinds of pests—coyotes, wolves, foxes, badgers, prairie dogs, and noxious insects of all kinds, those that prey both upon the animal and the vegetable world—a variety of items that have aggregated vast sums of money.

The prairie dogs in the West are sometimes quite offensive; they burrow holes in the plains and render it unsafe for those who would ride beyond a mild trot. I have seen suggestions in various documents sent out by the Agricultural Department and by gentlemen who have taken counsel with wise chemists on how to destroy prairie dogs by the use of various kinds of poisonous gases. Nitrous oxide, or laughing gas, I once saw specified in a prescription for their extermination. It was mistaken for poisonous gas which would have exterminated the pest; but, at any rate, it was no worse than what I saw in a printed report from the Committee on Agriculture, in which one of the live-stock experts testified about Polled Angus cattle being the best dairy cattle in the world. If he had been asked the question what Holsteins and Jerseys were good for, I suppose he would have put them down as beef cattle. It is on a par with some of the proposed benefits to be derived from the extermination of various kind of disturbing vermin, both for man and domestic animals, and for the plant and vegetable kingdom.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. REED. I think the remarks of the Senator upon prairie dogs and laughing gas are of such interest that we ought to have a fuller attendance; and if it is not disagreeable to the Senator, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection, Mr. President, to the Senator suggesting the absence of a quorum, but it is immaterial to me whether they come or not. I shall talk to the galleries or to the seats. I do not expect to convert many Senators; I will admit that; but I think, in common with the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Pennsylvania, it is high time that these items in the Agricultural appropriation bills were considered.

Mr. REED. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

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

Ashurst	Gore	McKellar	Sheppard
Baird	Harding	Martin	Sherman
Bankhead	Henderson	Nelson	Shields
Beckham	Hitchcock	New	Smith, Ariz.
Benet	Johnson, Cal.	Norris	Smith, Md.
Brandege	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Smoot
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Penrose	Swanson
Colt	Kenyon	Phelan	Thomas
Culberson	King	Pittman	Trammell
Curtis	Knox	Ransdell	Vardaman
Fletcher	Lenroot	Reed	Walsh
France	Lewis	Saulsbury	Warren
Gerry	McCumber	Shafroth	

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, at this moment indulge me to say that the Senators whose names were given by the Senator from Washington [Mr. PENROSE] upon the previous roll call are still detained at the hearing of the Interstate Commerce Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, in the bill now pending before the Senate I find, on pages 2 and 3, what is a duplication—the eradication of cattle ticks, the eradication of influenza and strangle, and so forth. When these are taken with other general items in the regular appropriation bill, I believe it amounts to an extravagance and a useless expenditure of public money.

The production of sheep is provided for in an item of \$60,000, on page 3. I wish to consider this in connection with an item in the regular appropriation bill on page 62. The production of sheep is not a question merely of time and range, or of the natural increase of the animal. It is a question of the preservation of the animal life after it shall have been made into potential additions to the wealth of the country. On page 62 it is provided in the House bill that \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used for investigating the extent and effect of the killing and harassing by dogs of sheep and other meat-producing animals, and of the best methods for reducing and preventing the same. That was in the House bill, and has

been stricken out by the Senate, and no substitute has been provided in any other amendment, unless it should be an amendment of a general character which is merely discretionary with the power expending the money.

This House provision ought to stay in if any of them stay in. I regard it as much more important to check the inroads of useless dogs on the sheep supply of the country than to investigate the best way of exterminating coyotes. They are both in the same class. One is not more destructive than another. A sheep-killing dog can do more damage in the sheep belt than any other known animal. When that is taken in connection with the item of \$60,000 for the production of sheep, on page 3 of the supplemental bill, it would work out an actual benefit; but the sheep production does not include the sheep preservation, so the \$60,000 item, under the rule of strict construction ordinarily adopted by the department, would preclude the method of diminishing the available supply of useless dogs in the country. I think there is more necessity for that than there is for attempting to exterminate many of the noxious insects and animals that are provided for specifically in many of the items.

I believe a good dog license would do something toward that end. I think there ought to be a capitation or excise tax placed upon all the dogs of the country. It is a source of revenue and it is a means of regulation. This remedy probably never will be carried out until the useless curs of the country are subjected to some financial burden, to be paid by the owner.

If the \$10,000 item should be restored the methods to be used are very simple. It does not require an expert from the live-stock department to ascertain the best method of stopping the destruction of the sheep supply through dogs. All you have to do is to locate the dog and kill him. A clothesline is available for that purpose. You need not waste explosives on him in war times. Just take a clothesline and hang him. That is the easiest way; but nobody seems to have thought of it in the Department of Agriculture. There are all kinds of high-priced methods of exterminating the animal, such as chloroform and expensive poisons. The chloroform does no good unless you catch the dog, so that ordinarily it is a question of the activity of the investigator; but the \$10,000 item, if it should be restored, ought to be devoted to taking a census of the dog population of the 48 States first, and especially in the sheep belt the character of the dog ought to be investigated. That can be helped along, probably, for the \$10,000. Whenever the dog is under suspicion no chances ought to be taken in the sheep belt. Dogs are very prolific—much more so than sheep, in proportion. While they have been objects of invidious legislation for many centuries, the dog has survived from primeval times. It is easy enough to get a supply of dogs. The only question is about preserving the sheep supply for wool and mutton. Instead of taking that sensible way of diminishing the risk to the sheep production, it seems that they are taking the roundabout bypath of some scientific method. I suppose they will need a psychologist on the dog before it is done, in order to enable them to investigate the mentality of the dog and discover why it is that a dog has an appetite for mutton, and thereby, if you would destroy the appetite, you would remove the evil, instead of removing the dog. If you would revive what was referred to in the esteemed Speaker's lyric in 1912, when he was a candidate in the national Democratic convention, "Quit kicking my hound dog around," and develop a good crop of hounds of the Missouri breed, it would do more to preserve and multiply the sheep supply than all the appropriations, including Mr. Houston as the head of the Department of Agriculture, that have been known since this administration began.

The trouble is the dog has disappeared as a useful animal. He has become an ornamental beast.

I would rather have one good hound dog, with a tan border and an ear like a Persian rug, turned loose to preserve the food supply and to preserve the balance of food products than all of the pampered white pests that are going around town led by a darkey maid, with a cable attached to a collar around his neck, taking the air every morning. There is more time spent with those degenerate, sore-eyed brutes than there is on all the babies in Washington. I would discriminate in the taxation. One that is kept for ornamental purposes as a canine luxury ought to be taxed, in a childless household, \$50 as a minimum. That would produce revenue; with that and with the \$10,000 provided on page 62 of the Agricultural appropriation bill it will enable us to kill off all of the useless ones and start on the coyotes to preserve the supply of sheep.

I think this amendment, Mr. President, ought to be restored in lieu of the one on page 3, to which I made allusion the other evening in an inquiry when the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] had the floor, an item of \$52,950 for making cottage cheese on the farm.

I do not know whether some of the earlier tribe to which I belong have too little respect for the modern way to make these old-time food products or not, but to me this item is ridiculous, supremely so. What is cottage cheese? If you are lucky enough to have milk in the crock during a thunderstorm, it will cottage cheese itself without an appropriation. All you need is to sour the milk, and either hot weather or patience will do it—either one. Just let it alone for a while, and after it is soured all you have to do, when it is reduced to a curd, is to beat it up a little; and if you like any kind of seasoning in it put it in; if not, eat it in a natural state. It is nutritious. It is a good thing to eat. It is said to be an antidote for old age, and it ought to be extremely popular in the Senate. The chemists some years ago in the valleys of the Ural investigated the great longevity of the people residing in that country. It led up to the fact that they were habitual consumers of curds, sour milk. Then they went to analyzing, and they found that it had in it what the chemists call a beneficial microbe; it made war on the microbe of old age. It purified the blood, made it active, fortified one against hardening of the arteries and softening of the brain and an indisposition to exercise and the tendency to enlarge the waist band of the trousers and keep you down to your normal size. I read a report on that from a very learned chemist at one time that occupied me nearly a half day. It was full of information, but the result of it was eat cottage cheese or drink sour milk or eat curds.

When using the scientific name, I notice they do not call it cottage cheese. They call it by a dignified name. I remember when the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] once spoke of oleomargarine, he wanted to leave the "oleo" off. That means oil, and it seemed to be a little bit too thick. He wanted to leave it off and just call it "margarine"; it was more euphonious. So, in referring to cottage cheese, I shall refer to it hereafter as curds. That is the chemical name.

Mr. PENROSE. Perhaps some member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may enlighten us as to what is the objective in the investigation of cottage cheese. It might be interesting to ascertain whether there is any member of the committee who knows what it is.

Mr. SHERMAN. I would be very glad if any member of the committee has original information on the subject.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] is here.

Mr. SHERMAN. Or any Member of the Senate outside of the committee, so that we may learn what it is.

Mr. NELSON. May I ask the Senator from Illinois a question?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. NELSON. Will he please inform the Senate the distinction between cottage cheese and Limburger cheese?

Mr. SHERMAN. There are two vital points, Mr. President, in which they differ and by which a novice would not make a mistake. It is the age and the odor. You might mistake one, but you never can mistake the other.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator from Wyoming, if the Senator will permit an interruption, is a member of the committee, and I should like to ask him if he has any information as to the purpose of the department in this cottage-cheese investigation as a war measure?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I must confess that when this bill was under consideration I did not spend an hour or a moment in the Committee on Agriculture. Every day that that committee was in session I was in attendance upon the Committee on Military Affairs as a member of a subcommittee or as a member of a conference committee.

I may say, while I am on my feet, that I do not approve of this bill as a whole, nor in many of the particulars.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. NELSON. I had a letter some time ago from a lady in Iowa referring to this cottage-cheese matter. She said there were women traveling around the State giving instructions to the farmers' wives how to make cottage cheese. They claimed to be employees of the Government and were getting \$8 a day and their expenses. She wrote to me a very inquiring letter and wanted to know if these things were so. She felt that, if true, it was a great piece of extravagance. I referred her letter to one of the executive departments and never heard any more from it. Can the Senator give us any information on that point? Has the Government men and women out instructing farmers' wives in the West and Northwest how to make cottage cheese?

Mr. PENROSE. At \$8 a day.

Mr. NELSON. At \$8 a day, or \$6, or any other per diem? I am curious to know, because I am very sorry I did not keep a

copy of the letter. I sent it to a department for investigation, but I have had no return. However, I have given the Senator the substance of it.

Mr. SHERMAN. I would have been glad if the Senator had preserved a copy of the letter. It is apparently a small matter, that one item of \$52,950 proposed in the bill for a purpose of this kind, but it is well enough to take some time over it. That \$52,950 may look larger to me than to the average Senator, but I suppose most of us are not worth that much, if we had our debts paid and our rent bills in the District here settled.

I have had both oral communications and, I think, a few letters, if I had time to search my files, of the same kind the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has mentioned, to the effect that experts have been going among the women on the farms and giving them information on how to take care of dairy products, including curds. It had not reached that great elaboration and detail that it has now; but upon two occasions, in oral conversations with ladies and their husbands from agricultural districts in the West or Northwest, they have spoken of this great desire to illuminate the farm kitchens of the country. I refer to the women who come here, the farmers' wives, the ones who do not keep house by proxy, by servants. With them it is a matter of supreme concern. One old lady who was here said they came out into her kitchen and began to tell her about things which she knew were not so, for she tried it for 40 years in her kitchen, and it would not work.

Here is something that is of very great advantage on the cottage-cheese end of it, while I am talking about this item. If we are going to have any genuine conservation of food products so as to utilize the sour milk, Mr. President, the first thing we have got to do is to take dilettante of this country in tow and cultivate their appetites. There will be no consumption of cottage cheese unless there is an appetite for that brand of edible. To the average man looking over a bill of fare in the city whose appetite has become debased or degenerated by a long course of survival on such a menu as ordinarily is put forth at a hotel or a public eating place, he has lived on caviar, preserved animal products of uncertain age, or canned goods, or bread made from patent flour, or things that have a little nutriment in them as an Egyptian mummy. I would just as lief go down to the Smithsonian Institution and eat a mummy that was wrapped 4,600 years ago during one of the reigns of the forgotten Rameses. We have eaten such stuff until we have had our appetite somewhat perverted.

Men complain to me about eating war bread. A Senator told me not long ago that even the coal miners in his State when they went to buy 25 pounds of wheat flour and had to buy 25 pounds of the substitute at the enhanced price to which the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] referred yesterday, in going home threw the substitute in the gutter and took the 25 pounds of flour home. They would not eat corn meal; they would not eat barley flour or rye; they had been accustomed to eating wheat-flour bread; and they would not eat a mixture. They will not eat war bread. They would be healthier if they did.

So it is the people's appetite. The healthiest bread there is in the world is the bread made from the whole wheat berry without taking a thing out of it. The man who invented patent flour or the bolting process by which all the coarser portions of the grain were taken out and nothing but the purified flour left did not add anything to the happiness or health of the human race. Patent flour has not in it much more nutriment than that much putty. There is nothing in it but gluten. I looked over an analysis of whole-wheat flour, made out of the entire berry, without a thing taken out, and an analysis of a sample of patent flour. You could not feed dumb brutes with the cereal product that a human being is eating, and keep them alive for 12 months. The greatest tribute to the toughness of the human race physically is the fact that it can live on what it eats and keep a reasonable degree of health.

If we are to come to a cottage-cheese basis, the first thing we must do is to cultivate the appetite of the consumer. You will have to have lectures dilating on the value of cottage cheese as a food product. I can imagine having gentlemen of the kind that need these lectures in a hall, a thousand of them.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. NELSON. Speaking about the cultivation of the appetite, there is a kind of a cheese they call Brick cheese. The Senator has probably heard about it. That was introduced and the taste for it was cultivated over the lager-beer counter. Could not something of the kind be done with cottage cheese?

Mr. SHERMAN. If we had something to act as a stimulus it is possible.

Mr. PENROSE. How can that happen if we get national prohibition?

Mr. SHERMAN. Of course, that presents an appalling possibility.

Mr. PENROSE. It shows that prohibition is a menace to cottage cheese. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHERMAN. It is also a menace to the pretzel, but really the only thing offensive in the pretzel is its shape, like some human beings. It is really a nourishing product. People could very well exchange their cereal food and put pretzels on the table if you would only change the form. They are unpopular now because of the nature of our public enemy. Along with sauerkraut it has become almost a prohibitive article. Anybody who would say a good word for either might possibly be given a trip on a rail.

Mr. PENROSE. Twenty years.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to ask the Senator whether he has noticed that in addition to these substitutes, some of which are entirely palatable, they compel the householders to buy a large quantity of bran with the flour they have been eating, thereby raising the cost of cow feed to an extraordinary height and compelling human beings to eat it?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; I have noticed that. In fact, I have been a devotee of bran diet for several years myself, not with a desire to injure the cow, however. I take the ordinary flour, and in order to get back what ought never to have been taken out, according to my standard of living, I buy bran and eat them both. I have to buy them separately. I can not mix them, but the result is just the same.

What the Senator from West Virginia refers to as compelling purchasers to buy bran is true. It is making stock food higher. That is a form of substitute for wheat flour. If the whole grain were milled together and the bran were left in, you would get a whole wheat bread that would not require these regulations from the Food Department.

But the cottage-cheese item of \$52,950 ought to be stricken out, Mr. President, because it serves no useful purpose. People will not eat cottage cheese outside of a limited few unless their appetites are very radically changed. Certain people in the city want it. They get it, some of them, from the regular dairy driver, who brings it around for them, but only by special arrangement. If you go to the bill of fare and look at it at any place, it is very seldom you find it, and it is chiefly some very frugal cook who takes the sour milk that is a waste product otherwise of the establishment and converts it into cottage cheese. If you will notice on the bills of fare where cottage cheese is accessible there will not be one person out of ten who ever orders it. They never will order it until their appetites are cultivated. I have seen them order Roquefort or Schweitzer. I have seen them send for Limburger. It is never upon the table ordinarily, for prudential reasons, but it can be ordered, and I have seen them eat all these compounds, but not one time in ten have I seen them order cottage cheese.

Not only is it barren of any odoriferous taint, but it has in it all the elements of the high-priced cheese, some of which was brought before the war from across the seas. If there were to-day a crusade entered upon by which the different varieties of cheese would be simplified, I would have no objection to devoting some money to that purpose; but Roquefort cheese, while it is very palatable and in a reasonable amount is healthful, yet ordinarily to the novice who has not acquired the cultivated habit of eating it it looks like cottage cheese in the last and extreme stages of putrefaction. The more green streaks it has in it, the more variegated yellow that comes up close to the border, and the greater the prismatic landscape that can be seen in a cube of Roquefort cheese, the more nearly perfect it was in its manufacture.

That is largely a question which appeals to the eye. Those who are experts in eating it like to look at it just as the smoker of a Habana likes to look at the curling smoke. A man can shut his eyes and derive but very little satisfaction from a cigar that costs from 25 cents to \$1, whereas he may get a Pittsburgh stogy or a rope made in the local shops at home, open his eyes, and see it curl toward the zenith with admiration, although it comes at a price of three for a nickel. That shows that human imagination is very largely involved in the element of pleasure.

It is possible, as I was going to suggest when I was diverted from that line of thought a while ago, that if these gentlemen whose appetites need cultivation were gotten together in a hall some place by some expert from the Agricultural Department they could be reasoned with. I have tried to visualize the kind of an audience the expert would have that he would gather in from the curbstone. They would be always distinguishable. If

you look at their index finger the yellow mark ordinarily is on the right hand. Sometimes if they are left-handers it is on the left-hand index finger, but they are never to be misunderstood. The yellow stain proclaims them as habitual cigarette smokers. Not the kind that merely take the smoke in and eject it in the ordinary way, but inhale it into their lungs, thereby obtaining a prolonged satisfaction at the expense of their bronchial tubes and other respiratory organs. They never eat cottage cheese. If they ever eat anything, it is the manufactured cheese and the pretzel. The ordinary gentlemen of that kind in Chicago, inside of the "loop" of the first ward, are the kind who need the instruction. They are free-lunch fiends. For many years they have subsisted, the greater part of their lives, on free lunches. What prohibition will do with them is left to a merciful Providence. I shall not undertake to analyze their condition in that event; but with the stimulus taken away from them by the foam-crested "schooner," the cheap gin, inside of the "loop," which costs 3 cents for each slug administered to the patient—when they have that, the pretzel, and the overaged accompaniments that go with it, and the lower meat products manufactured into viands of various degrees of stringiness and toughness, which look well enough, will make trouble; if a man had to eat it sober, I do not know what would become of him. It requires a certain amount of stimulus of some kind to be able to absorb nutriment of that character. He is the type you have got to take in and educate to eat cottage cheese. He would never eat it if he is let alone.

Go to the opposite pole of the social equation and you find the man who is a habitual diner out, who is a seasoned, hardened veteran, a banqueter of many courses, of nine kinds of liquor, and of many years' experience. It is no use to tell such a man he is digging his grave with his teeth. He prefers to have a good time while he is here, and to let the grave take its chances of being dug. So on he goes. His appetite will no more be addicted to cottage cheese than it will be to branch water as the ordinary method of slaking his thirst.

I am moved to inquire whether the Department of Agriculture knows the kind of a problem it is undertaking. I do not think it does know it, nor do I believe it very much cares. What it does care for is that some supposedly wise person, male or female, has suggested that \$52,950 would just about reach the requirements of the persons out on the road now, together with seasonable additions for the next 12 months' line of food endeavor.

In further explanation of why that ought to go out I will say that on page 12 of the general Agricultural appropriation bill, in lines 11 and 12, are certain items explaining the purposes for which they are given.

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and disseminate information concerning live stock, dairy, and other animal products.

This is a dairy product. Under that item, which is quite liberal, there is an abundant opportunity, without any violent construction of the language, to provide for such instruction on the production and consumption of dairy cheese as may be necessary.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, the Senator will note that over a million dollars in the general Agricultural appropriation bill is appropriated for the kind of investigation he is referring to—\$500,000 in the paragraph ending in line 11, page 13, and another \$500,000 in line 19.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have not found the page where it is summed up.

Mr. PENROSE. It is over a million dollars for that one purpose.

Mr. SHERMAN. The fact that over a million dollars is provided for that purpose is ample reason why this specific item of \$52,950 in the other bill, which appears to be in that particular an afterthought, ought not to be allowed.

Then, on page 15 of the general bill there is a further appropriation, which is cumulative to the one already spoken of for the purpose of cottage cheese. The provision is:

For all necessary expenses for investigations and experiments in dairy industry, cooperative investigations of the dairy industry in the various States, inspection of renovated-butter factories and markets, \$364,390.

That is an investigation of the dairy industry. Cottage cheese is a part of the dairy industry. There is no reason for this item of \$52,950 to be in addition to those two provisions already made, either of which is amply broad enough to provide for the investigation of this particular item.

Then, leaving this subject of cottage cheese, I will remark as to renovated-butter factories that I have several of those in my particular bailiwick. They are scattered around over various parts of the United States, often in close proximity to large dairy sections. I have noticed that the renovated-butter factory is always lurking in the vicinity of a great dairy belt.

The butter that becomes rancid in a grocery or which spoils before it reaches the retail dealer, either from insufficient icing, from improper handling, or from the native filth that may be incorporated in it by the original producer, all hastening to produce that rancid state which repels the consumer—many thousand pounds of that variety of butter are collected at a single point and shipped to the renovated-butter factory. It is there treated with boracic acid; it is churned with unskimmed milk and coloring matter is added. It is churned with that preservative and sometimes illegitimately with other preservatives that are much more unhealthy than is boracic acid or the trace that is left in it after the butter is washed.

It is then sent to Washington and sold as original Elgin butter from the Fox River Valley, Illinois. I know the difference between reworked butter coming out of a renovated-butter factory and the original product. If they want to investigate that, I have no objection to it. It serves a useful purpose, but it needs supervision by some authority outside of those who are preparing the product and getting it to the consumer. Under that item they can just as well investigate the question of manufacturing cottage cheese as to have a separate item of \$364,000 and over provided for that purpose.

On page 26 of the regular appropriation bill—and I take all of these items in connection with each other, because the two bills are interrelated, and while one is a stimulus—the smaller bill, known as House bill 11945—yet they dovetail in together. Beginning on line 7 we find:

For the investigation and improvement of fruits, and the methods of fruit growing, harvesting, and, in cooperation with the Bureau of Markets, studies of the behavior of fruits during the processes of marketing and while in commercial storage, \$85,280.

I do not know just what they will discover as to "the behavior of fruits during the process of marketing," but I have discovered some phenomena that are worthy of investigation. One is an inevitable tendency on the part of the boxes or packages holding the fruit. The particular amount for this purpose is \$85,280. I do not know how this estimate was reached, and I would be glad to inquire from some member of the committee if he or any other member knows how this particular amount was arrived at. What is the \$280 for? Why was it not made a round \$100,000 or \$200,000?

Mr. PENROSE. At least.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes; at least, as the Senator from Pennsylvania suggests. It is a mere matter of figures. It is like suing a person. When you are laying the damages at the end of the declaration, you might just as well sue for a million dollars as for 10 cents; it is merely a matter of a few curls of the pen or the depression of a few typewriter keys. Why was it not made a couple of hundred thousand dollars? How did they arrive at \$85,280? I might have a suspicion that it was to fit an existing pay roll, with possibly a 10 per cent addition or whatever was thought to be a legitimate increase in the requirements of that part of the department's activities.

But "the behavior of fruits" is something that interests everybody in Washington. I have noticed a most reprehensible tendency on the part of the bottom of the package or box containing fruits to rise; it gets farther and farther from the outside margin of what had once been the bottom. I think Isaac Newton discovered the law of gravity that pulls everything down. I should like to have some wise man in the Department of Agriculture discover the law that pulls the bottom of boxes up.

There is another thing which I can understand, namely, that the boxes are never full. Last week I measured one of the boxes of blackberries that I took home, and it lacked nearly an inch—eleven-twelfths of an inch—of reaching the top edge of the box. I do not think the grower of the blackberries brings them in in that way. I took this particular box and turned it upside down, and I found that the bottom of the box, in addition to obeying the mysterious law of rising, had three thicknesses of brown paper folded up and laid in. I did not buy brown paper; that is not a nutritious article of food; I bought berries; but not only did the bottom of the box rise, but the bottom of the box was bolstered up and padded worse than any actress ever seen in Washington—padded with brown paper; and when I measured it after compression I found that the entire stolen space in that box was 1½ inches.

That occurred where? In the District of Columbia. This is the model city of North America. Here it is that an example is set for all the world, and especially for all of the heathen that come from west of Pittsburgh. We are asked for such appropriations as this to enable some expert to tell us how to market berries and to enable him to study "the behavior of fruits during the process of marketing." I want them first to investigate and discover the behavior of the boxes.

Mr. PENROSE. Well, these are war measures.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; that is correct. And after the dealer gets the box with the fruit in it, I should like the department to investigate him. I will wager any official of the Department of Agriculture a silk tile—which he can have at my expense—that I can go out with any investigator of the department in the city of Washington, and I can find duplicates of that box in hundreds of places in Washington. It will encourage us to fight the Hun if we can get what we pay for. Here, where the benignant countenance of that colossal figure that rests on the dome of the Capitol looks eastward to warn all the monarchs of the world that free government is our birthright, we can not, even in the city of Washington, stop the fruit dealers and those handling berries from swindling us out of an inch and a quarter of depth in their boxes. Before the department attempts to remove the mote from the eye of the old lady in the kitchen out on the western farm and to instruct her in the mysteries of cottage cheese, I want them to pluck the beam out of the eye of the Washington fruit and berry dealer.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I suggest to my distinguished friend, that in talking so much about the law of gravitation, he has perhaps forgotten that the law of capillary attraction may prompt the bottom of the box to rise.

Mr. SHERMAN. I had not thought of that, and I thank the Senator from Utah for making the valuable suggestion. I think I will communicate with some of the great professors of physics and advise them that the law of capillary attraction in the case of a piece of brown paper has been so strong as to spring the bottom of a wooden box. [Laughter.] I never knew that before; it is an explanation, however, that is worthy of investigation out of this \$85,280 fund.

On page 57 of the general agricultural appropriation bill—and I wish to hurry along, Mr. President, because I do not desire to take any more time than actually is necessary to call attention to these matters—I find the following item:

For investigations of insects affecting deciduous fruits, orchards, vineyards, and nuts, \$93,380—

There is that degree of certainty and particularity in the appropriation that makes me anxious for information from some member of the committee as to how this particular sum was arrived at—

Provided, That \$9,600 of said sum shall be available for the investigation of insects affecting the pecan and method of control of same.

There is one insect in the country that affects the pecan more than anything else, and a town constable or a deputy sheriff can cure it. I refer to the gentlemen who go out and cut the pecan trees down. Instead of taking the nuts off the tree—they could steal the nuts, and that would be bad enough—they cut the tree down. That has been the besetting evil all up and down the northern pecan belt. It is a nut which assumes considerable importance, and the regulation of this evil would do more even than to track the insects that are supposed to be waging destructive warfare on this article of food.

Then, in line 11, on page 57, of the same bill, I find the following item:

For investigations of insects affecting cereal and forage crops, including a special investigation of the Hessian fly and the chinch bug, \$122,060.

I wish to go forward now to page 58, where, in lines 7 and 8, is found the following:

For investigations, identification, and systematic classification of miscellaneous insects, including the study of insects affecting the health of man and domestic animals, household insects, and the importation and exchange of useful insects, \$52,330.

There are useful insects in the country, but their number unfortunately is very small compared with the number of noxious ones. It is like the eternal struggle between good and evil except that in a pronounced degree the evil insects overbalance the good. There is more difficulty in finding useful insects, those that will do good and will prey upon the evil ones, than there is in finding the other kind.

But this exchange of useful insects will be construed with the language at the bottom of page 58, where the gypsy moth and brown-tail moth, or both the same kind, shall be hedged against by introducing and establishing the parasites and natural enemies of these insects and colonizing them within the infested territory. This provides another appropriation of \$304,050, making a total appropriation of nearly \$1,000,000—\$986,680 all together.

Mr. President, these provisions are specific in amount. I should like to inquire from some member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry if any investigation has been had that will tend to destroy the insect known as *Cimex lectularius*? Is there any member of the committee here? This insect is one of the greatest pests known to civilized man. It is nocturnal in

its habits. It is carnivorous in its diet. It is indestructible in its longevity and its ability to escape the efforts of man to exterminate it. It is not found in primeval times and ages. Like the English sparrow, it is an attendant of civilized communities.

Prior to coming to this Chamber, I spent a good part of my life on the road, and I had a vast experience with this insect. It is known to polite society and to hotel keepers and to scientists as *Cimex lectularius*. By the proletariat it is called the bedbug. I wish to inquire from the head of the Department of Agriculture and from the chairman of the committee, when he shall resume his seat, if there are any efforts in their investigation of interstate commerce to stop the spread of this carnivorous pest? It has done more to sap the vitality of the human race and interfere with the ability successfully to make war on the Kaiser than anything I know of. It is worse than the chinch bug. The chinch bug is a relic compared with his primeval forays. It is an insect that belongs to an earlier age. It is no longer the pest that it was. With the country settled up, with the grass burned out, with no longer the opportunity for it to hide and hatch as in days gone by, the chinch bug is not now the standing menace to the crops that it was. There is provision made here for taking care of chinch bugs. I do not know how many other bugs could be provided for; but the writer of the bill, or those in the department who have had charge of that, have unwittingly allowed a vast number of insects to escape. I can think of any number of noxious insects that are not specifically mentioned in this bill, and can only be covered by the general phrase of "other hurtful insects." They seem to have exhausted their stock of information on noxious insects.

I have already referred to the clause that is stricken out on page 62, preventing sheep-killing dogs from continuing their devastations.

On page 82 there is what seems to me a wholly indefensible item:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make studies of cooperation among farmers in the United States in matters of rural credits and of other forms of cooperation in rural communities.

What is the use of that? Reduced to practical effect, it is a colporteur going in rural districts teaching farmers how to borrow money from the Government. Note its language:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make studies of cooperation among farmers in the United States in matters of rural credits.

There is the rural-credit bank. The farmer already knows how to cooperate to take care of himself, to spread useful information about crop raising, about live stock. He knows how to take care of the restoration of his soil. He learns that by local laws. All the great agricultural and live-stock States of the Union now have a system of their own. They have county agents; they have State authorities. Under their State universities they are getting detailed and accurate information upon how to take care of these different problems. In proportion as they have learned these things the demand on borrowing money from the Treasury subsides. Here is an invitation to the Secretary of Agriculture to send out investigators to teach the farmers of certain parts of the United States how to approach the Treasury to borrow money. I think it is utterly indefensible, Mr. President, and it ought to be stricken out.

On page 83 is a cumulative provision of \$5,000, reading as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the act entitled "An act to fix standards for Climax baskets for grapes and other fruits and vegetables, and to fix standards for baskets and other containers for small fruits, berries, and vegetables, and for other purposes," approved August 31, 1916, including the employment of such persons and means as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$5,000.

That item ought to go out. There is no reason why that ought to be in the bill in addition to the sum already provided for on page 26, with precisely the same purpose; and this serves no other purpose, that I can see, except to expend \$5,000 more.

Then, on page 88, is this item:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the authorities of the States concerned, or with individuals, to make such investigations and demonstrations as may be necessary in connection with the development of live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States, including the erection of barns and other necessary buildings, and the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$60,000.

That reminds me that in the cane-sugar country there must be some occasion for an appropriation of this kind. It must be because the cane-sugar industry in some places has decayed. It is no longer profitable. For some reason, prior to the beginning of the war it was found that no returns could be had on the investment. Some of the cane-sugar manufacturers are in the business not of original choice, but because they have inherited the property; it has come down to them from their ancestors. Some of them are very small in their holdings. They are of the

French blood. They do not part with land; and as the family multiplies the land itself is subdivided into very small holdings; and anyone who is familiar with that country knows that these small holders, in the aggregate, amount to a considerable part of the cane-sugar producers. Now, the large sugar-plantation men, those like Mr. Matthews and others out a way from New Orleans, have very large investments. They buy the crude sugar from the small producers and put it in shape where they themselves can job it to the sugar refineries. But the mere fact that on page 88 of the Agricultural appropriation bill \$60,000 is thought to be necessary to restore the prosperity of the cane-sugar area is a tremendous commentary upon what has occurred under certain economic conditions. I shall not oppose that. If these men who found in peace times that it was no longer profitable to produce sugar can be helped to the extent of \$60,000, I have no objection to that item. I only call attention to the necessity for such an item and the fact that we are running on an economic principle that requires such appropriations.

Again, on page 91:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the existence of the pink bollworm of cotton in Mexico, and to prevent the establishment of such insect in the United States by the employment of all means necessary, including rent outside of the District of Columbia.

There is one part of that that is impossible to be performed—the provision here that the Secretary shall meet the emergency of the pink bollworm of cotton in Mexico. I do not think any investigator will care to go across the line into the cotton-producing area in Mexico, outside of a comparatively small area along the border, just on the other side of the Rio Grande. To reach the parts where the pink bollworm comes from, its origin in the most dangerous form, you must reach the interior of Mexico.

To do that involves an investigator in considerable risk. There are worse things than pink worms there. This is an impossible item in that much of it; and I would suggest to the chairman of the committee that that much of it be modified, because this is a \$50,000 item, and, so far as it expects an investigator to go across the border to look into the destruction of the pink bollworm there, it is on a par with the item of \$52,950 for cottage cheese. It is absolutely impossible under present conditions to be usefully expended.

I do not enter at great length upon this item in elaborating the reasons; but carrying over farther, after page 91, on page 92, beginning in line 14, I find the following:

To make surveys to determine the actual distribution of the pink bollworm in Mexico and to exterminate local infestations in Mexico near the border of the United States, in cooperation with the Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities, \$25,000;

To investigate in Mexico or elsewhere the pink bollworm as a basis for control measures, \$25,000.

Here is a total of \$100,000, a part of which may reasonably be expected to be expended in the interior of Mexico or across the line. There is no safety, nor is there any certainty that anybody can produce any useful results by an investigation across the border. It seems to me that these items ought to be reduced so as to bring them within the possibility of performance.

Upon page 99 is a general provision, in section 14, as follows:

That whenever the President shall find that an emergency exists requiring stimulation of the production of wheat and that it is essential that the producers of wheat, produced within the United States, shall have the benefits from time to time, seasonably and as far in advance of seeding time as practicable, to determine and fix and to give public notice of what, under specified conditions, is a reasonable guaranteed price for wheat, in order to assure such producers a reasonable profit. The President shall thereupon fix such guaranteed price for each of the official grain standards for wheat as established under the United States grain-standards act, approved August 11, 1916. The President shall from time to time establish and promulgate such regulations as he shall deem wise in connection with such guaranteed prices, and in particular governing conditions of delivery and payment and differences in price for the several standard grades at the local elevator or the local railway market where such wheat is delivered from the farm where produced, adopting No. 1 northern spring or its equivalent as the basis. Thereupon the Government of the United States hereby guarantees every producer of wheat produced within the United States that, upon compliance by him with the regulations prescribed, he shall receive for any wheat produced in reliance upon this guaranty within the period, not exceeding 18 months, prescribed in the notice a price not less than the guaranteed price therefor as fixed pursuant to this section. In such regulations the President shall prescribe the terms and conditions upon which any such producer shall be entitled to the benefits of such guaranty. The guaranteed prices for the several standard grades of wheat for the crop of 1918 shall be based upon No. 2 northern spring or its equivalent at not less than \$2.50 per bushel at the local elevator or the local railway market where such wheat is delivered from the farm where produced.

This is a committee amendment, the reading of which I have just completed. It places in the hands of the President the power to fix prices for wheat. It is entirely dependent upon the President. It depends upon no congressional action after the passage of this bill containing section 14, the committee



amendment; but it takes away from Congress, unless it should legislate by amending this article, or repealing it, any further power in the way of price regulation of wheat. It seems to me that Congress should keep that power. We have entered upon the era of price fixing. Two dollars and twenty cents was fixed here in former legislation as the basic price. If Congress has once entered upon the course of price fixing, it must keep the power and must continue from time to time to regulate the prices. I do not believe that power should be delegated to a department. In name it is delegated to the President, but we all know that that is only a nominal delegation of power; that practically it puts the fixing of the price of wheat in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, who in turn will delegate it out to some employees or subordinates.

In fact, it puts upon the President a power which can be exercised by him only by again delegating the power which we vest in him. It leaves it in the hands of persons with this delegated power, then, to fix the price of wheat from time to time. Where it will come from, who it will be, how they will exercise that power, what degree of wisdom or folly will manifest itself in judging of market conditions under which the farmer or wheat producer will dispose of his surplus products, we know nothing. We delegate in general blanket terms that power. I believe Congress ought to keep the power and fix by its own action a basic price, subject to amendment from time to time, instead of delegating it to a department.

But, if we have once delegated it to a department, it will stay there. All of us know how extremely difficult it is to recall a delegated power and resume its operation by Congress. It is there subject to the usual amplification, to the elaboration which the department finds upon the application to which it inevitably becomes subject. These matters, I think, Mr. President, are ones that would properly call for an amendment of the general bill.

In regard to the amendment offered this morning striking out the former committee amendment on page 6, I wish to comment briefly. This is what is known as the prohibition amendment. I would prefer the original committee amendment, if my will controlled on that matter.

There are now available in stock in the country about 200,000,000 gallons of whisky which ordinarily would be devoted to beverage purposes. Former legislation destroyed the distillery in this country, so far as it produces a beverage. All the distilling of potable liquors coming from distilleries were discontinued pursuant to the last act of Congress on that subject. The distillers of this country have acquiesced in that arrangement. They have, as far as possible, converted their distilleries into plants for the production of industrial alcohol. Of the parts of a distillery that could be used only for the manufacture of whisky, the large warehouses required for storing it in bond, some will now be unavailable or will not be needed. The parts or the structures where the whisky is racked off, a large part of the cooerage used, will no longer be valuable property. They acquiesced in the arrangement. They have adjusted their business to the former amendment.

The banks of the country have loaned on warehouse certificates of a very large quantity of whisky held in bond considerable sums of money. I am not overly tender about the property rights that attach to intoxicating liquors to be used as a beverage. I believe, however, some fairer arrangement to take care of the established credit on the basis of warehouse certificates on whisky in other forms should be had before the ban of the law is put upon that form of what heretofore has been legitimate property.

I would vote, Mr. President, for the Government to take over the whole of the 200,000,000 gallons, export it, sell it for legitimate purposes to hospitals, use it for medical purposes until the last gallon of it shall have been consumed, rather than to disturb the credit and bring on possible bankruptcy—not to say, in some communities, panic—where the sums loaned to individual holders of warehouse certificates will exceed the capital stock of the bank making the loan. I do not believe this matter has been given altogether as much consideration as it ought to have. I am not prepared to say that if some fair solution of it can not be worked out I will not vote for it in its original severity, but I do believe that more care ought to be had in the protection of the property rights involved.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KENDRICK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Smith, Md.
Baird	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Kellogg	Penrose	Smoot
Borah	Kendrick	Phelan	Sutherland
Calder	Kanyon	Poindexter	Swanson
Chamberlain	King	Pomerene	Thomas
Coit	Lenroot	Ransdell	Thompson
Culberson	Lewis	Saulsbury	Trammell
Curtis	McCumber	Shafroth	Underwood
Fernald	McKellar	Sheppard	Vardaman
Fletcher	Martin	Sherman	Walsh
France	Nelson	Shields	Warren
Gore	New	Simmons	
Johnson, Cal.	Norris	Smith, Ariz.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-four Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Does the first amendment in the bill go over under objection, the amendment permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to employ persons within the draft age?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that it went over on the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. My recollection was that it went over, but I was not certain that the Secretary had made a note of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary so informs the Chair. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, line 15, strike out the words "grain, hay" and the comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment is, in line 16, strike out "\$180,720" and insert "\$30,000."

Mr. KING. Is this subject to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. KING. I move to amend by striking out the entire item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah moves to amend the amendment by striking out the entire item.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. That will necessitate the elimination of the words "market news service on feeds and seeds."

The SECRETARY. Strike out, on page 8, lines 15 and 16, the following: "Market news service on feeds and seeds, \$30,000," up to the semicolon. It leaves in the semicolon.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The SECRETARY. In line 17 strike out the word "surveys" and insert "survey."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. In line 17, strike out "\$449,700" and insert "\$100,000."

Mr. KING. I move to amend that by striking out "\$100,000."

Mr. FLETCHER. That would leave it without any appropriation at all.

Mr. KING. Exactly.

Mr. FLETCHER. The department could not pay the salaries.

Mr. KING. Exactly.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not think it ought to be stricken out. Either the whole provision ought to be stricken out or the appropriation should be left in.

Mr. KING. I regard the whole thing as useless, a work of supererogation, a purpose to give employment to a number of incompetent men, as most of these items are for.

Mr. FLETCHER. The fertilizer situation is very important.

Mr. NORRIS. I make a point of order on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will please state it. Mr. NORRIS. I understand we are considering only committee amendments now.

Mr. PENROSE. This is a committee amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. If the committee amendment prevails, then there is not anything to vote on after the committee amendment is left in the bill. I concede the Senator might move to cut down the amount as small as he wants, but I object to cutting it all out. In fact, it will have just the opposite effect, as I understand it, from what the Senator is trying to accomplish.

Mr. KING. It seems to me the mere fact that the House agreed upon a certain amount and the Senate committee amended it, and the question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senate committee would not preclude an emandation by the Senate eliminating the entire item. I do not understand that it would be subject to the point of order. Therefore, to make the matter very clear, I move to strike out the following words, found in line 17, page 8:

Fertilizer survey of the United States, \$100,000.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator ought to include the words in line 16, "food and."

Mr. KING. I move to amend by striking out the following: "Food and fertilizer."

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand we have already agreed to the committee amendment striking out "surveys" and inserting "survey."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator can not therefore move to amend it.

Mr. KING. If that be true, then my amendment will go only to the word "fertilizer," in line 16, and the words "survey of the United States, \$100,000," in line 17.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I make the point of order that we are proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement by which we are to consider only unobjected amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was not aware of that unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas if the unanimous-consent agreement, of which I was not aware, would preclude an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. SHEPPARD. For the present it would.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; that can not be so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will please state the unanimous-consent agreement. The present occupant of the chair knows nothing about it.

Mr. SMOOT. By the unanimous-consent agreement asked—and I take it for granted it was consented to by the Senate—we are to consider only committee amendments, but that does not preclude an amendment to a committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is now advised of the situation. Unanimous consent was asked and granted that the committee amendments only should be considered first, and committee amendments are always amendable. So the amendment of the Senator from Utah is in order. He seeks only to amend the committee amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER. I suggest that the word "survey" having been inserted by a vote of the Senate, that amendment having been agreed to, it is not in order now to move to strike it out. You would have to reconsider that vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It can only be stricken out after a motion to reconsider. The question is on the amendment of the committee, in line 17, to strike out "\$449,700" and insert "\$100,000."

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I wish to see if I understand the motion to strike out. I understand it applies to the provisions in lines 16 and 17, "fertilizer survey of the United States, \$100,000." Am I correct in that? I should like to hear from some member of the committee what survey is intended to be covered by this amendment. It may be a very important provision.

Mr. PENROSE. If the Senator will permit me, I think there ought to be here the chairman or some member of the committee to explain these items. I agree with the Senator from Tennessee. It is not fair to the Senate to ask us to pass upon these wasteful, improvident, and unnecessary appropriations without some explanation. There is no member of the committee here. What Senator is in charge of the bill? The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] has not attended any meetings. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] just informed me that he attended no meeting of the committee.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] is here.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator from Iowa does not appear to be redolent with knowledge. What member of the majority party is in charge of the bill?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I was called out of the Chamber temporarily, and I did not hear the inquiry of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. If the Senator from Tennessee will permit me, I made the statement that it is only ordinary courtesy to the Senate that there should be some member of the Committee on Agriculture to explain these items, which to many of us appear wasteful, improvident, and unnecessary.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I shall be glad to give the Senator any information he may desire if I can possibly give it to him.

Mr. PENROSE. I do not hear the Senator.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I say I would be glad to furnish him with any information that I have. I am a member of the committee. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let there be order in the Chamber.

Mr. PENROSE. I hesitate to ask the Senator from Texas, because he confessed on Saturday night that he was not a member of the committee and knew nothing about the bill and was unable and unwilling to explain any details.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Not at all, Mr. President.

Mr. PENROSE. The Record will show that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; the Record will not show it.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator expressed the thought that his only knowledge of the bill was contained in the paragraph relating to the prohibition rider, and he emphatically denied responsibility for the rest of the measure.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Not at all, Mr. President.

Mr. PENROSE. If the Senator has had an opportunity over Sunday to study the measure—

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator is in error. The Senator's recollection is at fault.

Mr. PENROSE. With all the varied accomplishments of the Senator from Texas, I think the Senate is entitled to have a member of the committee here.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am a member of the committee.

Mr. SHIELDS. I think I have the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. SHIELDS. I ask that this amendment may go over until some member of the committee can explain it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am a member of the committee and will be glad to give the Senator any information he may request.

Mr. SHIELDS. I understood the Senator from Pennsylvania to say you are not a member of the committee.

Mr. PENROSE. I thought he was not.

Mr. SHIELDS. I will ask the Senator from Texas to explain what survey is proposed by the provision in lines 16 and 17 in these words:

Fertilizer survey of the United States, \$100,000.

It seems that the House provided for \$449,700 for this survey. The subject matter is a very interesting one and a very important one, and the item ought not to be stricken out without a very full explanation of it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, before I proceed with the explanation I want to say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that he has, I am sure unintentionally, done me an injustice. What I said Saturday evening was that I was not the chairman of the committee; and therefore had no authority to consent to the elimination of items in the bill. He has simply indulged to-day in one of his characteristic pieces of persiflage with which he entertains the Senate on numerous occasions.

The Department of Agriculture has the following to say on the subject of food and fertilizer surveys:

Surveys have been made of (a) quantities of raw food products on farms, (b) stocks in the hand of manufacturing, storing, and wholesale and retail concerns, (c) quantities of certain kinds of food preserved for home use, quantities actually on hand in the household, and estimated amounts of family consumption, and (d) fertilizing materials.

The Department of Agriculture further represents that—

(a) With the cooperation of the Bureau of Crop Estimates, information regarding stocks on farms, principally quantities of cereals and numbers of live stock, including poultry, were obtained as of August 31, 1917.

The department says further that a more comprehensive survey was made as of December 31, 1917.

Furthermore, the department represents that—

(b) For commercial concerns, a preliminary survey covering 18 items was made under date of August 31, 1917, and a more comprehensive survey, covering 86 items, under date of December 31, 1917.

The department says that—

Schedules were sent out by mail to all concerns whose names and addresses could be ascertained. In connection with the more comprehensive survey, 500,000 schedules had been returned by the end of February.

It says further—

Mr. SHIELDS. Do I understand that relates to fertilizer or merely food?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It relates to food and fertilizer. It includes both.

Mr. SHIELDS. I suppose the Senator will reach the point applicable to fertilizer in his reading.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will. I want to give full information on this point, inasmuch as it has been requested. The department says:

Special surveys of retail establishments were made by personal canvass in 41 representative counties, including cities of all sizes, for the purpose of obtaining complete returns from such establishments in these representative communities. The information obtained in this way is being used to check by comparison the returns received by mail and to furnish a basis for estimating the holdings of very small concerns whose names and addresses generally could not be ascertained.

The department further states that—

(c) Surveys have been undertaken and are approaching completion by placing more than 40,000 schedules in the hands of representative families in the various States, requesting information concerning the preservation, uses, holdings, and consumption of foods in the household as a basis for making estimates for the 22,000,000 families of the entire country. A separate dietary survey is under way for the purpose

of collecting detailed information from a large number of families at all seasons of the year in order to show food habits and customs, food waste and consumption, and the use of food according to its nutritive value.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator is speaking of the fertilizer survey?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am speaking of the food and fertilizer survey of the United States.

Mr. PENROSE. But the food survey is eliminated.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand. It was my impression, however, that information was wanted on this entire item. I am now approaching the fertilizer phase.

Mr. PENROSE. The interesting recital about food partakes a little of a variety of camouflage, it seems to me, because the committee has not been impressed by the argument of the department and has eliminated the food survey. Now, unless fertilizers are used on food I think it would be well if the Senator would confine himself to fertilizers.

Mr. SHIELDS. I understand the Senator from Texas is reading the explanation given by the Agricultural Department as to the entire item as it appears in the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am.

Mr. SHIELDS. And he will come to the part applicable to the fertilizers in a few minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I was just about to take up the fertilizer phase, when the Senator from Pennsylvania appeared upon the scene. The department says that—

(d) A fertilizer survey was made showing the stocks on hand of 26 items of important fertilizer material as of October 1, 1917.

Further food surveys should be made and monthly reports obtained regarding important items of food, such as wheat, flour, corn, beans, sugar, pork products, potatoes, etc., held by leading classes of concerns, especially manufacturers, storages, and large wholesale establishments, in order to secure information necessary to formulate policies regarding the conservation of foods and the encouragement of production. Dietary surveys should be completed and additional fertilizer surveys be provided for.

That is the recommendation of the department. It has already made a survey of the fertilizers on hand, of 26 items of important fertilizing materials, on October 1, 1917.

Mr. PENROSE. But if I may be permitted, Mr. President, how does the Senator arrive at these figures? They all seem to be split up in a mysterious way. For instance, I find for "food and fertilizer surveys, \$449,700." Why did they not make it a half million dollars at once? How do they come to pennies?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have here detailed statements as to how the money is expended.

Mr. PENROSE. I have no doubt they have provided for the expenditure of the money; but what I want to get at is how these figures are arrived at.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I shall gladly tell the Senator. For instance—

Mr. PENROSE. There is a mysterious split of the figures which I do not quite understand. Why the appropriation should be just \$720 extra in the item for grain, hay, feed, and seed? Why should it not be \$180,700? There is such a mathematical and wonderful accuracy in these figures that I am a little puzzled to know how they were arrived at. Does the Senator from Texas know?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I was just about to give the Senator detailed estimates.

Mr. PENROSE. Well, anyone can read the report; but I supposed the Senator was so familiar with the matter that he could tell the Senate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why, Mr. President, it is impossible to recollect the various details of these expenditures.

Mr. PENROSE. Well, how were the figures "720" arrived at, which are almost too insignificant to bother with in an Agricultural or in any other appropriation bill?

Mr. SHEPPARD. To what particular item is the Senator from Pennsylvania referring now?

Mr. PENROSE. I am referring to the item which the Senator is discussing, right in front of him, on line 16—"grain, hay, feeds, and seed," which was originally put at \$180,720. It is a mystery to many of us on this side of the Chamber, and perhaps on the other, how the \$720 was arrived at.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the Senator will allow me, I shall endeavor to explain it.

Mr. PENROSE. I hope the Senator from Texas will do so.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The department asked for \$280,186 for the fiscal year of 1919, stating that this sum should be expended as follows: One specialist at \$3,780; one assistant at \$2,400; another assistant at \$2,220; another at \$1,500; two clerks at \$1,800; another clerk at \$1,680; five clerks at \$1,620; five clerks at \$1,400; one clerk at \$1,320; 26 clerks at \$1,200; 40 clerks at

\$1,100; 74 clerks at \$1,000; 53 clerks, messengers, and telephone operators, \$900 to \$420; 1 multigraph operator, \$1,200; another at \$1,000; and 140 miscellaneous clerks; the total being \$280,186, which the department estimated would be needed for salaries. Then follow specifications for the remainder of the estimate.

What standard or what methods the House committee followed in fixing the amount at \$180,720, of course I do not know, but I give the Senator the figures, showing how the department arrived at the original estimate as to what it thought would be required for the fiscal year 1919.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator from Texas mean to state that under the item "Market news service on grain, hay, feeds, and seeds," which calls for an appropriation of some two hundred and odd thousand dollars, the number of employees just stated by the Senator was required?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; I am speaking now of the item of food and fertilizer survey. I can give the Senator the estimate as to the employees in the market news service on grain, hay, feed, and seeds if he desires.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, I shall be glad to have that information. But does the Senator mean to state that of this appropriation for food and fertilizer surveys of the United States of \$449,700, more than \$200,000 of it is to be consumed in paying the clerks? In other words, we appropriate four hundred and some odd thousand dollars, and more than half of it is to be consumed in paying the clerks and other employees?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is the estimate of the department.

Mr. KING. Well, I think if that is the method of appropriation it ought to be revised, and somebody else ought to furnish information as a basis for the drafting of bills and the making of appropriations than those who have supplied this information to the Senate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The department states how many clerks it desires for the work and how much is to be paid each one. What else would the Senator want?

Mr. KING. Well, it would seem that, in order to expend this two hundred and odd thousand dollars, there are needed not only a few but scores of clerks.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Well, these clerks are required in order to make the survey; they perform the bulk of the work.

Mr. KING. What is the amount appropriated for the employees furnished under the preceding item?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The total amount is \$88,480.

Mr. KING. Out of the \$180,000?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes; that is true.

Mr. SHIELDS. That applies to feeds and seeds, but not to food and fertilizer.

Mr. KING. That refers to the market news service on grain, hay, feeds, and seeds; that is, to furnish the market news service on feeds and seeds—grain and hay having been stricken out—it costs \$80,000 for clerk hire.

Mr. SHEPPARD. About 63 clerks are required under that item of \$88,000.

Mr. SHIELDS. That is not the item under consideration; the item under consideration is the appropriation of \$100,000 for the survey of fertilizers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator from Utah is simply inquiring about the preceding item in connection with an inquiry regarding this. The department has filed a very detailed estimate as to what it needs and has also given a statement as to what it has done and what it intends to do.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas advise the Senate as to how much was appropriated for this purpose in the general Agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. SHEPPARD. For this item I do not think any amount is carried in the general appropriation bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not positive as to whether or not it was in that bill, but I think there has been a general appropriation made for this purpose every year for years past.

Mr. SHEPPARD. At any rate, the theory of this bill is that it is carrying out the emergency food-production act of last year, which was in addition and supplementary to the general Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Utah has probably confused with the general appropriation bill the special food-survey bill that was passed last August, which did make provision for this survey.

Mr. SMOOT. Can the Senator say how much the appropriation amounted to in that general food-survey bill?

Mr. GORE. My recollection is it was something like \$700,000, but I am not certain.

Mr. SMOOT. That is as I remember it. I thought it was \$750,000; but it does seem to me that that is all the money that ought to be expended for that purpose. It looks to me as though we were going crazy on the expenditure of money.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is for the Senate to say.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that is true; I think the Senator is correct in saying that, and I think the Senate ought to strike out this item of the bill, because there is already appropriated seven hundred thousand and some odd dollars for this very purpose. It is a waste of money.

Mr. GORE. I will say to the Senator that the appropriation has undoubtedly been exhausted. The survey was made as of August 31 of last year and also December 31, and this appears to be a continuing reiteration of surveys. I think there is some force in the proposition that the fertilizer supply ought to be kept in sight and that the department ought to do what it can to see that the supply is ample. That is the view of the committee.

Mr. SHIELDS. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma what sort of a survey of fertilizers and foods is to be made?

Mr. GORE. I assume that it is to ascertain the location of all of the principal ingredients entering into fertilizer, and to bring that location to the attention of those who are interested in the manufacture of it or who are interested in obtaining it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The object of the survey is to show the stocks of fertilizer on hand and where they are located.

Mr. SHIELDS. I presume it is not intended to ascertain as to the constituent elements of fertilizer, because it would not reach that at all; but if it is the intention to ascertain the quantities of commercial fertilizer available for use and on hand in the United States it is a very wise provision, and ought to be kept in the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The language used by the department is this:

A fertilizer survey was made showing the stocks on hand of 26 items of important fertilizer material as of October 1, 1917.

Mr. SMOOT. That survey has already been made.

Mr. SHEPPARD. A survey has already been made; and the department now recommends that additional fertilizer surveys be provided for.

Mr. SMOOT. Do I understand, then, that the Senator contends that we have got to make a survey every year of the amount of fertilizer on hand?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I make no contention. I am simply giving what the department says about it.

Mr. SHIELDS. The fertilizer is exhausted every year, and the users of the fertilizers are to be kept informed, and so an annual survey ought to be made.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SHIELDS. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should like for my own information to inquire if this survey is not for the purpose of discovering the source of all supplies of fertilizer?

Mr. SHEPPARD. And materials for fertilizer; where they are located.

Mr. VARDAMAN. And also the amount already manufactured, is it not?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Exactly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. And the source of the supply of the fertilizers of the country?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is true.

Mr. VARDAMAN. It seems to me that it is very necessary, and that it ought to be done. The yield of the crops depends very largely upon the amount of fertilizer used, and the necessity for the crop all will admit.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, as I understand, this appropriation is not only for the purpose of investigating the supply but also for ascertaining the price at which fertilizers are being sold, so as to determine whether the consumers of fertilizer are being oppressed or whether there is any extortion being practiced on them, for the supply will more or less control the price.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator will remember that there was a revolving fund provided for by Congress for the purpose of enabling the Government to purchase fertilizer and fertilizer contents. I presume the Government has been expending that money as rapidly as it can, and is furnishing fertilizer wherever it is required. There is no question, Mr.

President, that a survey was made, as stated in the report of the Agricultural Department. That was less than a year ago; and to make an appropriation now for another survey, when they know exactly how much fertilizer there is on hand, seems to me an absolute waste of money. The Secretary of Agriculture does not say that this proposed appropriation is to ascertain where the ingredients of fertilizer are located or where they can be obtained as raw material, but the survey is to ascertain the amount of fertilizer there is in the country. Such a survey has already been made; and I repeat that it is a waste of money to appropriate any money at this time for that purpose.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It says "Items of fertilizer material."

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but that means the items that are on hand that go into fertilizer.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does not that mean the raw materials of which fertilizer is made?

Mr. SMOOT. A proper survey ought to ascertain where the ingredients are produced, and whether they can be produced in this country or not, whether found in the shape of phosphate rock, or whether they are manufactured by means of chemical processes.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that already in the past two years there have been discovered, because of such investigations as are in part provided for here, great opportunities for the production of potash in the western country; and the potash produced there to-day is taking the place of potash that formerly was imported, as I understand, from Germany into this country.

Mr. SMOOT. I presume the Senator refers—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. I had the floor, Mr. President, and I thought the Senator was through. I will wait until he concludes.

Mr. KENDRICK. I merely wish to add that I have no doubt that deposits of the same material can be found both in the State of Utah and in my own State, and not only would such deposits serve us well at this particular time when we are unable to get potash from other countries, but they would serve us after the war is over. In my judgment, the amount carried by the bill is a very small amount for such an investigation as is desirable.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator that this appropriation is not for that purpose at all. I presume the Searles Lake proposition is the one to which the Senator has reference.

Mr. KENDRICK. No; Mr. President, there have been erected within the past two years enormous plants for the production of potash in the western part of the State of Nebraska. Very prosperous communities which never existed before have been built up there since the discovery was made.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, everybody knows why potash is produced in Nebraska. From the water in the lakes in the western part of that State at this time, but it has been known that potash existed there for years past; and the only reason that it is made use of now is because the price of potash is so high that the process of extracting the potash from the waters there has been made profitable. If the price of potash was the same to-day as it was several years ago those waters would be there just as they have been perhaps for centuries, and the potash in them would not be extracted.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if he intends to say that the information has been available for many years that those waters did contain potash to an extent that would permit of the commercial production of potash?

Mr. SMOOT. For many years it has been known that potash was there; but the price of potash was so low that its extraction was not justified.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, within the week I have talked to one of the manufacturers who told me in detail about the way this information was obtained. As nearly as I can gather from that and other information, little or nothing was known about the matter until within the past two or three years.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it is the same with the lakes there as it is with Searles Lake. It has been known for years and years that the waters of that lake contained potash; but it has been tied up, as the Senator knows, because of the withdrawal of the land and because of the doubt as to whether the Government would give title to the lands or would hold them and leave the properties unworked until Congress passed a leasing law. Congress has passed a leasing law, and I presume by this time Searles Lake is being worked for potash.

I wish to say to the Senator that in the southeastern portion of my State potash rock has been known to exist for years, but the problem has been as to extracting it and making enough out of the process to pay expenses. To-day there is a great mill located there, and we are producing in that State, I presume, as much potash as in almost any other State in the Union. In quantity it is unlimited; and if the price remains as it is to-day four or five mills could be erected there, for there is plenty of material to furnish the work for that number of mills. There is, however, no appropriation asked for that purpose. The work is being done by private parties.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator state the price at which it is being sold?

Mr. SMOOT. I have not looked at the quotations of late, but the price is twice as high as it was a few years ago.

I wish to say that this appropriation is not for the purpose of hunting potash material; it is not to determine how it may be extracted; but it is for the purpose of ascertaining how much of the manufactured material is on hand; that is all it is for.

Mr. KENDRICK and Mr. SHIELDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield first to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. KENDRICK. I wish to correct the Senator's statement in regard to the withdrawal of lands. Nearly every foot of land included within the sand-hill lakes is now, and has been for some years, in the hands of private owners.

Mr. SMOOT. I was referring to Searles Lake. I know that the lakes in Nebraska were in private ownership.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, I will ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, if the Senator from Utah will permit, if it is not true that this appropriation is intended for the purpose of making investigations concerning materials out of which fertilizer may be made?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, my information is—it may not be accurate—that it does not relate to fertilizer materials in place or in native form, unmined or unmoved from the native place, but relates to fertilizer materials that have assumed a commercial form, the ingredients and the finished product both, I assume.

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly as I understand it, and as I stated it. So far as finding out where potash is located, I will say that I think that enough potash could be extracted from the waters of Salt Lake to furnish all the fertilizer material needed in the United States. The only question is as to extracting the potash from those waters at a cost that would justify selling the fertilizer throughout the country.

Mr. SHIELDS. Then, I understand the Senator to mean that these supplies are known, but the cost of extracting them is prohibitive, except under certain conditions?

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly it, Mr. President.

Mr. SHIELDS. Then, it will be very wise to make the survey to discover deposits where the cost would not be prohibitive; but I do not understand that this appropriation is for that purpose at all.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not for that purpose.

Mr. SHIELDS. It is for the purpose of ascertaining the quantity of fertilizer now manufactured and ready for use and ready to be sold to the consumer.

Mr. SMOOT. Every fertilizer company advertises the amount of fertilizer it has on hand. There is not a retail distributor in the United States who does not know where the wholesale distributor is, and he places his orders in the same way as he has done for years past; and if the wholesaler has the stock on hand the retailer gets the fertilizer at the price agreed upon.

Mr. SHIELDS. If the Senator will allow me a suggestion right there, this is not for the benefit of the retailer or the wholesaler or the manufacturer, but it is for the benefit of the consumers, so that they may know what supply is on hand and whether or not they are paying a reasonable price.

Mr. SMOOT. The Government is now shipping fertilizer from Chile and paying for it out of the revolving fund which we appropriated a year or so ago. The Government fixes the price at which that fertilizer shall be sold.

Mr. SHIELDS. But, notwithstanding that, the price has more than doubled in the last two years.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no doubt of that; and I will say to the Senator that nearly everything else has more than doubled in price; and this commodity has advanced perhaps in no greater proportion than has everything else in this country.

Mr. SHIELDS. It has advanced so that it is hardly possible to use it any longer.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Harding	Martin	Shafroth
Beckham	Henderson	Myers	Sheppard
Borah	Hitchcock	Nelson	Shields
Brandeggee	Johnson, Cal.	New	Simmons
Calder	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Smith, S. C.
Colt	Kellogg	Overman	Smoot
Culberson	Kendrick	Penrose	Sterling
Curtis	Kenyon	Phelan	Sutherland
Fernald	King	Pittman	Swanson
Fletcher	Knox	Poindexter	Thomas
France	Lenroot	Pomerene	Thompson
Gerry	Lewis	Ransdell	Trammell
Gore	McKellar	Saulsbury	Warren

Mr. BORAH. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-six Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I can not see why the Senate should appropriate \$100,000 for a thing that anybody can find out who is interested in knowing about it by spending the price of a postage stamp and writing to a fertilizer journal, and within a week he will receive the information that is asked for under this appropriation. It is simply a waste of money, for no other purpose than to send men all over the country, at the expense of the Government, to collect information that is known and collected from other sources and can be and will be gladly distributed upon request. Therefore I trust that the motion will prevail and that this item will be stricken out.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, inasmuch as the discussion is now regarding fertilizers, and I have discovered what seems to me to be the absence of a much-needed appropriation, I ask to fertilize this bill by proposing the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, after the figures "\$52,950," on line 5, it is proposed to insert the words "and making cottage cheese off the farm, \$53,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that objection is made, under the agreement, to the amendment on line 17, and therefore it will be passed over. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 18, after the word "conservation," to strike out "and" and insert "of," so as to read:

Conservation of food products in transportation and storage.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 19, after the word "storage," to strike out "\$229,937" and insert "\$204,484," so as to read:

Conservation of food products in transportation and storage, \$204,484.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment by striking out the figures "20," so that it will read "\$4,484" instead of "\$204,484."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah proposes an amendment to the amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On line 19 it is proposed to strike out "\$204,484" and to insert "\$4,484."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, while we are moving along on the bill I notice as I cast my eye over the Senate the presence of the chairman of the committee, which is a rarity during the discussion of the measure; and I will take advantage of his presence here to ask him the total amount that this bill carries.

Mr. GORE. Something more than \$19,000,000, I believe.

Mr. PENROSE. This supplemental bill?

Mr. GORE. I think so; yes, sir.

Mr. PENROSE. And the original bill carried nearly thirty million?

Mr. GORE. About twenty-seven million.

Mr. PENROSE. Over twenty-eight million?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. PENROSE. Twenty-eight million dollars and nearly \$20,000,000 more is nearly \$50,000,000. Mr. President, three-quarters of which, I think it is gradually being shown, might just as well be poured into the gutter.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, as we recently appropriated—

Mr. PENROSE. I was coming to that point, if the Senator will permit me. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee another question. A little while ago we passed the general Agricultural bill, and only a few days ago we agreed to the report of the conferees, and it has been for some two days in the hands of the President. Hardly had we completed that act when this bill chases it along and comes out of the committee, adding another \$20,000,000. Now, I am interested in finding out why these items were suddenly discovered as necessary to stimulate agriculture for the war. Why did not the committee, when they were framing the general bill, have cognizance of these other items?

Mr. GORE. I think the explanation of that is this: On August 10 last, or prior to that time, I may say, we had passed what was known as the food-survey or food-production act. I differentiate it from what is known as the food-control act. It was intended and passed as an emergency measure. Its alleged object, and I presume its real object, was to stimulate and increase production to meet the extraordinary requirements of the war. Under that special act a special organization has been erected, and special activities looking to the meeting of the emergency have been perfected. Now, it is desirable on the part of the department to keep the regular, ordinary services of the department which were administered prior to the war, and which will continue to be administered after the war, separated from these special activities. The normal and usual activities which will continue in the future, when peace returns, will be cared for under the regular appropriation. It is imagined that this bill will cease with the war, that the special activities will cease, the special appropriations will cease, and the special organization will cease; and it is, of course, desirable to keep the special organization separate from the regular organization, so that there will be some reason when the war is over to dismantle the one without interfering with the other. I can not say that I quite lay the flattering unction to my soul that all these appropriations will be discontinued when the war is over.

Mr. PENROSE. None of them will ever be discontinued unless the attention of the Senate is very forcibly called to them. They are here to stay, with a constant increase, as long as there is an appropriation bill that passes without being read by Senators.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee why these special appropriations in this special war measure can be fairly described as relating to the war crisis. Is there anything in the situation on the western line that directly, indirectly, or remotely is connected with the investigation of the habits and practices of prairie dogs and coyotes? That is in this extra bill, and I should be very glad if the Senator would enlighten me on that point.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I really am re-inspired, I may say, by the confidence of the Senator from Pennsylvania, that he imagines we can really win this war and carry our arms to triumph on the western front without devoting proper attention to the prairie dogs in Wyoming.

Mr. PENROSE. I admit that they would create disquiet on the rear, and perhaps divert the attention of the population; but in all seriousness I should like to ask the Senator why nearly a half million dollars should be spent on prairie dogs at a moment when the very last dollar is being wrung from the individual and the corporation by taxes or loans?

Mr. GORE. Of course, speaking seriously—

Mr. PENROSE. I am speaking seriously.

Mr. GORE. Yes; I appreciate that—it was the feeling of those who were back of this legislation, and who support it now, that the war creates an extraordinary demand for food.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

Mr. GORE. And that, in order to meet this demand, food production should be stimulated, conservation should be stimulated, and those agencies which destroy or interfere with the production of food should, as far as possible, be placed under control and destroyed. Now, of course, the prairie dogs have gone through many a battle in this Chamber.

Mr. PENROSE. And they are still there.

Mr. GORE. So with predatory animals, the coyote and the wolf; they are regular combatants in the gladiatorial scene which always takes place here when the Agricultural bill is under consideration. It is contended, I believe, that \$100,000 worth of cattle and sheep, perhaps more, are destroyed annually by the coyote and the wolf. Now, the prairie dogs also prey on vegetation, and interfere with the production of food. That is the contention back of this appropriation; and if we can exterminate that pest, and rescue from their maws or jaws the food they now consume, that much more will be available for the Army and Navy of the United States and the allies.

Mr. PENROSE. I am not surprised that the Senator smiles as he makes his explanation, because this bill is largely a work of humor. Nearly \$400,000 is appropriated to destroy these pests, who, in turn, it is alleged, destroy, at the most, \$100,000 worth of food.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes; I yield the floor for the present.

Mr. KENDRICK. As I, in part, represent one of the Western States that is vitally interested in at least a portion of this legislation, I think it worth while to say, in answer to the Senator from Pennsylvania, that this appropriation for the destruction of predatory animals and even prairie dogs has more real merit than it would seem to have when it is made a subject for levity here in the Senate. I know personally of ranchmen in the West who have expended thousands of dollars for the destruction of both prairie dogs and predatory animals in territory over which they did not exercise any control whatever, and have done so to the benefit of themselves and the communities around them.

The difficulty about both of these questions is found in the fact that the work of extermination can not be limited to individuals or counties or even States, because, as in the case of predatory animals, they do not confine their roving to the borders even of the States.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. KENDRICK. I yield.

Mr. PENROSE. In the same appropriation there is a large allowance doubtless for the domestication of mink and marten. Can the Senator explain how they bear relation to the war crisis?

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, I have no knowledge whatever on that point.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator was starting out with apparently a very complete knowledge of everything and therefore I hazarded the inquiry.

Mr. KENDRICK. I am certainly in a position to speak upon the two points I have just mentioned—the question of predatory animals and its direct application to food production.

Mr. PENROSE. Have the mink and the marten any defender here in their relation to the western front or food production?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I merely want to say one word with regard to predatory animals.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee the question I have just propounded.

Mr. GORE. I suppose that is to encourage fur-producing animals, so as to substitute their fur as far as we can for the wool, which has soared to such a high price recently.

Mr. PENROSE. Has any estimate been made as to when the mink and marten will be so numerous as to dot every hillside and produce a crop of fur that will be appreciable in the census returns?

Mr. GORE. No; that is a process of evolution.

Mr. PENROSE. Yes; evolution with an appropriation.

Mr. GORE. No one can exactly foresee the aons to come and tell just when this evolution will have been consummated.

Mr. PENROSE. Then the Senator is a little weak on mink and marten?

Mr. GORE. I am not so strong on mink and marten as I am on the predatory animals. I differentiate the predatory animals from mink and marten, and even from prairie dogs, to some extent.

Mr. PENROSE. If so, then I would move to strike out that part of the appropriation.

Mr. GORE. There can be no doubt that the appropriation for the destruction of predatory animals is a very wise appropriation. It is necessary, because the ravages of these animals amount to multiplied millions, perhaps \$100,000,000, a year. Their extermination is a thing that in the years to come can be completely accomplished, and the cattleman and the sheepman can be emancipated from that threat and that destructive agency. The conservation that will result from it will be enormous, and it will be a general benefit which will be well worth the money which has been appropriated for that object. I think the prairie-dog appropriation certainly has not so many arguments in its favor. Perhaps the destruction caused by them is not so general; at least, I do not realize it to be so; but from what the Senator from Wyoming says, that appropriation is very well justified.

Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania made some reference to the fact that I was not in the Chamber. I want to say that during the morning hour I was listening to the

hearings before the Interstate Commerce Committee—hearings that were insisted upon by the Senator from Pennsylvania and others yesterday. I have to report at the committee meeting now. It is meeting at 3 o'clock, and I shall be obliged to absent myself from the Chamber for a while on that account; but I trust that in my absence the prairie dog and marten and mink will continue to receive the gentle attentions of the Senator from Pennsylvania and others.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on line 19, as amended.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have opposed these and similar appropriations, but without success, ever since I have been a Member of this body. I believe these appropriations are unnecessary, and I do not think they are at all beneficial, except possibly to multiply the species which is sought to be exterminated.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. KENDRICK. I just wish to say to the Senator, in regard to the predatory animals and the efforts by the Government to destroy those animals, that the agencies set up by the Federal Government have proved so efficient that in the past two or three years the authorities of some of the Western States who have been paying countless thousands of dollars in bounties for this same purpose have seriously considered a plan of increasing the efficiency of the Government by adding a State appropriation to the money appropriated by the Federal Government, so as to carry this work along in a general way instead of a local way, which is bound to be a failure. I want to say further to the Senator, in regard to that one question, that it is incumbent upon the Government to take some action because of the great territory in the West, such as Indian reservations and forest reserves, in his State and mine, over which the Government exercises almost complete and exclusive control. These territories provide breeding grounds for these animals; and if the Federal Government will not lend a hand in destroying them it is impossible for the people living in adjoining sections to get any protection whatever. Local effort is entirely fruitless.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the only argument I have ever heard which seemed to me to be a plausible one in behalf of these appropriations for the extinction of predatory animals is the fact that the Government has created large reservations over which it exercises practically exclusive jurisdiction, and that consequently it should itself exterminate the pests which are bred in these reservations, and to which the State laws, generally speaking, do not apply; but I know that in the days when bounties were offered for predatory animals, and so much was paid for every scalp—a practice which I think still prevails in the West—the animals which were the subject of the bounty seemed impossible of extermination. They constituted a constant and perpetual source of revenue for those who took advantage of the bounty laws, and who received the greater portion of the moneys designed for that purpose.

The Senator from Wyoming is much better informed with regard to the operation of this law than am I, because the subject matter of the appropriations peculiarly affects his pursuit in life; and I am going to accept his statement regarding the beneficial effect of these appropriations upon the subjects involved, because I know that what he has stated about the matter can be accepted absolutely by the Senate. I have stated here on two or three occasions, however, that the natural effect of these appropriations would be the same that is observed in the matter of the boll weevil, the potato bug, and other insectivorous life for which we appropriate millions every year, but which thrive under the appropriation. Now, the prairie dog, Mr. President, is a very attractive and interesting little animal, whose chief characteristic is that he associates underground with rattlesnakes, and between them they divide the good things of life in so far as their limited areas are concerned; and yet it is a singular fact that thus far—I suppose it will come—these appropriations do not provide for the joint extermination of the two particular inhabitants of these villages, the rattlesnake and the prairie dog. I do not know what the Government has done in Wyoming or in Utah with regard to prairie-dog extermination, but in my State the festive little animal thrives upon destructive appropriations. Evidently he is there to stay, and his boon companion, the rattlesnake, keeps him constant and unflinching company; and I think—although I state this with some hesitation, because my duties here have made it impossible for me to spend as much time as I should like in my home—I think the effect of this appropriation has been to stimulate the prairie-dog industry; and if it be necessary to legislate by money appropriations for the increase of our food production during the war, then perhaps this legislation will produce that consequence,

provided the prairie dog is an edible animal. I think in all probability if this appropriation is administered as its predecessors have been, prairie-dog meat may become a staple article of diet, and Mr. Hoover will then request us to devote ourselves to that form of meat food so as to make the beef supply more available for our allies. In that sense it may be that this appropriation will produce the desired result; but while I am on my feet I want to speak about my own amendment, because I think it is quite appropriate.

I am opposed to class legislation. I have voted for it occasionally, because I have had to; but I believe in the good old Democratic doctrine of "special privileges to none and equal rights to all." Now, here is an appropriation of \$52,950 for making cottage cheese on the farm. I do not see why it is necessary to encourage the making of cottage cheese on the farm. Making cottage cheese off the farm, however, is a different proposition. If we are to encourage the making of cottage cheese in this country at all, let us encourage making it off the farm, in the cities and elsewhere, and by that means add very materially to our food production. Therefore I have offered an amendment providing for an appropriation of \$53,000 for making cottage cheese off the farm. Apart from the fact that that relieves this appropriation from the charge of being class legislation, we make it universal; and if it be true that he blesses the world who makes two blades of grass grow where only one blade grew before, then think what a great benefit my amendment will confer upon the world, if it establishes the making of cottage cheese off the farm.

I hope, Mr. President, that when we reach that amendment in due course it will be unanimously adopted.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator how far off the farm it must be made?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, that reminds me of the old quotation:

Thou art so near, and yet so far!

If it is off the farm I do not think the authorities should discriminate as to distance. I have no doubt that the matter may become the subject of a number of technical rules of a department which will determine what is cottage cheese on the farm and what is cottage cheese off the farm; but if we particularize too much ourselves, I am afraid that we may invite the very difficulty which is suggested by the question of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether he has any remote notion as to what would result from an investigation of cottage cheese? What is the objective or the purpose of investigating cottage cheese?

Mr. THOMAS. This is not the investigating of cottage cheese; it is the making of cottage cheese.

Mr. PENROSE. Very well; it is the same thing.

Mr. THOMAS. The result of the investigation would depend upon the age of the cheese.

Mr. PENROSE. Are new purposes to be discovered by a variety of manufacture, or what is wrong with the way it has been made for 10,000 years?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I can not answer that question, because I had nothing to do with the insertion of this clause. My only concern is to rob it of the imputation of being class legislation and to extend its benefits to the making of cottage cheese off the farm as well as cottage cheese on the farm. I may say that I offered that amendment when the Senator was temporarily absent from the Chamber.

Mr. PENROSE. Does the Senator think the appropriation is large enough for this important purpose?

Mr. THOMAS. I made mine a little larger. I made mine \$53,000, first, because I believe in round numbers, and, second, because I think the disadvantages attending making cottage cheese off the farm are such that it is a few hundred dollars to the bad as compared with making cottage cheese on the farm.

Mr. PENROSE. That seems reasonable.

Mr. THOMAS. I thought I would convince the Senator from Pennsylvania, if I failed in other directions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of New Mexico in the chair). The question is on the amendment as amended. Without objection, it is agreed to.

Mr. KING. May the Secretary please report the amendment?

The SECRETARY. The amendment just agreed to is in line 19, to strike out "\$204,484" and to insert "\$4,484."

Mr. KING. I have an amendment to offer to the next paragraph, when that shall be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the amendment of the Senator from Utah was adopted, and now the question is on adopting the amendment as amended.

Mr. KING. I beg the Chair's pardon.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment is, in line 22, to strike out "\$2,136,028" and insert "\$1,610,155," so as to read "in all, \$1,610,155."

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to know whether the words "survey of the United States, \$449,700," were stricken out?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That item went over by request.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. This is an amendment to strike out "\$2,136,028" and substitute "\$1,610,155," and it covers several items such as city market service, \$66,131; direct market activities, \$85,100; special market activities, \$109,440. Is there anyone who can inform me what direct market activities are as distinguished from special market activities?

Mr. KING. I was just going to state to the Senator that I shall submit a motion at the proper time to strike out each of those items.

Mr. PENROSE. It seems to me the Senator on a little reflection will see that that is a very excellent reason for getting an additional appropriation by a different name.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Of course, I realize that those items are not a committee amendment, and it may not be strictly in order now to vote upon them; but they are a part of the total of \$2,136,000, which the committee amendment proposes to reduce to \$1,610,000. Therefore I thought it was pertinent to inquire what is meant by that language. It seems to me when we are taxing the people to the extent we are the Senate ought to know something about what these sums are and what the purposes are for which they are appropriating these sums and taxing the people. There is no word of explanation about it at all.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield.

Mr. KENDRICK. As the Senator from Pennsylvania has well said, it seems a pity that some member of the committee can not be present and explain these items in detail. I regret that I am not better informed, but it is my impression from experience with such things myself, and from a good deal of agitation on this particular subject, that the object to be served here is to bring to the consumers of products better information and better facilities for securing the products of the farm and of the ranch than are to be had at the present time.

There has been for some years a strong protest against a situation that increases so materially the prices of products to the consumer, as compared to the prices received by the producer, and undoubtedly these items are intended to serve the purpose of bringing the producer and consumer nearer together.

For the information of the Senator from Connecticut, I will say that there is now a strong movement on foot to establish in all the cities of the country at the largest consuming points municipal markets for all kinds of meat products, for the purpose of eliminating at least a part of the well-known excessive cost that is levied upon the consumer by the middlemen. I am not opposed to the middleman in his activities, I will say; but this question has been agitated, and there is an increasing effort to bring about a reform in that situation. I am persuaded that these items are intended to cover that point.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Now, Mr. President, that is just a sample of the way we are legislating. Here is a great supply bill, an appropriation bill, and when a Senator is asked for what purpose the three items to which I have called attention, aggregating \$260,671, as I figure it, over a quarter of a million dollars is to be devoted, the Senator says he assumes and presumes thus and so. The language of the bill allows the department to do anything they have a mind to do with the money. It does not limit them to any purpose whatever. They can say for direct market activities or for special market activities. They can do anything they want with the money. It is not wise legislation, and it ought not to appear here before the Senate from any committee that has not given it careful consideration.

That is all I have to say about it. Of course I know it will pass, but it is not my idea of a proper performance of our duties to pass items of that kind in this way and under this information.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. KING addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think it is almost a farce to try to consider a \$19,000,000 appropriation bill as this bill has been considered this afternoon. It is nearly 4 o'clock, and I think if Senators who are interested in this bill will not stay in the Chamber and it is not possible for us to keep a quorum here the Senate ought to adjourn and wait until a time when we can take up the bill and have Senators here.

Mr. KING. I will say to my colleague that that is the purpose for which I just addressed the Chair. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the Senator allow me to state the explanation the department gives of these three items?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator can do that to-morrow.

Mr. KING. I suggest to the Senator, if it meets his approval, he can do that to-morrow when more Senators will be present. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Utah moves that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, July 10, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, July 9, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

We bless Thee, our Father in heaven, for the law of compensation which follows the abnormal upheavals, physically, mentally, morally, in the course of human events. Hence, we confidently look forward to a readjustment of the political, social, and religious conditions when the war, which has shaken the world from center to circumference, shall have passed into history through a victory for right; when shams shall give way to the genuine, royalty shall be recognized by character, nobility by nobility of soul, and religion by a life hid in Thee; when all men shall be recognized as sons of the living God; in the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

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

### LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. ESCH. To prefer a request. I ask unanimous consent for an indefinite leave of absence for my colleague, Mr. DAVIDSON, on account of sickness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WHITE of Maine. I desire to ask unanimous consent for five weeks' leave of absence for Mr. GOODALL, on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent for five weeks' leave of absence for his colleague, Mr. GOODALL, on account of sickness. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

### SHIPPING LEGISLATION—CONFERENCE.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 12099 and ask unanimous consent to disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 12099, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire what the subject matter of this bill is.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is the bill we passed recently giving the President power to commandeer ships and regulate ocean freight rates.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12099) to confer on the President power to prescribe charter rates and freight rates and to requisition vessels, and for other purposes.

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

The Speaker announced the following conferees: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HARDY, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Mr. EDMONDS, and Mr. HADLEY.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, July 8, 1918.

HON. CHAMP CLARK,  
Speaker of the House.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I request leave of absence for one week to attend to personal business.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed) ALBERT F. POLK.

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



## DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES SUBJECT TO MILITARY DUTY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Secretary of Commerce, in response to House resolution 380, which communication was read, and with the accompanying list ordered printed in the RECORD and to lie on the Speaker's table:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, July 8, 1918.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,  
Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with House resolution No. 380, of June 3, 1918, I submit herewith statement showing the total number of employees of the Department of Commerce who were on January 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years and for whom request for exemption from military duty or for deferred classification has been asked by the department and allowed.

The statement gives the name and home address of each person, the character of work he is performing, and the length of time of such service. The principal reason for the action of the department in each case is given, with general explanations respecting each service.

The total number of employees of the department is approximately 10,000. In two services—the Bureau of the Census and the Steamboat-Inspection Service—no exemptions or deferred classifications have been asked. In the case of the Bureau of Navigation but one has been asked. The facts respecting the other five services are given in detail. In no case has exemptions or deferred classification been asked for any of the clerical staff except in so far as the chief clerk of the lighthouse depot at Tompkinsville, N. Y., engaged on naval work, may be considered such.

The statement for each bureau shows the total force subject to draft, the number entering military service, and those for whom deferred classification or exemption has been requested.

The statements under the heading of each service give the particular circumstances respecting that service.

Yours, very truly,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,  
Secretary.

## STATEMENT AS TO EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR WHOM CLAIMS FOR EXEMPTION OR DEFERRED CLASSIFICATION IN CONNECTION WITH ARMY DRAFT HAVE BEEN MADE AND ALLOWED.

## SUMMARY.

Exemptions	0
DEFERRED CLASSIFICATION.	
Office of the Secretary	0
Bureau of the Census	0
Steamboat-Inspection Service	0
Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce	18
Bureau of Navigation	1
Coast and Geodetic Survey	28
Bureau of Fisheries	8
Lighthouse Service	77
Bureau of Standards	229
Total	361

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

Out of an approximate number of 172 employees in the office of the Secretary, 16 have left for service in the Army or Navy. Of those now in the office, 20 are within the draft age, but no claims for exemption or deferred classification have been made.

## BUREAU OF THE CENSUS.

The expert statistical force of this bureau has rendered considerable assistance to the Provost Marshal General in connection with the Army draft and is now cooperating with other branches of the service in statistical work.

It has an office force of 638. Sixty employees have left for service in the Army or Navy. Forty-nine of its present employees are within the draft age, but no claims for exemption or deferred classification have been made.

## STEAMBOAT-INSPECTION SERVICE.

Extra duties have been devolved upon the personnel of this service by the examination of the increased number of candidates or officers for the enlarged merchant marine and other additional work in connection with the inspection of vessels being constructed and the materials used therein.

Out of a force of approximately 320 employees, 24 have left for service in the Army or Navy. Nineteen of its present employees are within the draft age. No claims for exemption or deferred classification have been made.

## BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC SERVICE.

Since the beginning of the war the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce has been the central information office for export and import statistics of the United States, for export and import statistics of foreign countries, for reports on the raw-material situation, the shipping situation, Government control of exports and imports, and similar important subjects of interest with reference to foreign countries. The United States Shipping Board, the War Trade Board, the Food Administration, the Fuel Administration, the Naval Consulting Board, the Military Intelligence Branch of the War Department, and other organizations engaged in war work have made constant demands on the bureau for economic and statistical information with reference to exports and imports, commodities, and foreign countries. The commercial-attaché service and the commercial agents, special agents, and trade commissioners of the bureau in foreign countries have been engaged largely in making investigations and reports on matters of war importance, particularly reports on the trade in important commodities. In addition to its statistical publications, the bureau has issued reports on Germany's foreign-trade organization, German trade and the war, reconstruction in France, and has published currently in its daily paper economic and trade reports and discussions of legislation having war significance.

Only six deferred classifications have been recommended of the entire staff in Washington, these recommendations referring only to men doing responsible administrative work; only four deferred classifications recommended for men in our district-office service, all four being trained men on responsible work; and the remaining recommendations all having reference to men in the foreign service who were appointed because of their special university and other qualifications for foreign service, and who could only be replaced with the greatest difficulty, with loss of time and efficiency, and at a substantial expense.

Elliot G. Mears, 3708 Patterson Street, Chevy Chase, D. C. Length of service: 2 years 11 months. Character of work and reason for claim: In direct charge of administrative work connected with the 11 foreign offices of the commercial-attaché service. Specialized education in business administration and years of administrative experience. Persons of equal qualifications and training not available.

Oliver C. Moles, 2607 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. Length of service: 3 years 2 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Expert in foreign trade-marks and on patent and trade-mark laws in foreign countries; good linguist; assistant chief of division. Persons with like qualifications very rare. Work would be seriously curtailed if the bureau lost his services.

Lynn W. Meekins, 109 Waverly Place, New York City. Length of service: 1 year 8 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Commercial agent in New York office of the bureau. The only trained man available for special work in that office. Good linguist, report writer; would require long training to replace him; all other agents of same type have entered military service. His withdrawal from the work would detract considerably from the value of the office at this time.

Paul J. Croghan, 1719 Willard Street NW., Washington, D. C. Length of service: 3 years and 9 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Assistant Chief of Trade Information Section. Thoroughly conversant with activities of the bureau and with sources of trade information throughout the country. Could not be replaced except by man with similar extensive experience; none available.

Harvey W. Haun, 1714 U Street NW., Washington, D. C. Length of service: 6 years and 7 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Chief of Auditing Division. Impossible at the present time to obtain men with a knowledge of Government methods of handling accounts, and separation of Mr. Haun with his experience would throw that branch of the work in great confusion. Failed to pass physical examination on first quota of draft.

Charles E. Herring, 1775 California Street NW., Washington, D. C. Length of service: 4 years and 4 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Chief of Division of Commercial Agents. Directing work of special investigators in this country and abroad. Linguist and trade expert. Separation of Mr. Herring would interfere seriously with investigations being made in foreign countries.

Thomas L. Gaukel, 3545 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. Length of service: 3 years and 7 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Assistant Chief of Division of District Offices. Expert in district-office management. About to be assigned to bureau's office at Chicago, Ill.

John F. Hurst, American Embassy, Petrograd, Russia. Length of service: 1 year and 2 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Secretary to commercial attaché at Petrograd, Russia. Practically impossible to find a man with his knowledge of European languages and experience in consular-office work who would be available for a position at the salary laid down.

Harold E. Everley, in South America traveling. Length of service: 1 year and 3 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Special agent investigating furniture markets in South America. If recalled would necessitate postponement of the investigation, the result of which is awaited with interest by manufacturers, as men of like qualifications could not easily be obtained; it took several months for bureau to find a man with proper equipment—Mr. Everley, who had had South American experience.

Arthur L. Hill, 1400 East Fifty-third Street, Chicago, Ill. Length of service: 2 years and 7 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Just returned from bureau work in Japan. Assistant to commercial agent in charge of Chicago office. Experienced in bureau and district-office work. About to be transferred to Washington as assistant to the chief of the Division of District Offices.

Norman L. Anderson, in foreign service at Christiania, Norway. Length of service: 1 year and 10 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Commercial agent at Christiania, Norway. Few suitable men available with knowledge of Scandinavian languages. Very desirable that Mr. Anderson should carry on the important work on which engaged; formerly in Army, was released for this very important mission.

John F. Butler, in foreign service at Paris, France. Length of service: 2 years and 8 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Clerk to commercial attaché at Paris, France. Experienced in work, been abroad for two years, services most valuable at present time and impossible to replace him without material loss to trade promotion interests; doing much war work in present capacity.

Axel H. Oxholm, in foreign service, traveling in Scandinavian countries. Length of service: 1 year and 7 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Special agent investigating markets for American lumber in Scandinavian countries. Knowledge of Scandinavian languages and experience in lumber trade. His recall would curtail investigation seriously and would involve a considerable waste of money spent.

T. O. Klath, 318 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York City. Length of service: 1 year 9 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Commercial agent in charge of the bureau's sample exhibit room at New York. Exhibit comprises samples of foreign-made goods collected at considerable expense throughout the world; requires a man with extensive bureau experience.

Paul L. Edwards, The Hague, Netherlands. Length of service: 3 years 6 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Commercial attaché at The Hague, Netherlands. Experienced in commercial attaché work. Because of his knowledge of foreign languages and his familiarity with conditions in Germany and the Netherlands since the outbreak of the war it is believed that he could not be replaced by any other man who would handle the work as he is now doing it. Only because of unusual equipment that such a young man appointed to such an important post. Doing much war work.

Lew B. Clark, in foreign service at Buenos Aires, Argentina. Length of service: 3 years. Character of work and reason for claim: Clerk to commercial attaché at Buenos Aires, Argentina. Considerable experience in South America, speaking Spanish like a native, and is of great value to bureau because of his qualifications and experience. He could be replaced with great difficulty.

Herman G. Brock, 2304 Woodridge Street NE., Washington, D. C. Length of service: 3 years 2 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Special agent making special commercial investigations in foreign countries. Has been investigating markets for American goods in South America for the past year and a half. Owing to his unusual language equipment (French, German, Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese) and his experience in South America and in district office work, his training renders him peculiarly valuable to the bureau. About to be sent to England to make commercial investigations and assist in war work.

Paul M. La Rose, 5015 Cabanne Avenue, St. Louis, Mo. Length of service: 2 years 11 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Commercial agent in charge of district office at St. Louis. By reason of experience the district work would be seriously hampered if his services were withdrawn; one of very few young men left in our district-office service, others having enlisted or been drafted.

Deferred classification was asked for 18 out of a total force of 175; 7 of the 18 are in service abroad.

The service has thus far lost 26 men in the draft from its Washington office alone.

#### BUREAU OF NAVIGATION.

One of the bureau's vessels, the *Dixie*, has been turned over to the Navy Department.

Eighteen members of the radio inspection force of this bureau have been transferred to the Army or Navy. A substitute radio service has been organized, and it is now conducting in five centers schools where radiotelegraphy is being taught without charge to those who desire to enter the military service of the United States as radio operators. No claims for exemption have been made for the force of this bureau, and only one claim for deferred classification, that of—

Arthur Batcheller, 103 Belvedere Street, Boston, Mass. Length of service: 1 year 3 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Radio inspector in charge of Boston office. Conducting an evening school.

#### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

A mere pro forma tabulation of those in the Coast and Geodetic Survey for whom deferred classification has been asked and granted without some explanation of how this bureau is peculiarly an adjunct of both arms of the military service under normal conditions and how essential are the results of its work to the Army and the Navy in the present emergency would be both misleading and unfair to the bureau. The personnel of the bureau is composed generally of persons of technical training along lines that require university education for admission and considerable experience after admission before they become proficient.

Such are the special qualifications of these technical men that Congress has provided legislation whereby, in time of national emergency, the President is authorized to transfer and commission them in the Army and the Navy. Under this authorization more than 70 of these technically qualified men have been transferred to the Army and the Navy by Executive order. Also, five vessels of the bureau with their crews have been transferred to the Navy Department by Executive order.

The withdrawal of so many of the technical employees of the bureau would be of little significance if the activities of the bureau could in this measure be decreased, but the bureau is still under weighty obligations to the Navy, the merchant marine, and even the Army in the matter of supplying navigation charts and in making emergency surveys. The bureau is responsible for the production of charts of the coasts of the United States and all outlying possessions. Further, the Navy has called upon the bureau for important confidential military surveys, and the Army has required special geodetic work as a basis for military maps of certain regions of our country.

To fulfill these war obligations the remaining technical personnel of the bureau, augmented from time to time by new employees as those properly qualified could be found, has been diligently employed, and it has been only for the purpose of saving to the bureau these technically qualified employees that the claim for deferred classification has been exercised.

For these reasons claims for deferred classification have been made for the following:

H. W. Hemple, 2326 South 60 Court, Cicero, Ill. Length of service: 9 months.

F. L. Gallen, Coast and Geodetic Survey. Length of service: 9 months.

Character of work and reason for claim: Deck officers. Engaged on wire-drag work at request of Navy Department. Deck officers come to the bureau through an exacting civil-service examination and must have university training before they are admitted to the examination.

Joe Belmont, Coast and Geodetic Survey. Length of service: 10 months.

E. Hanson, Coast and Geodetic Survey. Length of service: 1 year 1 month.

Character of work and reason for claim: Seamen. Seamen on survey vessels are also used as rodmen, leadsmen, etc. Experience necessary. If serving in merchant marine deferred classification would be granted.

Holger Simonsen, Coast and Geodetic Survey steamer *Patterson*, Seattle, Wash. Length of service: 1 year 2 months. Character of work: Quartermaster on steamer *Patterson*.

S. Sandelius, Coast and Geodetic Survey steamer *Patterson*, Seattle, Wash. Length of service: 4 years 1 month. Character of work: Boatwain, steamer *Patterson*.

Addison Kilgore, Coast and Geodetic Survey steamer *Patterson*, Seattle, Wash. Length of service: 1 year 2 months.

Fred Moe, steamer *Explorer*, Seattle, Wash. Length of service: 2 years 2 months.

James F. Gilbert, steamer *Explorer*, Seattle, Wash. Length of service: 5 years 1 month. Character of work: Assistants to engineer, steamers *Patterson* and *Explorer*.

M. Dean Graves, steamer *Patterson*, Seattle, Wash. Length of service: 9 months. Character of work: Chief writer, steamer *Patterson*.

E. Dahlstrom, steamer *Patterson*, Seattle, Wash. Length of service: 6 years 3 months. Character of work: Chief carpenter's mate, steamer *Patterson*.

Reasons for claim: Deferred classification in these cases were requested by reason of special qualifications and experience. If they were serving in the merchant marine they could obtain deferred classification.

Kenneth Reynolds, 424 East Capitol Street, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 3 years 6 months.

Wm. Evans Johnson, Apartment 24, The Alamo, 1233 Twelfth Street NW., Washington, D. C. Length of service: 8 years.

Samuel L. Rosenberg, 1705 Sixth Street NW., Washington, D. C. Length of service: 6 years 2 months.

Charles P. Geyer, 1128 East North Avenue, Baltimore, Md. Length of service: 1 year 2 months.

Frank B. Gehring, Jackson Avenue, near Montana Avenue, Raspeburg, Md. Length of service: 1 year 2 months.

H. S. Coe, 1838 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C. Length of service: 7 years 9 months.

John Mewes, 109 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year 1 month.

John H. Buscher, Good Hope, Anacostia Station, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year 1 month.

Thomas J. A. Shea, Jr., 94 Bates Street, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 4 years 6 months.

Gilbert Fayette Winslow, 103 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D. C. Length of service: 5 years 10 months.

Orland P. Sutherland, 1811 Wyoming Avenue, apartment 32, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year 10 months.

Nathaniel Pendleton White, St. Paul Street, Kensington, Md. Length of service: 3 years 4 months.

Walter D. Sutcliffe, 435 Tenth Street NE., Washington, D. C. Length of service: 4 years 11 months.

Joseph Zucker, 412 Eleventh Street NE., Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year 9 months.

Character of work and reasons for claim: These men are draftsmen, lithographic transferers, pressmen, computers, etc., engaged in the several branches connected with computations for and production of maps and charts for the use of the Army, Navy, and mercantile marine. Their withdrawal from the work would seriously delay the same.

Frank Neumann, Honolulu Magnetic Observatory, post-office box 48, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii. Length of service: 7 years 2 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Magnetic observer in charge of observatory near Honolulu. His withdrawal would result in a serious break in the observatory record, which has been continuous since 1902.

G. E. Maddox, steamer *Explorer*, Seattle, Wash. Length of service, 1 year 10 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Radio operator, steamer *Explorer*. If deferred classification were refused Mr. Maddox, he could enlist in the merchant-marine service and there obtain same.

E. Duvall Bromley, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Washington. Length of service: 1 year 1 month. Character of work and reason for claim: Observer in charge of field party. His withdrawal would seriously injure the work.

#### BUREAU OF FISHERIES.

The Bureau of Fisheries has turned over to the Navy Department four of its vessels, and is aiding in the war by special efforts to increase the use of fish as food by adding to the classes of fish accepted as such and by promoting the distribution and marketing of the same. It is also endeavoring to bring about a reduction in the price of fish hitherto wasted and to utilize waste products in the production of oil, fish feed, and fertilizers, also the extension of leather manufacture from fish skins.

Clarence A. Anderson, Seattle, Wash. Length of service: 1 year 1 month. Character of work and reason for claim: Instructing fishermen in the Pacific Coast States and in Alaska in the best methods of curing fish and in promoting effective cooperation between fishermen, dealers, and distributors. Deferred classification asked on account of his special knowledge of the important work of preserving fish as food. Work requested by governor of Alaska.

Harry J. Christoffers, London, Wis. Length of service: 7 years 10 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Engaged in promoting the use of neglected aquatic food products and expanding the production of aquatic leathers; miscellaneous work in connection with the fur-seal fisheries. Deferred classification asked on account of his services being needed on the Pribilof Islands and his special knowledge and experience in connection with the work there.

Donald R. Crawford, Key West, Fla. Length of service: 1 year 1 month. Character of work and reason for claim: Instructing fishermen and packers in the proper methods of preserving fish as food and in the investigation of problems affecting the food supply in various waters of the Gulf of Mexico.

James S. Gutsell, Ithaca, N. Y. Length of service: 1 year 8 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Investigations and experiments for the guidance of oyster planters, and for the production of an increased supply of food from coastal waters. Special knowledge and training for the work in which he is engaged.

Joseph Kemmerich, Blaine, Wash. Length of service: 9 years 7 months. Character of work and reason for claim: In charge of the Baker Lake (Wash.) fish hatchery. Special training in the particular branch of fish culture in which he is engaged.

Austin F. Shira, Fairport, Iowa. Length of service: 7 years 8 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Superintendent of the Fairport Laboratory, the work of which is, as a whole, directed to the increase of fish-food supplies from inland waters. Deferred classification requested on account of his experience and knowledge of fish culture and the utilization of fishery products.

William P. Studdart, Seattle, Wash. Length of service: 1 year 1 month. Character of work and reason for claim: Instructing fishermen in the Pacific Coast States and in Alaska in the best methods of curing fish and in promoting effective cooperation between fishermen, dealers, and distributors. Deferred classification requested on account of his special knowledge of methods of preserving fish as food.

Harden F. Taylor, District of Columbia. Length of service: 3 years. Character of work and reason for claim: Highly technical work and experiments which relate to the preservation and preparation of fish as food. Deferred classification requested on account of his experience and expert technical knowledge.

The total of statutory positions in this bureau held by men during the past fiscal year is 370. Among these positions there were, on June 30, 42 vacancies. The number of employees inducted into the military service to June 30 was 31.

No deferred classification was asked for any of the clerical staff of this service.

#### LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

Fifty vessels and a total personnel of 1,132 have been transferred to the Navy. The depots of the service have been utilized for berthing and repairing naval vessels. A large part of the space at Tompkinsville, N. Y., has been turned over to the Navy Department to be utilized as a naval base, and provides headquarters for 20 or more boats, with storehouses, offices, barracks, quarters, etc.

The efficient maintenance of the light-houses, light vessels, and other aids to navigation is of the utmost importance during war time to the vessels of the Navy as well as to all shipping. Exemptions asked have been only of persons indispensable to this end.

Reason for claims: Deferred classification was requested in the following cases because the employees were stationed on lighthouse vessels or at light stations of the highest importance to be maintained in an efficient manner, and these well-trained and tried men could not be replaced under present conditions without great difficulty, if at all.

Peter D. Ance, Charlevoix, Mich. Length of service: 7 years 7 months. Character of work: Master Grays Reef Light Vessel, Michigan.

Thomas L. Kelly, Key West, Fla. Length of service: 5 years 8 months. Character of work: Assistant keeper Carysfort Reef Light Station, Florida.

Axel Lorentzen, 458 Court Street, Brooklyn, N. Y. Length of service: 1 year 3 months. Character of work: Assistant engineer Five Fathom Bank Light Vessel, New Jersey.

Sverre Carlson, 203 Lafayette Avenue, Staten Island, N. Y. Length of service: 1 year 8 months. Character of work: Fireman Ambrose Channel Light Vessel, New York.

Francis T. Douglass, 121 East Eighty-eighth Street, New York. Length of service: 5 years 7 months. Character of work: Engineer Relief Light Vessel No. 51, Tompkinsville, N. Y.

Edwin H. Humburg, 643 Cauldwell Avenue, The Bronx, N. Y. Length of service: 1 year 7 months. Character of work: Assistant engineer Cornfield Point Light Vessel No. 48, Connecticut.

Roy L. Murphy, Ogdensburg, N. Y. Length of service: 9 months. Character of work: Assistant keeper Cleveland Harbor Lights, Ohio.

Samuel E. Crozier, Youngstown, N. Y. Length of service: 9 months. Character of work: Assistant keeper Cleveland Harbor Lights, Ohio.

Daniel C. Corlett, Cheboygan, Mich. Length of service: 1 year 10 months. Character of work: Engineer, Buffalo Light Vessel, New York.

Henrik G. Olsen, Aloha, Mich. Length of service: 9 years 9 months. Character of work: Assistant keeper, White Shoal Light Station, Mich.

Wesley Gray, 247 Cumberland Avenue, Portland, Me. Length of service: 3 years 6 months. Character of work: Assistant keeper, Halfway Rock Light Station, Me.

Peter Rasmussen, 124 Cedar Grove Avenue, New London, Conn. Length of service: 2 years 2 months. Character of work: Engineer, Cornfield Point Light Vessel, Conn.

George C. Birch, Lewes, Del. Length of service: 2 years 2 months. Character of work: Fireman, Overfalls Light Vessel No. 69, Del.

Herman F. Metevier, 200 State Street, Cheboygan, Mich. Length of service: 1 year 3 months. Character of work: Assistant engineer, Martin Reef Light Vessel, Mich.

Edward Kott, Calumet Harbor Light Station, South Chicago, Ill. Length of service: 4 years. Character of work: Assistant keeper, Calumet Harbor Light Station, Ill.

Carl A. Madsen, R. F. D. No. 4, Falmouth, Me. Length of service: 1 year 4 months. Character of work: Mate, Portland Light Vessel, Me.

Frank A. Davis, Duxbury Pier Light, Plymouth Harbor, Mass. Length of service: 1 year 11 months. Character of work: Keeper, Duxbury Pier Light, Mass.

James K. Halemau, Kailua, Hawaii, T. H. Length of service: 4 years 10 months. Character of work: Keeper, Kailua Light Station, Hawaii.

George Ah Choy, Kohala, Hawaii, T. H. Length of service: 1 year 3 months. Character of work: Keeper, Kahola Point Light Station, Hawaii.

Mark McDonough, Ketchikan, Alaska. Length of service: 6 months. Character of work: Fireman, lighthouse tender Cedar.

Andre H. Roness, Ketchikan, Alaska. Length of service: 7 months. Character of work: Quartermaster, lighthouse tender Cedar.

Nels M. Jensen, Ketchikan, Alaska. Length of service: 3 months. Character of work: Seaman, lighthouse tender Cedar.

Charles Nerup, Ketchikan, Alaska. Length of service: 4 years 7 months. Character of work: Boatswain, lighthouse tender Cedar.

Harry F. Howard, Ketchikan, Alaska. Length of service: 8 months. Character of work: Machinist, lighthouse tender Cedar.

James J. Jefferson, Ketchikan, Alaska. Length of service: 3 years 11 months. Character of work: Assistant engineer, lighthouse tender Cedar.

Fred. O. Daggett, Ketchikan, Alaska. Length of service: 8 months. Character of work: Machinist, lighthouse tender Cedar.

Thomas Donahay, Ketchikan, Alaska. Length of service: 5 months. Character of work: Seaman, lighthouse tender Cedar.

Charles R. Moore, Ketchikan, Alaska. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Second officer lighthouse tender Cedar.

Charles G. Johnson, Ketchikan, Alaska. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Fireman, lighthouse tender Cedar.

George L. Metzger, Ketchikan, Alaska. Length of service: 1½ months. Character of work: Seaman, lighthouse tender Cedar.

William H. Barton, Ketchikan, Alaska. Length of service: 4 years 8 months. Character of work: First officer lighthouse tender Cedar.

Francis Britt, Ketchikan, Alaska. Length of service: 5 months. Character of work: Quartermaster, lighthouse tender Cedar.

Robert Martin, Ketchikan, Alaska. Length of service: 7 months. Character of work: Quartermaster, lighthouse tender Cedar.

Ole Ericson, Bartlett Reef Light Vessel, Conn. Length of service: 7 months. Character of work: Seaman, Bartlett Reef light vessel, Conn.

Jack W. Storey, Ketchikan, Alaska. Length of service: 3 months. Character of work: Seaman, lighthouse tender Cedar.

Scotty O. Therrien, Mackinac Island, Mich. Length of service: 1 year 1 month. Character of work: Assistant keeper, Chicago Harbor Light Station, Ill.

John Freeman, 4610 West Willow Street, Seattle, Wash. Length of service: 9 months. Character of work: Seaman, Umatilla Reef Light Vessel No. 67, Wash.

John C. Taylor, Erma, N. J. Length of service: 7 months. Character of work: Seaman, Five-Fathom Bank Light Vessel No. 79, N. J.

Nicholas Eckel, 419 Chestnut Street, Detroit, Mich. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Assistant keeper, Rock of Ages Light Station, Mich.

Thomas J. Eckel, 419 Chestnut Street, Detroit, Mich. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Assistant keeper, Rock of Ages Light Station, Mich.

John H. Sullivan, Cross Village, Mich. Length of service: 3 years. Character of work: Assistant keeper, White Shoal Light Station, Mich.

Thomas F. Smith, 418 Customhouse, St. Louis, Mo. Length of service: 8 years. Character of work: Engineer, lighthouse tender Oleander.

Carlton Roberts, Key West, Fla. Length of service: 5 years 8 months. Character of work: Assistant keeper Alligator Reef Light Station, Fla.

Judson Colbeth, 847 Main Street, Westbrook, Me. Length of service: 3 months. Character of work: Assistant keeper Crabtree Ledge Light Station, Me.

Andrew Larsen, Brenton Reef Light Vessel, R. I. Length of service: 5 years 10 months. Character of work: Machinist, Brenton Reef Light Vessel No. 39, R. I.

Louis Hudak, Cheboygan, Mich. Length of service: 4 years 9 months. Character of work: Assistant keeper Spectacle Reef Light Station, Mich.

Reasons for claims: Deferred classification was requested in the following cases because of the same reasons stated for the preceding group, and also because the men named were stationed on vessels of the Lighthouse Service transferred to the Navy in accordance with law, and hence were actually in the naval service:

James L. Benjamin, Astoria, Ore. Length of service: 8 months. Character of work: Fireman, lighthouse tender Manzanita.

Axel E. J. Anderson, 1577 Harrison Street, Astoria, Ore. Length of service: 3 years 3 months. Character of work: Machinist, lighthouse tender Manzanita.

Ole J. Lilleoren, Astoria, Ore. Length of service: 5 years 8 months. Character of work: Second officer lighthouse tender Heather.

Henry Carlson, Astoria, Ore. Length of service: 2 years 9 months. Character of work: Machinist, lighthouse tender Manzanita.

Nicolas Schurzel, 471 Valley Street, San Francisco, Cal. Length of service: 6 months. Character of work: Assistant engineer lighthouse tender Manzanita.

Emil Raanti, 104 Washington Street, Astoria, Ore. Length of service: 2 months. Character of work: Fireman, lighthouse tender Manzanita.

Thorvald Thorkilson, Astoria, Ore. Length of service: 1 year 2 months. Character of work: Seaman, lighthouse tender Manzanita.

C. L. Nielsen, Astoria, Ore. Length of service: 1 year 6 months. Character of work: Seaman, lighthouse tender Heather.

Ben Larsen, Astoria, Ore. Length of service: 7 months. Character of work: Seaman, lighthouse tender Heather.

Ole Nelson, Astoria, Ore. Length of service: 1 year 7 months. Character of work: Seaman, lighthouse tender Manzanita.

Sverre Christensen, Astoria, Ore. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Quartermaster lighthouse tender Heather.

Marcus Jacobsen, Astoria, Ore. Length of service: 2 years. Character of work: Fireman, lighthouse tender Heather.

Lars Bjelland, Astoria, Ore. Length of service: 2 years 5 months. Character of work: Quartermaster lighthouse tender Heather.

Ole Volden, Astoria, Ore. Length of service: 1 month. Character of work: Seaman, lighthouse tender Columbine.

Gus Montague, Wanchese, N. C. Length of service: 4 years. Character of work: First officer lighthouse tender John Rodgers.

Hjalmar Herlin, 1381 Franklin Avenue, Astoria, Ore. Length of service: 3 months. Character of work: Quartermaster lighthouse tender Manzanita.

Ivar Brevik, 427 Thirtieth Street, Astoria, Ore. Length of service: 3½ months. Character of work: Seaman, lighthouse tender Manzanita.

Reason for claim: Deferred classification was requested in the following cases because these employees are engaged in repairing and installing illuminating apparatus peculiar to the Lighthouse Service, in which work they are specially skilled and could not be replaced without much delay, which would be seriously detrimental to the upkeep of the aids to navigation, especially essential during the continuance of the war:

Roger P. Leonard, 706 North Montford Avenue, Baltimore, Md. Length of service: 3 years 8 months. Character of work: Foreman machinist, Lazaretto Lighthouse Depot, Md.

Harry W. Howard, 376 Connecticut Street, Buffalo, N. Y. Length of service: 2 years 10 months. Character of work: Assistant mechanic, tenth lighthouse district.

William C. Helbig, Buffalo, N. Y. Length of service: 12 years 5 months. Character of work: Mechanician, tenth lighthouse district.

Sydney M. Falconer, Jr., 5425 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. Length of service: 3 years 4 months. Character of work and reason for claim: Draftsman, especially experienced in unusual problems presented by lighthouse work. It would be very difficult to obtain draftsman qualified for such work.

Thomas H. Soyster, 1401 Columbia Road NW., Washington, D. C. Length of service: 6 months. Character of work and reasons for claim: Marine draftsman, especially experienced in unusual problems presented by lighthouse work. It is now extremely difficult or impossible to obtain draftsman.

Reasons for claim: Deferred classification was asked for the following because these mechanics were specially trained in the work of the Lighthouse Service and are employed also on work done at the General Lighthouse Depot for the Navy Department, and it is extremely difficult under present conditions to fill their places:

Henry C. Kortbein, 464 Cary Avenue, West New Brighton, N. Y.: Length of service: 7 years. Character of work, boiler maker, general lighthouse depot, Tompkinsville, N. Y.

Frank A. Schneider, 124 Van Duzer Street, Tompkinsville, N. Y.: Length of service: 5 days. Character of work, boiler maker, general lighthouse depot, Tompkinsville, N. Y.

John J. Kendra, Great Kills, N. Y.: Length of service: 11 months. Character of work, blacksmith, general lighthouse depot, Tompkinsville, N. Y.

John J. Osinski, 56 John Street, Port Richmond, N. Y.: Length of service: 6 years 8 months. Character of work, boiler maker, general lighthouse depot, Tompkinsville, N. Y.

Roswell G. Lamb, 208 Richmond Turnpike, Staten Island, N. Y.: Length of service: 1 year 5 months. Character of work and reason for claim, employed on superintendence of construction and repair work and in drafting work, and has had especially valuable experience. It is practically impossible to fill existing vacancies in similar positions under the present conditions.

William P. Lynch, Ivy Road, Wilmington, Del.: Length of service, 4 years 3 months. Reld O'Meara, Hamilton, Md.: Length of service: 1 month. Character of work and reason for claims: Foremen, working party, fifth lighthouse district, in charge of repair and construction parties. Work of urgent military importance in connection with operations of naval and commercial vessels. Very difficult to replace these men.

Ward J. Lawton, 68 Berkeley Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.: Length of service: 3 years 10 months. Character of work and reason for claim, chief clerk, third lighthouse district, Tompkinsville, N. Y., in charge of the large office force at the general lighthouse depot, where much work is being done directly and indirectly for the Navy. Specially trained in work of this depot, and unable to replace with competent, experienced, and capable person.

#### BUREAU OF STANDARDS.

The work of this service is now almost wholly war work in connection with nearly all the branches of both the Army and Navy. For this purpose a force of 470 on April 1, 1917, has expanded to a total of 1,117 to-day. The demands from the military services come at an average rate of over 20 daily. Among the war activities are the development, production, or testing of various materials and instruments for aircraft parts and for military work, researches for materials for substitutes, cooperation in constructing and testing (to the number

of 5,000 monthly) of gauges for munition manufactures, inventing and developing devices for locating enemy batteries in the artillery service.

The employees named in the following are either scientific specialists, by training and qualifications peculiarly fitted for the work they do or are technical experts in the mechanical trades and in the lines of work on which they are engaged.

Deferred classification was requested in the cases named, because, first, the men are directly employed upon specific war activities; second, they are specially qualified by training and experience for such activities; third, it would be impossible to replace them (if that were possible at all) without seriously interrupting the progress of urgent war work:

Leon Adler, Champaign, Ill.: Length of service: 9 months. Character of work: research in chemical metallurgy, gases in steel, and the development of methods of limiting manganese in steel.

Max Albert, Pittsburgh, Pa.: Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: experimental cement researches for military departments.

Gilbert V. Anderson, Philadelphia, Pa. Length of service: 2 months. Character of work: Research and testing of military airplane motors.

H. A. Anderson, Brooklyn, N. Y. Length of service: 8 months. Character of work: Investigating the use of bakelite in propeller construction for airplanes and other materials for aircraft construction.

William C. Andrea, Baltimore, Md. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Designing apparatus and instruments for testing military master gauges used in the manufacture of munitions, Liberty motors, and Liberty trucks.

A. F. Beal, Marshall, Mich. Length of service: 9 months. Character of work: Testing of timepieces for the ships of the Emergency Fleet Corporation and for airplanes of the Signal Corps and testing stop watches for the Ordnance Department for the study of gun firing.

H. S. Bean, Stockton, Cal. Length of service: 7 months: Character of work: Engaged in the inspection and testing of master gauges for munitions, standard motor trucks, and Liberty motors.

E. H. Berger, York County, Pa. Length of service: 8 months. Character of work: Laboratory investigation of bituminous materials.

Robert W. Boreman, Middlebourne, W. Va. Length of service: 2 months. Character of work: Experimental investigation of airplane engine performance at high altitudes.

R. D. Bowker, Athol, Mass. Length of service: 5 months. Character of work: Investigation of sole leather for Army shoes.

H. A. Bright, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 5 years. Character of work: Expert engaged in the investigation and testing of cement materials required by the military departments.

W. B. Brown, Prec. 49, Alameda County, Cal. Length of service: 1 year. Character of work: Expert engaged in research on airplane motor radiators.

Roy W. Bruner, Wellsburg, W. Va. Length of service: 5 months. Character of work: Instrumental work on military problems.

S. M. Burka, Baltimore, Md. Length of service: 1 year and 1 month. Character of work: Engaged in study of the weathering of optical glass for military instruments and in the spectroscopic analysis of war materials.

K. A. Castleman, Ellicott City, Md. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Experimental investigation of airplane radiator performance.

W. C. Chapin, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year and 8 months. Character of work: Expert in the inspection of railroad track scales.

W. L. Cheney, Chardon, Ohio. Length of service: 8 months. Character of work: Research in connection with the testing of and specifications for the leather to be used in the manufacture of Army shoes.

E. R. Clark, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year. Character of work: Chemical work on textiles used in making military fabrics.

Simon Collier, Salem, Mass. Length of service: 3 months. Character of work: Research and testing of rubber supplies for military purposes.

E. W. Comamery, 1912 East Ninety-seventh Street, Cleveland, Ohio. Length of service: 5 months. Character of work: Development and testing of rifle lights and trench flares and of portable lights for the Army.

Arthur L. Conaty, Providence, R. I. Length of service: 2 months. Character of work: Testing of master gauges for munition plants.

W. E. Congdon, Portland, Me. Length of service: 3 months. Character of work: Development of technical standards practice codes for construction and operation of Government plants.

A. D. Conley, Portland, Me. Length of service: 1 year and 11 months. Character of work: Experimental development of new types of wall board to be used by the Army for the construction of cantonments and other structures here and in France.

J. W. Cook, 213 Second Street SE., Washington, D. C. Length of service: 5 years and 8 months. Character of work: Research problems for the military departments involving liquid air.

Rudolph A. Corvey, Newark, N. J. Length of service: 2 months. Character of work: Inspection and testing of electric lamps for military departments.

C. S. Cragoe, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 4 years. Character of work: Research on airplane spark plugs.

S. J. Crooker, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Research on telephone problems of special importance to military telephone service.

B. L. Cushing, Rockland, Mass. Length of service: 6 months. Character of work: Investigating the strength of materials for airplane construction.

H. J. Daignault, Woonsocket, R. I. Length of service: 2 months. Character of work: Testing military fabrics.

L. I. Dana, 1942 Calvert Street, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Standardization of temperature-measuring instruments for use in arsenals and industrial plants engaged on important war work.

H. A. Davis, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 6 years 10 months. Character of work: Problems involving expert knowledge of supplies required in war work.

R. Davis, 1422 Perry Place NW., Washington, D. C. Length of service: 6 years 10 months. Character of work: Applications of photography to military problems.

W. Davis, 900 Eleventh Street SE., Washington, D. C. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Testing Portland cement for military purposes.

L. H. Dawson, Needham, Mass. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Inspection of gauges used in the manufacture of munitions.

J. H. Dellinger, Montgomery County, Md. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Military research on radio communications.

E. E. Dickson, Chicopee, Mass. Length of service: 6 months. Character of work: Testing of military fabrics and research on the design of balloon and airplane fabrics.

A. Domovsky, 1116 Trenton Avenue, New York City. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Testing military supplies.

R. C. Duncan, 5001 Irving Street, Philadelphia, Pa. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Development of electrical equipment for military purposes.

J. R. Dwyer, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 7 months. Character of work: Testing Portland cement for the War and Navy Departments.

William J. A. Ebert, Northampton, Pa. Length of service: 8 months. Character of work: Testing of Portland cement for the War and Navy Departments.

Arthur F. Eckle, Chicago, Ill. Length of service: 7 months. Character of work: Computing and design of military optical instruments.

E. A. Eckhardt, Philadelphia, Pa. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Developing military apparatus.

C. R. Edwards, Chester County, Pa. Length of service: 4 years 2 months. Character of work: Inspection of railroad track scales.

Junius D. Edwards, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 4 years 10 months. Character of work: Military aircraft problems.

Samuel W. Epstein, Warren, Pa. Length of service: 1 year. Character of work: Analysis of rubber materials.

A. J. Erichsen, Atlantic City, N. J. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Testing of adhesives for military purposes.

Fred H. Engles, Kingfisher, Okla.: Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Making of apparatus and appliances used in the military researches of the bureau.

C. A. Fairchild, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 3 years and 2 months. Character of work: Engaged in precision measurements of high temperature and heat tests for military departments.

F. Finklestein, Boston, Mass. Length of service: 1 year and 11 months. Character of work: Testing of thermometers to supply the demands of military departments.

M. F. Fischer, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 4 years and 7 months. Character of work: Engaged in testing compasses for the Signal Corps and Shipping Board.

J. C. Fisher, Berkeley County, W. Va. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Military investigation for the Army and Navy.

John Henry Fisher, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 4 months. Character of work: Military research on new cylinder pressures in aeronautic engines of military airplanes.

Russell T. Fisher, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 8 months. Character of work: Design and construction of apparatus for investigating military fabrics.

R. O. Fitch, Washington, D. C.: Length of service: 4 years and 11 months. Character of work: Military problems, including materials used in construction of cantonments and hospital buildings.

P. D. Foote, Pittsburgh, Pa. Length of service: 6 years and 11 months. Character of work: High temperature testing and research work which the bureau is doing for the several military bureaus, arsenals, etc.

E. L. Fonseca, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year and 6 months. Character of work: Technical investigation of spark-plug behavior in military airplane engines and handling spark-plug tests for the Signal Corps.

R. D. France, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 9 months. Character of work: Ingot investigation and manganese investigation, both of fundamental military importance.

Leopold Freedman, New York City. Length of service: 7 months. Character of work: Construction of apparatus required directly for military use.

H. M. Freeman, Monongalia County, W. Va. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Testing and development of radio apparatus required by both the Army and Navy.

J. R. Freeman, jr., Providence, R. I. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Development of light aluminum alloys for aviation.

I. H. Fuller, Elyria, Ohio. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Inspector of gauges for munitions, Army motor trucks, and Liberty motors.

Barnett D. Gordon, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 5 months. Character of work: Research on the properties of balloon gases.

D. Goren, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 3 years and 8 months. Character of work: Work for the improvement of methods of locating hostile batteries.

W. S. Gorton, Baltimore, Md. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Work on military applications of X-ray apparatus.

Thomas P. Green, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 7 years and 7 months. Character of work: Most important duties in the care, distribution, and keeping records of stocks of chemicals used in the tests made for military departments.

Albert H. Greenwald, Pittsburgh, Pa. Length of service: 5 years and 5 months. Character of work: Inspecting and testing cement which is bought by the Government for use of the War Department.

Morris C. Gregory, Corning, N. Y. Length of service: 1 year. Character of work: Manufacture of optical glass for the use of the Army and Navy.

Marcus A. Grossman, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 9 months. Character of work: Study of coated metallurgical material for aviation.

Kasson S. Gibson, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year and 6 months. Character of work: Engaged in making optical investigation in ultraviolet spectrophotometry.

Louis J. Gurevich, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year and 10 months. Character of work: Investigation of physical metallurgical methods of platinum testing for purity, and the development of platinum substitutes, in response to direct requests from military departments.

A. E. Hanson, Quincy, Mass. Length of service: 1 year and 9 months. Character of work: Testing and inspection of gauges used in the manufacture of munitions, Army trucks, and Liberty motors.

T. R. Harrison, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year and 11 months. Character of work: High-temperature experimentation for the Military Establishments.

R. W. Hart, Stamford, Conn. Length of service: 8 months. Character of work: Testing of and specifications for leather used in the manufacture of Army shoes.

- J. M. Hartman, Junction City, Kans. Length of service: 6 months. Character of work: Determining the reliability of various extensometers for use in the inspection of shells and shrapnel.
- F. W. Hartman, Milwaukee, Wis. Length of service: 7 months. Character of work: Tests on steel used in airplane construction.
- A. R. Harvey, Butler County, Ohio. Length of service: 5 months. Character of work: Investigation of radiator design for both Army and Navy.
- A. S. Hathaway, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year and 9 months. Character of work: Inspector of construction on the new war emergency laboratory and other emergency buildings.
- B. D. Hathcock, Pittsburgh, Pa. Length of service: 1 year and 10 months. Character of work: Tests on rope, cable, porcelain, insulators, steel, cement, and other engineering materials used in military construction.
- R. H. Heald, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 4 months. Character of work: Engaged in testing of airplane models and equipment.
- A. M. Heinzlemann, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 2 years and 2 months. Character of work: Testing of ink and ink products, especially on secret inks, for the Bureau of Navy Intelligence.
- Mayo D. Hersey, City Hall, Cambridge, Mass. Length of service: 7 years and 10 months. Character of work: Testing of airplane instruments for military purposes.
- Walter J. Hinkle, Pittsburgh, Pa. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Engaged in the manufacture of optical glass for military purposes and the making of military optical instruments.
- B. H. Hirschensohn, Newport, R. I. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Testing of the haemacytometer pipettes used in the Army and Navy hospitals, and in testing glass volumetric apparatus.
- Earle D. Hoats, Northampton, Pa. Length of service: 7 years and 11 months. Character of work: Testing Portland cement for military purposes.
- O. J. Hodge, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year and 11 months. Character of work: Investigation work of water-current meters in the development of water resources, and engaged in making tests of immediate military urgency.
- C. P. Hoffman, Hudson County, N. J. Length of service: 1 year and 5 months. Character of work: Technical manipulator of the large testing machine which is in constant use for military researches on cast-steel motor-truck wheels for the Army trucks, etc.
- L. A. Hoffman, Boston, Mass. Length of service: 6 months. Character of work: Research work on the aeronautic instruments.
- F. S. Hoibrook, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 8 years and 10 months. Character of work: Supervisor of bureau's track-scale testing equipments used in the testing of railroad-track scales.
- H. D. Holler, Columbus, Ohio. Length of service: 3 years and 4 months. Character of work: Electroplating of military materials, chemical investigation of dry cells for military uses.
- R. K. Honoman, Lancaster, Pa. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Engaged in important airplane investigation for the aviation service of Signal Corps.
- H. Inslay, Haverstraw, N. Y. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Testing optical glass for military instruments and in petrographic research on silica brick, porcelain, and other ceramic materials required in military work.
- A. Isaacs, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 4 years and 7 months. Character of work: Technical problems connected with refrigeration of great importance to the Military Establishments.
- I. M. Jacobsohn, Chicago, Ill. Length of service: 1 year and 4 months. Character of work: Analysis of metallic materials used by the military branches of the Government.
- W. S. James, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 7 years. Character of work: Expert in charge of military investigations and the design of cooling radiators for use on military airplanes.
- L. Jordan, Urbana, Ill. Length of service: 5 months. Character of work: Research on problems of a special military importance.
- A. Joseshof, New York, N. Y. Length of service: 6 months. Character of work: Expert inspector of gauges for munitions.
- L. V. Judson, Worcester, Mass. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Determinations of precision measurements of standards for testing meter gauges in the manufacture of munitions and standardizing munition gauges.
- H. J. Kaiser, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 7 years 7 months. Character of work: Construction of apparatus required in the military researches for the military departments.
- J. C. Karcher, Hennessey, Okla. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Confidential scientific investigations for new and improved methods of locating hostile batteries.
- W. Kinney, Northampton, Pa. Length of service: 5 months. Character of work: Testing and investigating Portland cement required for military purposes.
- Frank A. Kirkpatrick, Pittsburgh, Pa. Length of service: 1 year 8 months. Character of work: Investigations of lime and gypsum of special value in Government construction work.
- R. S. Jessup, Baskerville, Va. Length of service: 1 year 9 months. Character of work: Investigations in the heat laboratories of the bureau for military purposes.
- J. A. Keehn, 30 Miller Street, Rochester, N. Y. Length of service: 6 months. Character of work: Construction of apparatus especially designated for testing gauges used in the manufacture of munitions of war.
- W. J. Keiss, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 7 years 9 months. Character of work: Inspecting Portland cement for military purposes.
- R. Kleinoshmidt, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 9 months. Character of work: Investigation of the design and construction of airplane radiators.
- Howard B. Knowles, Taunton, Mass. Length of service: 4 years 11 months. Character of work: Military testing for the Ordnance Department to insure the soundness and other qualities in the metals used in the manufacture of munitions and other military supplies.
- Clarence E. Lane, Corydon, Iowa. Length of service: 2 months. Character of work: Development of methods and apparatus for locating enemy batteries.
- O. A. Lansche, Brighton, Ill. Length of service: 1 year and 8 months. Character of work: Installation of equipment for the testing of military airplane engines under high altitude conditions.
- L. J. Larson, Champaign, Ill. Length of service: 1 year and 10 months. Character of work: Military researches on airplane woods.
- C. S. Lauby, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 3 years and 11 months. Character of work: Important structural materials, research work for the Navy Department.
- E. B. Laughlin, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 6 years and 9 months. Character of work: Inspection and testing of master gauges.
- P. G. Ledig, Alta Loma, Cal. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Investigations of military aircraft problems.
- A. J. Lewis, Rockland, Mass. Length of service: 1 year and 5 months. Character of work: Analysis of varnishes, linseed oil, etc.
- H. A. Linendoll, Champaign, Ill. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Investigation and tests of coated metals for military airplane construction.
- M. B. Long, Lincoln, Nebr. Length of service: 8 months. Character of work: Standardizing the radiation of quartz mercury vapor lamps for fabrics, also developing a radiometric signaling device for military purposes.
- F. D. Lowell, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 5 years and 4 months. Character of work: Calibration of radio instruments required by the Army and Navy radio services.
- G. E. Lund, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 9 months. Character of work: Construction of apparatus required for military use.
- W. O. Lytle, 1313 Vermont Street, Lawrence, Kans. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Radio investigations and military tests involving radio problems.
- Oscar L. Maag, Pittsburgh, Pa. Length of service: 3 months. Character of work: Manufacture of optical glass for military instruments.
- G. V. Maconi, New Haven, Conn. Length of service: 1 month. Character of work: Special tests on concrete to find a lightweight concrete of suitable building strength for shipbuilding.
- F. W. Martin, Boston, Mass. Length of service: 5 years and 7 months. Character of work: Testing thermometers for the military departments.
- J. J. R. Martin, Bridgeport, Conn. Length of service: 5 months. Character of work: Testing master gauges for military purposes.
- L. O. Maxwell, Urbana, Ill. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Working on steels to be used for military purposes.
- R. S. McBride, 20 Hesketh Street, Chevy Chase, Md. Length of service: 8 years and 9 months. Character of work: Researches involving gas production, quality and distribution.
- F. J. McGrath, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 9 months. Character of work: Experimental study of the heat-retaining properties of military clothing materials.
- H. J. McNicholas, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year and 10 months. Character of work: Study of military glasses having selective color absorption, a subject of importance to the military departments.
- A. T. McPherson, Austin, Tex. Length of service: 4 months. Character of work: Confidential researches on certain gases used in warfare.
- W. F. Meggers, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 4 years. Character of work: Highly technical work having direct military application.
- Lewis L. Mellor, Cleveland Heights, Ohio. Length of service: 4 months. Character of work: Testing and investigation of optical military instruments for the use in the war.
- P. D. Merica, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 3 years and 10 months. Character of work: Development and investigation of light alloys for aircraft construction.
- P. W. Merrill, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year and 11 months. Character of work: Technical problems in optical glass production for military purposes.
- G. E. Merritt, New York City, N. Y. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: In charge of the index measurements of optical glass, a work of great military importance.
- C. H. Meyers, Gresham, Oreg. Length of service: 4 years and 1 month. Character of work: Engaged on military investigations involving his expert knowledge and skill in heat measurements.
- R. F. Miller, Altoona, Pa. Length of service: 1 year and 6 months. Character of work: Testing haemacytometer for use in Army and Navy hospitals and glass volumetric apparatus used in munitions laboratories.
- H. H. Moore, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 3 years 5 months. Character of work: Design and construction of apparatus for naval-gun firing.
- I. L. Moore, Worcester, Mass. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Investigations of military aircraft problems.
- R. Morgan, Cambridge City, Ind. Length of service: 6 months. Character of work: Measurement of inductance coils and condensers for the Army and Navy radio service.
- R. C. Morse, Humboldt County, Iowa. Length of service: 6 months. Character of work: Testing master gauges used in the manufacture of munitions, etc.
- D. J. Murphy, 95 Soho Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. Length of service: 1 year 9 months. Character of work: Inspecting and testing cement used by the military departments.
- H. A. Nelson, McPherson, Kans. Length of service: 8 months. Character of work: Analysis of chemicals of direct importance in military problems.
- P. F. Newell, Pittsburgh, Pa. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Testing ropes, cables, porcelain, insulators, and other engineering materials for the military departments.
- T. W. Nunheimer, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 6 months. Character of work: Construction of apparatus required by the bureau for making researches on military problems.
- C. E. Oakes, Benton, Oreg. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Engaged on technical standard quality for electric service.
- G. F. O'Conner, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year 10 months. Character of work: Investigations on refrigeration, the results of which are being used for military purposes.
- C. A. Osborne, Ames, Iowa. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Inspection of master gauges used in the manufacture of Liberty motor trucks and munitions of war.
- R. S. Ould, Oswego County, N. Y. Length of service: 3 months. Character of work: Experimental work on radio communication for military purposes.
- Albert W. Owens, Champaign, Ill. Length of service: 3 months. Character of work: Preparing the light alloys used in the construction of military aircraft.
- E. C. Patrick, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 5 years 9 months. Character of work: Testing of rubber products for military purposes.
- S. R. Parson, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 5 months. Character of work: Engine testing to determine the performance of military aircraft engines at high altitudes.

W. E. Parson, Pittsburgh, Pa. Length of service: 1 year 6 months. Character of work: Inspecting and testing Portland cement for the military departments.

A. R. Payne, San Diego, Cal. Length of service: 6 months. Character of work: Designing and testing of optical instruments for use by the Army and Navy.

Albert B. Peck, Pittsburgh, Pa. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Testing optical glass, etc.

G. G. Peters, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 5 years. Character of work: Measurement of expansion coefficients of small samples and interferometry, the results of which are used by the military departments.

F. P. Phelps, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 6 years 4 months. Character of work: Appraisal of raw sugar and standardization of quartz-control plates used by the Customs Service as technical basis for collection of import duties.

S. F. Pickering, Elyria, Ohio. Length of service: 7 months. Character of work: Engaged in testing balloon fabric.

E. S. Purington, Mechanics Falls, Me. Length of service: 2 years 10 months. Character of work: Experimental work on a military problem of great importance to the Army and Navy.

S. N. Quick, Fairfax, Va. Length of service: 8 months. Character of work: Inspecting the master gauges used in the manufacture of munitions of war, Army trucks, etc.

R. L. Tempilin, Minneapolis, Kans. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Designing a thrust and torque meter to determine actual engine performance of airplane engines under service conditions.

R. L. Rankin, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 8 months. Character of work: Inspector of gauges for munitions, standard motor trucks, and Liberty motors.

J. F. Rawson, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 5 months. Character of work: Construction of apparatus specially designed for the testing of master gauges.

Albert Rebsamen, Sharpsburg, Pa. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Technical manufacture of optical glass for military purposes for both Army and Navy.

J. A. Reinhardt, East St. Louis, Ill. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Construction of apparatus required directly for military use or in military research.

Lamar Ritchie, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 7 months. Character of work: Protective electroplating of military materials and equipment.

O. Rognaly, Minneapolis, Minn. Length of service: 5 months. Character of work: Design and testing of navigation compasses.

H. M. Rosser, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 month. Character of work: Testing balances, weights, scales, and other weighing apparatus demanded by both Army and Navy.

G. P. Rourke, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 5 months. Character of work: Manufacture of master gauges, testing apparatus.

Herbert F. Royal, Barnstable, Mass. Length of service: 3 months. Character of work: Manufacture of optical glass for military instruments for Army and Navy.

T. P. Sager, Syracuse, N. Y. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Investigations and tests of bituminous materials for the military departments.

P. A. B. Sahn, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 7 months. Character of work: Developing standards for the operation of electric-service stations.

N. J. Schaal, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Expert inspector of master gauges used in the manufacture of munitions of war.

Merrill K. Scheiner, Northampton, Pa. Length of service: 5 years and 7 months. Character of work: Engaged in testing and inspecting Portland cement for the War and Navy Departments.

R. B. Strang, Brooklyn, N. Y. Length of service: 1 year 8 months. Character of work: Engaged in the Government inspection of railroad-track scales and other scales.

C. L. Stretch, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 8 months. Character of work: Expert inspector of master gauges for munitions, Army motor trucks, and Liberty motors.

Tom L. Sorey, Oklahoma City, Okla. Length of service: 6 months. Character of work: Working on the measurement of the hardness of the steel used in munitions on problems affecting the efficiency of manufacture.

Walter J. Stampfle, North Pittsburgh, Pa. Length of service: 8 months. Character of work: Engaged in the manufacture of optical glass for military purposes.

Howard O. Stearns, Haverhill, Mass. Length of service: 4 months. Character of work: Developing and testing oxygen-control apparatus for use of the military aviators at high altitudes.

R. C. Sylvander, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 6 months. Character of work: Engaged on research work on aeronautic instruments.

C. S. Taylor, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 4 years 8 months. Character of work: Engaged in investigations and problems of refrigeration and purification of materials required for both Army and Navy.

William H. Taylor, Pittsburgh, Pa. Length of service: 1 year 8 months. Character of work: Expert in charge of the testing of optical glass furnished to the Navy Department for making gun sights, range finders, periscopes, etc.

F. J. Schlink, Peoria, Ill. Length of service: 4 years 10 months. Character of work: Engaged in routing, expediting, and collating the results of urgent military researches and tests.

H. Scott, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 5 years 8 months. Character of work: Engaged in metallurgical testing and investigations, thermal analysis, and heat treatment of metals for military purposes.

M. D. Shannon, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 4 years 3 months. Character of work: Engaged on the special and confidential military and technical photographing of apparatus appliances and of tests of a military nature.

H. I. Shultz, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 4 year 8 months. Character of work: Designing and testing optical systems, and in charge of work of great military importance.

F. B. Silsbee, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 6 years 8 months. Character of work: Engaged on urgent investigations for the aviation work of the Signal Corps.

Benjamin E. Sive, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year 11 months. Character of work: Investigation of chemical reagents, a work of special importance and urgency under the present war conditions.

Tom S. Sligh, Bellefonte, Pa. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Working on important and confidential military research for use of the Signal Corps.

G. A. Smith, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year and 4 months. Character of work: Important research for the Navy Department and the Shipping Board.

W. H. Smith, Philadelphia, Pa. Length of service: 7 years 10 months. Character of work: Expert on military airplane dopes for wing fabric, engaged in military work.

C. F. Snyder, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 8 years 6 months. Character of work: Check testing the appraisal of raw sugar and molasses by optical methods.

B. A. Solotaroff, 1440 Crotona Park East, Bronx, N. Y. Length of service: 1 year 7 months. Character of work: Portland-cement testing and inspecting for the War and Navy Departments.

G. C. Southworth, Crawford, Pa. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Engaged in testing and development of radio apparatus for military purposes.

W. H. Stannard, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 9 years 5 months. Character of work: Engaged in designing electrical instruments and experimental military work for the War Department.

H. F. Stimson, Leicester, Mass. Length of service: 2 years. Character of work: Engaged on important technical military investigations.

S. H. Stobbe, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 4 years and 9 months. Character of work: Construction of apparatus required for military use.

W. G. Stretch, Meridan, Conn. Length of service: 6 months. Character of work: Construction of apparatus specially designed for the testing of master gauges in the manufacture of munitions of war.

M. S. Strock, Denver, Colo. Length of service: 6 months. Character of work: Testing electrical materials for use of the military and other departments of the Government.

H. H. Turner, Chicago, Ill. Length of service: 5 months. Character of work: Design and construction of aeronautic engine and accessories.

E. P. T. Tyndall, Richmond, Va. Length of service: 9 months. Character of work: Testing the efficiency of searchlights and the application of color screens in connection with protective coloration.

Fred P. Upton, Boston, Mass. Length of service: 7 months. Character of work: Development and test of airplane models, propellers, and airplane parts.

J. Valasek, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year and 1 month. Character of work: High temperature measurements to meet the demands made by the Military Establishment arsenals.

M. S. Van Dusen, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 3 years and 10 months. Character of work: Scientific and technical investigations on refrigerations for military purposes.

H. L. Van Keuren, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 4 years. Character of work: Testing and inspection of master gauges for war munitions, etc.

L. E. Voorhees, Champaign, Ill. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Investigation of airplane radiator designs.

E. D. Walen, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 3 years and 6 months. Character of work: Experiments on military fabrics such as airplane wings, balloon fabrics, blankets, uniform cloths, etc.

C. O. Walden, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 6 months. Character of work: Operation of engines devoted to the investigation of ignition problems and the development of spark plugs.

R. G. Waltemberg, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 5 years and 10 months. Character of work: Investigative tests of metals of a miscellaneous nature submitted by the military departments.

G. E. Washburn, Lexington, Mass. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: In charge of the rachometer work of vital importance as part of airplane equipment.

E. R. Weaver, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 6 years and 1 month. Character of work: Engaged on gas problems of vital importance to military operations.

F. C. Weaver, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 7 years and 11 months. Character of work: In charge of optical shop and of the optical work of a military nature.

L. Wechsler, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year and 9 months. Character of work: Engaged on the analysis of nonferrous alloys for the War Department.

R. V. Wells, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 5 years. Character of work: Expert in turbidity—a subject of great importance in the production of optical glass for both the Army and Navy Departments.

F. V. Wetherill, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 1 year and 2 months. Character of work: In charge of service tests of spark plugs for aeronautic use of the military aviation service.

H. T. Wenzel, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: In charge of the testing of binoculars and other military optical instruments.

F. A. Wertz, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 5 years 4 months. Character of work: Testing and investigation of paint materials for the military departments.

L. M. Whitmore, Madison, Wis. Length of service: 1 year. Character of work: Problems of military importance, such as leather testing and analysis.

E. Wichers, Zeeland, Mich. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Study of metals of the platinum group which has a direct bearing on military needs.

J. A. Willoughby, Florence, S. C. Length of service: 2 years 2 months. Character of work: Radio work, particularly in making careful measurements in connection with radio work.

B. S. Willis, Wasca County, Minn. Length of service: 9 months. Character of work: Engaged in the testing of military instruments.

R. M. Wilhelm, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 9 years 9 months. Character of work: In charge of thermometer testing, working almost exclusively to satisfy the demands of the military departments.

H. W. Wilber, Keensville, Tex. Length of service: 9 months. Character of work: Steel analysis for the military branches of the Government.

G. M. Williams, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 6 years 10 months. Character of work: Chief inspector of construction on new War Emergency Laboratory and other emergency buildings.

F. M. Washburn, Minneapolis, Minn. Length of service: 10 months. Character of work: Investigation of aeronautic instruments, especially tachometers and other measuring instruments used in military aviation.

L. E. Whittemore, Topeka, Kans. Length of service: 9 months. Character of work: Study of problems in radio work for both Army and Navy Departments.

B. W. Woodward, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 3 years 7 months. Character of work: Researches on the failure of railway materials and the investigation of properties and production of sound ingots—a problem of greatest importance in munition manufacture.

J. W. Wright, Champaign, Ill. Length of service: 11 months. Character of work: Working out of new special glass pots used for the melting of optical glass used by both the Army and Navy.

W. R. Wright, Ann Arbor, Mich. Length of service: 9 months. Character of work: Investigating problems of great military importance.

L. B. Wylie, Chicago, Ill. Length of service: 7 months. Character of work: Expert tester of watches, clocks, and other instruments required for the ships of the United States Shipping Board and for use on airplanes.

L. Yurow, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 4 years 6 months. Character of work: Analysis of rubber materials used by military branches of the Government.

Edward D. Gordon, Washington, D. C. Length of service: 3 years 5 months. Character of work: Technical problems on munitions and master gauges.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4000. An act to authorize corporations organized in the District of Columbia to change their names;

S. 3835. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to vest in the Commissioners of the District of Columbia control of street parking in said District";

S. 3864. An act to add certain lands to the Minam National Forest, Oreg.;

S. 4524. An act to validate the homestead entry of Lizzie G. Garlin;

S. 2323. An act authorizing Anton Hiersche to select other land in lieu of land now owned by him, required for reclamation purposes;

S. 4527. An act authorizing the payment of indemnities to the Government of Greece for injuries inflicted on its nationals during riots occurring in South Omaha, Nebr., February 21, 1909;

S. 4728. An act to authorize the payment of \$2,000 to the Government of Japan for the benefit of the family of Tatsuji Saito, a Japanese subject, killed at Camp Geronimo, Mexico, May 25, 1916;

S. 4225. An act for the relief of the Atlas Lumber Co.; Babcock & Willeox; Johnson, Jackson & Corning Co.; and the C. H. Klein Brick Co., each of which companies furnished to Silas N. Opdahl, a failing Government contractor, certain building materials which were used in the construction of Burke Hall at the Pierre Indian School in the State of South Dakota;

S. 4146. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to determine and report upon the interest, title, ownership, and right of possession of the Yankton Tribe of Indians to the Red Pipestone Quarries, South Dakota;

S. 108. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to use at his discretion surplus moneys in the Treasury in the purchase or redemption of the outstanding interest-bearing obligations of the United States;

S. 110. An act for the relief of the Eldredge Bros. Live Stock Co., a corporation;

S. 3995. An act to amend section 224 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to certificates of discharge;

S. 4739. An act to fix the annual salary of the collector of customs for the district of North Carolina;

S. 2885. An act for the relief of the estate of Moses M. Bane;

S. 4562. An act to reimburse Horace A. Choumard, chaplain in Twenty-third Infantry, for loss of certain personal property;

S. 4460. An act for the relief of Walston H. Brown, sole surviving partner of the firm of Brown, Howard & Co. and of the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co.;

S. 4679. An act to provide for the disposition of abandoned lighthouse and life-saving stations;

S. 4742. An act for the relief of the Yosemite Stone Co.; and

S. 500. An act for the relief of John Murphy.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12229) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment the bill (H. R. 11231) to regulate the hours of duty of the officers and members of the fire department of the District of Columbia, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution of the following title:

H. J. Res. 313. Joint resolution providing for the disposition of moneys represented in the Alfred Bernard Nobel peace prize awarded in 1906.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 12100) to amend the act approved September 7, 1916, entitled "An act to establish a United States Shipping Board for the purpose of encouraging, developing, and creating a naval auxiliary and naval reserve and a merchant marine to meet the requirements of the commerce of the United States with its Territories and possessions and with foreign countries; to regulate carriers by water in the foreign and interstate commerce of the United States; and for other purposes," in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 4460. An act for the relief of Walston H. Brown, sole surviving partner of the firm of Brown, Howard & Co., and of the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4524. An act to validate the homestead entry of Lizzie G. Garlin; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 500. An act for the relief of John Murphy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2323. An act authorizing Anton Hiersche to select other land in lieu of land now owned by him, required for reclamation purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 4000. An act to authorize corporations organized in the District of Columbia to change their names; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2885. An act for the relief of the estate of Moses M. Bane; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4225. An act for the relief of the Atlas Lumber Co.; Babcock & Willeox; Johnson, Jackson & Corning Co.; and the C. H. Klein Brick Co., each of which companies furnished to Silas N. Opdahl, a failing Government contractor, certain building materials which were used in the construction of Burke Hall at the Pierre Indian School in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3864. An act to add certain lands to the Minam National Forest, Oreg.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 110. An act for the relief of the Eldredge Bros. Live Stock Co., a corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 4679. An act to provide for the disposition of abandoned lighthouse and life-saving stations; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 4562. An act to reimburse Horace A. Choumard, chaplain in Twenty-third Infantry, for loss of certain personal property; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4728. An act to authorize the payment of \$2,000 to the Government of Japan for the benefit of the family of Tatsuji Saito, a Japanese subject, killed at Camp Geronimo, Mexico, May 25, 1916; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 3995. An act to amend section 224 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to certificates of discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3835. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to vest in the Commissioners of the District of Columbia control of street parking in said District"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 4742. An act for the relief of the Yosemite Stone Co.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 108. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to use at his discretion surplus moneys in the Treasury in the purchase or redemption of the outstanding interest-bearing obligations of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 4739. An act to fix the annual salary of the collector of customs for the district of North Carolina; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 4146. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to determine and report upon the interest, title, ownership, and right of possession of the Yankton Tribe of Indians to the Red Pipestone Quarries, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Claims.

#### ELECTION TO COMMITTEE.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the election of the Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND to membership on the Committee on Insular Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves the election of Mr. BLAND of Virginia to the Committee on Insular Affairs. Is there any other nomination? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

The motion was agreed to.

## CORRECTION.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker—  
The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?  
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. To correct the RECORD.  
On page 8869 of the RECORD appears the following:

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee, how long he thinks that bill will take?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that the other water-power bills did not take more than two or three days. One of them, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, dealt alone with navigable streams. Another one, from the Committee on the Public Lands, dealt with water power on public lands. This bill deals with all combined water-power legislation, and naturally it will take longer. But I do not think it will take, even with due and fair consideration, more than two or three days. But I can not possibly tell.

Now, there is omitted from the RECORD at this point an important demand which a gentleman on that side of the aisle made and which every person on the floor heard:

Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

Mr. DENISON. That was the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] heard the demand for the regular order, and says that it was made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON]. I also heard him make it, as did everybody else in the House. Then follows:

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, if this bill is passed and the Unanimous-Consent Calendar is disposed of, would the gentleman be in favor of a recess of Congress?

Mr. SIMS. I will answer that question when the time comes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Did he say that in reply to me, or did he put that in afterwards?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not know. Did the gentleman from Wisconsin say that?

Mr. STAFFORD. I asked that of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], but did not get any reply, because the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] asked for the regular order.

Mr. DENISON. He made the reply.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Then follows:

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I object.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin object?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do.

The demand for the regular order prevented any further discussion, and therefore before making objection I said that if I was not to be permitted to ask a question or two I should object. I did object and supposed that the matter of unanimous consent was ended for that day. But I was mistaken, and in view of what was said later in the day by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], when he secured unanimous consent for the taking up of the same bill to-day, I wish to say that the gentleman from Tennessee did come to see me immediately after I had made the objection.

He said that he had first asked unanimous consent to have the bill taken up on Monday next, and that to this the gentleman from Massachusetts had objected, and that therefore at the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts he had asked unanimous consent to take it up to-day. In reply I said: "There is nothing urgent about this. It is very important, but it is not a war measure. The work can not be done during the war. The bill can much better be considered later during this Congress," and so forth. He said that he wanted to bring it up, but did not want to take advantage of me during my absence. I remained here all of the time until about 5 o'clock, when, seeing that the bill then being discussed could not reach a vote before adjournment, I went to my office to attend to some mail. I had only just gone, as the RECORD shows, before the gentleman from Tennessee arose and said that he understood that the gentleman to whom he had spoken had no objection to taking up this important bill at this time.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman want done about this RECORD?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I can not now do anything except to express my profound grief that the gentleman from Tennessee should have misunderstood so perfectly what I said. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMS. There were a number of requests by Members of the House, after I had the talk with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], that we should get to work on this water-power bill as early as possible. It is true I did not make the

request until about the time the gentleman said I did, but the reason I did not was that the House was in Committee of the Whole, considering another bill, and I could not make my request until the committee rose. I understood that the gentleman from Wisconsin, in talking about the matter, said that he really had not had time to read the bill and understand it. I drew the inference at the time when the regular order was demanded and the gentleman from Wisconsin said that if he could not get opportunity to ask a few questions about it that he would object. That made the impression on my mind that the objection was rather on account of the demand for the regular order than anything else. I did not want to bring up the request again without notifying him and asking if he was serious in his objection to the bill. The gentleman did say in substance all he has stated. I did not want to take any advantage of him. Such was not my intention.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 12099) to confer on the President power to prescribe charter rates and freight rates and to requisition vessels, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. RANDELL, and Mr. NELSON as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## DISPOSITION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9830) providing for the disposition of opium, its salts and derivatives, coca leaves, their salts and derivatives, and any other drugs seized by the United States Government in the enforcement of the provisions of the act of October 1, 1890, as amended by the act of March 3, 1897, February 9, 1909, and January 17, 1914, or the act of December 17, 1914.

Mr. GILLETT. I will have to object. We ought to have unanimous-consent day pretty soon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects. Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. I will withdraw it if there is any opposition to it.

Mr. GILLETT. It will come up by unanimous consent on Monday. I think the gentleman ought to wait until then.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate joint resolution 164.

Mr. GILLETT. I will make the same objection to that.

## PERSONAL STATEMENT.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. There is a further statement in this connection which I desire to make. This matter of having the Spanish-American War widows' bill considered had been presented to the Committee on Rules, by petition signed by a large number of the Members of the House, and it was my distinct understanding, after talking with gentlemen interested in the bill and with others interested in the water-power bill—and one of these gentlemen was a member of the Committee on Rules itself—that both bills were to be considered by the Committee on Rules; that a rule would be brought in to have both bills considered by the House and making the Spanish-American War widows' bill first in order, because it had in previous Congresses three times passed the House, and would now require but little, if any, time for debate. I went to my office with the distinct understanding that the Committee on Rules was to bring in such a rule for the consideration of the two bills, and that the Spanish-American War widows' bill would have the right of way.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us have the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

## LEGISLATION RESPECTING THE NAVY.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, there are four bills upon the Union Calendar which have been enacted in legislation in the general appropriation bill, and I want to have them taken from



the calendar and move that they lie on the table. They are the bills H. R. 6982, Union Calendar No. 120; H. R. 9390, Union Calendar No. 132; Senate bill 3126, Union Calendar 134; and H. R. 9747, Union Calendar 197. These have been enacted on the appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks that the bills that he cites by number lie on the table, because they have already been enacted into law in another way. The Clerk will announce them.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 6982, No. 120 on the Union Calendar; H. R. 9390, No. 132 on the Union Calendar; S. 3126, No. 134 on the Union Calendar; and H. R. 9747, No. 197 on the Union Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, they will lie on the table. There was no objection.

#### WATER-POWER LEGISLATION.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1419; but prior to that I wish to see if we can make an agreement between Mr. Esch of Wisconsin and myself as to the control of the debate. I submit this as a unanimous-consent request, that the time of general debate be equally divided between the gentleman from Wisconsin and myself, he to control one-half and myself one-half.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 1419, the water-power bill, and pending that he asks unanimous consent that he control one half the time, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch] the other half.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the chairman how it is going to be possible for the membership who want to know something about this subject to get Part I of the hearings, consisting of more than 600 pages? Where can we get copies?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I asked that a copy be mailed to every Member, and I believe it was so mailed. That took more than half of what we had printed, and the others have been given out at the request of Members.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have had no copy of Part I. On several occasions I sent to the committee rooms for copies, and have been unable to get a copy of the first part, 600 printed pages, of the more than 800 pages.

Mr. SIMS. There has been one copy mailed to every Member of the House. I do not know whether they got them or not. I could not follow them up, but there was one mailed to every Member of the House as soon as they were printed. I think we have remaining one copy for each member of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. So that 600 pages of these hearings are not available, and unless a Member has seen them he is entirely dependent on the debate for information?

Mr. SIMS. The other copies of the hearings were given out on the request of Members very largely. Of course, there were some persons who appeared before the committee who received copies, and copies were sent to libraries and one thing and another throughout the country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I doubt if one-tenth of the membership of this House have seen copies of Part I of the hearings.

Mr. SIMS. I regret it very much, but I can not follow up to see whether Members get their mail.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield? I have tried to get a copy of Part I of the hearings, but have been unable to do so. I have got the other two or three parts, and there seem to be plenty of them. Now, why are there not going to be some more of the first part printed?

Mr. SIMS. I would be very glad indeed if we could have a reprint of the first number, but it takes an order of the House to get it. I shall be glad to have it, if it can be done.

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman has no intention, I assume, of closing the general debate to-day?

Mr. SIMS. I have no thought of it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. CANNON. The debate had better run on without any attempt to close it.

The SPEAKER. This is not an attempt to close debate.

Mr. CANNON. I have no objection to an equal division of the time.

Mr. FERRIS. I understand there will be a disposition to yield to those who oppose certain features of the bill, as well as to those who favor it.

Mr. SIMS. As far as I am concerned, absolutely so.

Mr. FERRIS. And if need be they will be yielded an equal amount of time?

Mr. SIMS. Yes; there is no intention of cutting off anybody. The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. SIMS was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1419) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce, with Mr. WEBB in the chair.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I know this is quite a long bill, but it is also quite an important one, and we are to be asked to substitute the House amendment for the Senate bill. I think at least the House amendment ought to be read, and I will object to dispensing with the first reading.

Mr. SIMS. But the gentleman is willing that the House amendment shall be read, and not the Senate bill?

Mr. WALSH. I only ask that the House amendment be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman modify his request?

Mr. SIMS. Yes; I ask that the House amendment be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the House amendment.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the bill.

During the reading,

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, where is the Clerk reading?

The CHAIRMAN. He is just beginning section 18.

Mr. CANNON. I will ask to dispense with the further reading, because nobody can skip from one page to another to keep pace with the reading. I am not complaining of the Clerk at all, but I think maybe discussion would be better—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state to the gentleman from Illinois that the Clerk has read every word of the language up to the present point. The Chair has followed him, and he has not skipped anything.

Mr. SIMS. I should be very glad to dispense with the further reading. I asked to dispense with all of the first reading, but there was objection on that side.

Mr. CANNON. On what page is the Clerk reading?

The CHAIRMAN. Page 45.

Mr. CANNON. If the Chair says the Clerk has read it all, then he has, but he has made most marvelous progress.

Mr. SIMS. The consecutive paging includes the Senate bill, which was stricken out, as well as the House amendment, which he is reading.

Mr. WELLING. The Clerk has read only 22 pages. The first 23 pages are the Senate bill, which he has not read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has read only 22 pages, which is not an excessive amount to read within the time that he has been reading.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to obstruct the consideration of this bill. Unless somebody understands it better than I do, after pretty nearly an all night's work reading the bill, not many of us can get outside of it; but as the chairman of the committee is about to address the House, I think there ought to be a quorum to hear him.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois make the point of no quorum?

Mr. CANNON. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-seven Members present, not a quorum, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names.

Anderson	Britten	Caraway	Claypool
Anthony	Brodbeck	Carew	Cleary
Ashbrook	Browning	Carter, Mass.	Cooper, Ohio
Austin	Brumbaugh	Carter, Okla.	Cooper, W. Va.
Bacharach	Burnett	Chandler, Okla.	Cooper, Wis.
Baer	Butler	Church	Copley
Black	Caldwell	Clark, Fla.	Costello
Bland, Ind.	Cantrill	Clark, Pa.	Crago

Cramton	Gould	McKinley	Sells
Currie, Mich.	Graham, Ill.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Shackleford
Curry, Cal.	Graham, Pa.	Madden	Sherwood
Dale, N. Y.	Gray, N. J.	Maher	Siegel
Dale, Vt.	Greene, Mass.	Mann	Slayden
Davidson	Gregg	Mason	Small
Davis	Griffin	Meecker	Smith, Mich.
Delaney	Hamilton, N. Y.	Merritt	Smith, C. B.
Dempsey	Harrison, Va.	Miller, Minn.	Smith, T. F.
Dewalt	Haskell	Moore, Pa.	Snell
Dickinson	Hayes	Morin	Snyder
Dies	Heaton	Mudd	Stedman
Dill	Heintz	Neely	Steele
Dominick	Hersey	Nelson	Stephens, Nebr.
Donovan	Hicks	Norton	Sterling, Pa.
Dooling	Hollingsworth	Olney	Stevenson
Doremus	Hood	O'Shaunessy	Strong
Doughton	Houston	Paige	Sullivan
Dowell	Howard	Peters	Sweet
Drukker	Hull, Iowa	Phelan	Swift
Dyer	Husted	Folk	Switzer
Elston	Ireland	Porter	Talbot
Emerson	James	Powers	Templeton
Estopinal	Johnson, S. Dak.	Price	Thompson
Fairchild, B. L.	Juul	Purnell	Tillman
Fairchild, G. W.	Kahn	Ragsdale	Tilson
Fairfield	Kearns	Ramsey	Treadway
Farr	Kehoe	Rankin	Vare
Fields	Kelley, Mich.	Rayburn	Voigt
Flood	Kelly, Pa.	Reavis	Volstead
Flynn	Kennedy, R. I.	Riordan	Waldow
Focht	Key, Ohio	Robinson	Walton
Foss	Kieiss, Pa.	Rowe	Ward
Francis	Kincheloe	Rowland	Watson, Pa.
Freeman	Kling	Rucker	Watson, Va.
Fuller, Ill.	Kreider	Russell	Weaver
Fuller, Mass.	LaGuardia	Sabath	White, Ohio
Gallagher	Lehbach	Sanders, Ind.	Wilson, La.
Garland	Lunn	Sanders, N. Y.	Wilson, Tex.
Glass	McAndrews	Sanford	Winslow
Glynn	McCormick	Scott, Iowa	Young, N. Dak.
Goodall	McCulloch	Scott, Pa.	Young, Tex.
Gordon	McKenzie	Scully	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WEBB, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee having under consideration the bill S. 1419, the water-power bill, found itself without a quorum, whereupon he caused the roll to be called, and 228 Members answered to their names, and he presented a list of the absentees.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to request the membership of the committee that as long as they are present they do not disturb me by conversation on the floor. I will take no exception whatever to any gentleman leaving the Hall on account of looking after matters which he feels that he ought to look after, but I would like to have the attention of those present while they are here. I have no set speech. All I want to do is to try, as well as I can, to give the House the parliamentary situation, as well as a general outline of the fundamental propositions involved in the bill before us.

The Senate has passed heretofore water-power bills which came to the House, and we have passed substitutes for them which went to conference, but there has never been a complete agreement between the conferees on the part of the House and the conferees on the part of the Senate on any bill of either House. All bills that have been heretofore considered have been either those confined to the navigable rivers of the country or to power sites on the public lands.

A bill was passed in the Senate last December providing for the development of water-power dams on navigable rivers. That is the bill we are now considering, with a House amendment. Heretofore in former Congresses bills have been reported by the Committee on the Public Lands, passed by the House, but have failed of passage in the Senate.

At the beginning of this session of Congress the President requested a conference with the members of the Committee on Agriculture, the members of the Committee on the Public Lands, the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and also the Committee on Rules, for the purpose of having a special committee formed to which all water-power bills should be referred, with a view of having one bill to cover all legislation required for the different projects. He stated to the Members when we appeared that he had requested the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture to draft a bill that would cover all these water-power questions and jurisdictions and to provide that the three Secretaries should constitute a water-power commission, to whom all applications for license as provided for under the proposed act should be made, and clothed with power to execute the law fully.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has always had jurisdiction of all legislation with reference to dams on navigable streams for navigation purposes, and the Secretary of War had jurisdiction of such dams and passed on the ques-

tion of whether or not they were needed for navigation purposes. The Secretary of the Interior has primary charge of public lands not embraced in the forest reserves. The Secretary of Agriculture has primary jurisdiction and supervision of lands in the forest reserves. The committee was formed, as you all remember, by a special rule which was introduced and adopted carrying out the President's suggestion. By virtue of the rule all water-power bills of every kind were referred to the special committee. Among others, was the bill S. 1419, passed in December, and the committee thought it would be advisable to take up the Senate bill and amend it, so that when it passes the House and goes back to the Senate it can go to conference at once, and in that way get as early action as possible. According to estimates that have been made by very competent men, there has been developed in the United States water-power developments as follows: In national forests, 755,000 horsepower; in public domain, 173,000 horsepower; through reservoir development, 72,000 horsepower; requiring right of way over public lands, 1,000,000 horsepower; in navigable streams, 1,000,000 horsepower; in nonnavigable streams and involving lands privately owned, 3,000,000, constituting 6,000,000 horsepower in all that has been developed in the United States.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Perhaps, for the better understanding of this bill, it might be wise here to try to arrive at a part of its intent and application by the process of elimination, leaving that which may be thought debatable hereafter to be discussed. For example, take my own State of Vermont, bounded on the east by the Connecticut River, the upper stretches of which are not navigable, the river being navigable only a part of the way from the sea, and bounded on the west by Lake Champlain, technically navigable, and actually navigable, but not a water likely to be appropriated to water-power purposes.

What becomes of the interior waters of a State so situated? None of those interior waters are considered as navigable streams—with one exception or so—but they are feeders running down into the Connecticut on the one side of the mountains and to Lake Champlain on the other. Will this bill give jurisdiction to the Federal Government over those interior waters so that private capital may not under the laws of the State develop water power hereafter as it has in the past?

Mr. SIMS. Not at all; unless projects to be developed are on lands owned by the United States or are developed on navigable streams. It is possible that impounding waters in tributaries of navigable streams may reduce the flow and the depth of water in the navigable part of the stream, and might in this way so interfere with navigation as to require a permit to develop it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. But in the opinion of the gentleman, then, those would be isolated cases which would stand upon their own merits with relation to the general purposes of the bill?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. But as a public policy it is not the purpose of this bill to take away from the State government the right to direct and oversee or to license the use of those interior waters according to State law now existing or hereafter to be passed?

Mr. SIMS. Not at all; and could not, I think. In other words, if we passed such a law, it would be void as to such projects.

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

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I am under the impression that in what we used to call the "West," and I am quite sure it is true in Illinois and Indiana and perhaps in many other States, scores and scores of acts of Congress have declared spring branches navigable.

Mr. SIMS. They are navigable as a matter of law.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely; and would come under the bill?

Mr. SIMS. Yes. Any navigable stream that is within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War or the Congress of the United States, with reference to interstate commerce is a navigable stream, as I understand it, within the meaning of this bill.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, if I may follow just a moment with my questions, the interior waters of my State, as I have said, run on either side to waters that are, of course, technically navigable; but in no case—with the exception noted—do the waters bordering that State on either side in their capacity as navigable waters have any relation to navigation such as is contemplated by the bill. The Connecticut

River is as we say navigable only part way from the sea, and therefore up to the Canadian line it is simply a great stream.

Lake Champlain, of course, is a body of water that does not of itself develop any water power. What becomes of these feeders if they are to be by some association of ideas thrown in as a part of this navigable system? Will the policy of the bill prevent people utilizing that power except through the Federal authorities because those interior streams are in some sense a part of the network of navigable streams or waters?

Mr. SIMS. Not at all, unless the building of the structures should so reduce the flow of the water as to impair navigation in the navigable part of the river into which they flow.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. In these cases these little streams must of necessity flow over the dam on their own way again to the waters which continue to the navigable waters.

Mr. SIMS. And therefore would not affect the navigable part. I do not think the gentleman need to have any apprehension as to any disturbance on such streams as that. Such is not contemplated.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yet they still go to make up navigable waters.

Mr. SIMS. If you impair or destroy navigation, or the navigable part of the river, why then that impediment could be removed by the Secretary of War.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Exactly, and that is the point I want to get at. Who is to determine whether the first intention to use those waters at all must first be submitted to the Federal Government?

Mr. SIMS. I do not see any need of submitting to the Federal Government under this law or any other law in order to have a dam constructed on a stream which is entirely and wholly within a State—

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Well, there is always the possibility that somebody may afterwards raise the question whether this interferes with navigation, whereas the work contemplated in the first intention is under State law and by State authority and supposedly exclusively under State jurisdiction.

Mr. SIMS. Unless the fact has been ascertained or demonstrated that there was an impeding of the water, an impounding of the water, a diverting of it, to such an extent as to impair the navigable portion of the river—

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Does not that mean eventually under the policy of this law you have to first make sure you do not do anything to obstruct the navigability and submit to a Federal authority as to whether you can at all or not?

Mr. SIMS. I do not think the provisions of this bill are as broad as that. Such is not contemplated.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. SINNOTT. I understand all the navigable waters come within the provisions of this act. That is true.

Mr. SIMS. That is my understanding.

Mr. SINNOTT. Section 3, on the top of page 26, defines "navigable waters" as "all streams or parts of streams and other bodies of water or parts thereof, over which Congress has jurisdiction under its authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States." Now, is it not generally conceded that Congress has jurisdiction over non-navigable feeders flowing into navigable streams?

Mr. SIMS. Not unless it interferes so as to impair the navigability of the stream into which it flows.

Mr. SINNOTT. Then Congress has jurisdiction over that non-navigable part for the purpose of protecting the navigable part and the flow of water?

Mr. SIMS. Only to the extent it may impair navigation.

Mr. SINNOTT. Therefore Congress having jurisdiction over that small feeder, that small feeder under the provisions of this act is what is termed "navigable water," and therefore that small feeder would come under the provisions of this act?

Mr. SIMS. Providing it would have the effect of impeding the navigation of the principal stream into which it flows, which is a question of fact to be determined as such.

Mr. SINNOTT. That is not the provision of the act and that definition is one feature of the act I object to, thereby surrendering the jurisdiction to the Government over these small feeders.

Mr. SIMS. The Supreme Court of the United States has passed on that question.

Mr. SINNOTT. Unless it is necessary to conserve the water in the feeder for the navigation in the larger stream I object to requiring anyone who desires to develop power on privately owned land, on these little nonnavigable feeders, to apply to a Federal commission.

Mr. SIMS. I do not think there is any provision in the law that contemplates any such regulation.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Does it not follow as a matter of logical sequence that if the Federal Government has power to stop something which has been done because it injures a Federal right, then it has the right to prevent it being done at all?

Mr. SIMS. Providing that fact is alleged, charged, and proven.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Precisely, and that means in order to be sure you will not have anything stopped you must first go and find out whether it can be begun or not?

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, is not that the condition irrespective of whether this act is passed or not?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It may be; but this bill is to make more specific definition of what are Federal rights.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course, the bill in its definition can not enlarge the scope of Federal jurisdiction over navigable streams.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. But the bill by implication merely—

Mr. SHERLEY. It does not matter what you write into it the fact remains Congress can not by simply saying it has jurisdiction get jurisdiction.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I want to make certain there shall not be a hold-up of the right the man received under State law until he finds out whether he has any such right under the Federal Government.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is he not in a better situation where he can go to a definite forum and have a determination of the fact instead of simply now acting without real knowledge as to whether or not he is violating the Federal law?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Would the gentleman be willing to make that same application to all the other commercial and business relations of men so that we would better consult a Federal statute or the Federal Government before we do anything under State laws.

Mr. SHERLEY. No; but I say that when a man undertakes to do something that may be against Federal law the burden is on him to see that it is not.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Exactly so; but up to this time nobody has ever held that mountain streams or other small streams in the interior of a State had any relation to a Federal stream as to navigation.

Mr. SHERLEY. In the first place, I would not accept the statement as absolutely accurate; but to the extent it is accurate I do not think this bill sustains it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Has the gentleman some specific declaration in this bill in mind in support of it?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not think it follows that because a stream in a State is not navigable in a physical sense it is exclusively in the jurisdiction of the State, and I do not think any good lawyer has so contended.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I do not contend that.

Mr. SHERLEY. On the other hand, I do not think this bill undertakes to make a stream, where the facts do not warrant it, within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman submit to a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. There is no specific disclaimer in the bill protecting the very thing the gentleman refers to.

Mr. SHERLEY. You do not have to have a disclaimer. A legislative body does not have to disclaim taking jurisdiction of a thing it can not take jurisdiction of.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Here is the point that is apparent to any of us, whether friends of the bill or opponents of it: Every one of the interior waters interlocks with another, and eventually finds its way down to navigability.

Mr. SHERLEY. The determination of that would have to depend in each instance on the actual physical condition in connection with the stream.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. This water all runs down hill.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course it does. We do not make it all within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Now then, I want to know how precisely the limitations are fixed, so that a man who wants to do business knows when he is safe?

Mr. SHERLEY. The only way he will know that he is safe is by a knowledge of the physical conditions and not by any enactment here.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That would be ordinary common sense if they were not supervised by some one under the terms of this law, but who will interpret this law and say where the

State jurisdiction begins and where it leaves off, with the water all the time running down hill?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not think it is possible to make the definition so as to determine the physical fact, and that is the thing that will affect the jurisdiction.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. This looks to me a good deal like another reaching out of the Federal hand beyond State lines.

Mr. CANNON. Would the gentleman allow me? I am in perfect good faith in asking the question. When flat boats went to New Orleans, it being the only way we got to market before the day of railroads, the Wabash, including all of it, was declared to be a navigable stream. The Vermillion River, which runs past my town, floated flat boats down from Danville. On the Sugar River and the Eel River, and a great many tributaries, flat boats were constructed, and they floated down at high water. Now, on the statute books there are scores and scores of these little streams that are nonnavigable, in fact, that are declared to be navigable. Does the gentleman propose to repeal the laws that made them navigable?

Mr. SIMS. The bill provides in plain language what is meant by navigable waters, but to me it is almost no definition, and it is for the reason given by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. Navigation is a question of fact, or the impairing of navigation is a question of fact, and that has to be gone into when the question arises. We could not set out in the law details as to when a certain state of facts would amount to impeding or impairing navigation.

Mr. CANNON. I suppose in the end the question of fact would lead to masses of litigation.

Mr. SHERLEY. Has not the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] stated that situation rather conversely? Has not this frequently happened, that Congress has declared a technically navigable stream nonnavigable rather than declared navigable streams that are in fact not navigable?

Mr. CANNON. They did not so declare. I do not know of any special act that declares any stream nonnavigable.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think there have been any number of them in connection with the granting of permits to build bridges, and so forth.

Mr. CANNON. Permission to build bridges?

Mr. SHERLEY. The declaration that a stream was nonnavigable so as to take it out of the restrictions touching navigable streams.

Mr. CANNON. You probably best do it by wholesale, then, if this bill is to become a law.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a statement to the committee at this point. I agreed before going into the Committee of the Whole, and before beginning my speech, that if the Committee on Rules made report of a certain rule I would ask the committee to rise and let that rule be considered. The Committee on Rules is now ready with the rule, and I am therefore going to ask the committee to rise for the purpose of carrying out my promise that the rule may be considered. Inasmuch as I have hardly begun my speech, it seems it would be as good a time now as any.

Mr. CANNON. Is this a report from the Committee on Rules?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Does it pertain to this bill?

Mr. SIMS. Not at all. But I agreed to rise. I move that the committee do now rise, Mr. Chairman.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. WEBB, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (S. 1419) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that a moment?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

#### ELECTION OF A COMMITTEE MEMBER.

Mr. KITCHIN. Some time ago—and it seems that the Clerk did not get it—I nominated and the House elected Hon. FELIX CORDOVA DAVILA, of Porto Rico, a member of the Committee on Insular Affairs. It seems there is no record of it. Anyhow I renominate him.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina renominates Hon. FELIX CORDOVA DAVILA, of Porto Rico, as a member of the Committee on Insular Affairs. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on confirming the nomination already made.

The nomination was confirmed.

#### PENSIONS TO DEPENDENTS OF SPANISH WAR VETERANS.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report (No. 752) from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois presents a privileged report from the Committee on Rules, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House resolution 415.

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 4444, entitled "An act to pension widows and minor children of officers and enlisted men who served in the War with Spain, Philippine insurrection, or in China"; that there shall be not to exceed one hour of general debate, to be divided between those supporting and those opposing the bill. At the conclusion of such general debate the bill shall be considered for amendments under the five-minute rule. After the act shall have been perfected in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union the same shall be reported to the House with such recommendation as the committee may make, whereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the act and all amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONDON. Is it in order for the Committee on Rules to interrupt the consideration of a bill by bringing in a rule, and thus to interrupt the consideration of a bill?

Mr. SIMS. I moved that the committee rise.

The SPEAKER. The House interrupted. The committee had risen. The question is on agreeing to the motion for the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has 20.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides for the consideration of the bill S. 4444, which is known as the bill to pension widows and minor children of officers and enlisted men who served in the War with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or in China in the Boxer war.

This bill provides for the pensioning of these widows who were married before the passage of this act at \$12 a month, provided they have not an income to exceed \$250 a year, and for the payment of \$2 per month for any minor child under 16 years of age. Where a child is idiotic or helpless the bill provides that the pension may continue after 16 years of age.

The resolution gives one hour of general debate on the bill and then provides that the bill shall be considered under the five-minute rule in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DUPRÉ. This bill is similar to the one that passed the House before?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. It passed the House two or three times, and in each case it failed to pass the Senate. In this case it has passed the Senate, and it is proposed to take up the Senate bill.

Mr. GOOD. In what respect does this bill differ from the provision of the law first enacted by Congress granting pensions to widows of soldiers of the Civil War?

Mr. FOSTER. This is very similar to the bill that passed Congress giving \$8 a month to widows of soldiers of the Civil War, in which it was provided that the income should not exceed \$250 a year and where they were compelled to earn their living by daily work.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DUPRÉ. In the gentleman's experience will he say whether the Pension Bureau is inclined to be very severe in passing upon the question of income and things of that sort?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the Pension Commissioner has always required proof to show that the income was not \$250 a year. How severe he was I could not tell. But I think from what experience I have had in the Pension Office that he has always required that the evidence be produced. Of course it might happen

that to-day the widow has an income of \$250, and a year from now she might not have that, and she would then be entitled to a pension.

Mr. DUPRÉ. My reason for asking the question is that I do not think that an income of that sort should be taken into consideration by the Government. It is so small that it is almost negligible in these days.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course the pension is only \$12 a month.

Mr. LEA of California. Is that income personal to the widow?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is an income derived from her daily labor.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] in the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 4444, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4444) to pension widows and minor children of officers and enlisted men who served in the War with Spain, Philippine insurrection, or in China.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill. Is there a request for dispensing with the first reading of the bill?

Mr. WELTY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-nine gentlemen, not a quorum, are present. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

Anthony	Estopinal	King	Russell
Ashbrook	Fairchild, G. W.	Kreider	Sabath
Austin	Farr	LaGuardia	Sanders, Ind.
Bacharach	Fisher	Lehbach	Sanders, N. Y.
Baer	Flood	Lobeck	Sanford
Black	Flynn	Longworth	Saunders, Va.
Bland, Ind.	Fordney	Lunn	Scott, Iowa
Britten	Foss	McAndrews	Scott, Pa.
Brodbeck	Francis	McCormick	Scully
Browning	Freeman	McCulloch	Sells
Burnett	Fuller, Ill.	McKenzie	Shackelford
Butler	Fuller, Mass.	McKinley	Sherwood
Caldwell	Garland	McLaughlin, Pa.	Siegel
Caraway	Glass	Madden	Slayden
Carew	Glynn	Magee	Sloan
Carter, Mass.	Goodall	Maier	Small
Chandler, Okla.	Gordon	Mann	Smith, Mich.
Church	Gould	Martin	Smith, C. B.
Clark, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	Mason	Smith, T. F.
Claypool	Graham, Pa.	Meeker	Snell
Cleary	Gray, N. J.	Merritt	Snyder
Cooper, Ohio.	Greene, Mass.	Morrin	Stafford
Cooper, W. Va.	Gregg	Mott	Stedman
Cooper, Wis.	Griffin	Mudd	Steele
Copley	Hamilton, N. Y.	Neely	Stephens, Nebr.
Costello	Harrison, Va.	Nelson	Sterling, Pa.
Crago	Haskell	Nolan	Stevenson
Cramton	Hayes	Norton	Strong
Currie, Mich.	Heaton	Olney	Sullivan
Curry, Cal.	Heintz	O'Shaunessy	Sweet
Dale, N. Y.	Hersey	Paige	Swift
Dale, Vt.	Hicks	Peters	Switzer
Davidson	Hollingsworth	Phelan	Talbot
Davis	Hood	Platt	Templeton
Delaney	Houston	Polk	Thompson
Dempsey	Howard	Porter	Tillman
Dent	Husted	Pou	Tilson
Dewalt	Ireland	Powers	Treadway
Dies	James	Price	Vare
Dill	Johnson, S. Dak.	Purnell	Voigt
Dorainick	Juhl	Ragsdale	Waldow
Donovan	Kahn	Rainey, H. T.	Walton
Dooling	Kearns	Ramsey	Ward
Doremus	Kehoe	Rankin	Watson, Pa.
Doughton	Kelley, Mich.	Rayburn	Watson, Va.
Dowell	Kelly, Pa.	Reavis	Weaver
Drukker	Kennedy, R. I.	Robinson	White, Ohio
Dyer	Key, Ohio	Rowe	Whites, Iowa
Elston	Kiess, Pa.	Rowland	Young, N. Dak.
Emerson	Kincheoe	Rucker	Young, Tex.

The committee rose; and Mr. BANKHEAD having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (S. 4444) to pension widows and minor children of officers and enlisted men who served in the War with Spain, Philippine insurrection, or in China, found itself without a quorum; whereupon he caused the roll to be called, when 232 Members, a

quorum, answered to their names, and he presented the names of the absentees to be printed in the Journal and Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A quorum is present. The committee will resume its session.

Accordingly the committee resumed its session.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this measure has passed this House on three occasions. On December 4, 1912, in the Sixty-second Congress, the bill was passed with only 25 dissenting votes.

On April 1, 1914, in the Sixty-third Congress, the bill was passed with only 75 dissenting votes.

On February 16, 1916, it passed in the Sixty-fourth Congress without a roll call, and during the general debate only two Members spoke against the measure.

There is only one amendment. On page 1, lines 9 and 10, the words "including all furloughs" have been stricken from the bill. With that exception the measure is the same as the bills put through in other Congresses.

This bill passed the Senate on June 3 and was referred to the Committee on Pensions of the House. The committee made a unanimous report in its favor.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the House Committee on Pensions, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KEY, is unavoidably absent this afternoon because of illness. During three Congresses this bill has borne his name and on each occasion he has assumed responsibility for guiding it through the House. He has asked me to take his place this afternoon, and it affords me genuine pleasure to comply, because, like Mr. KEY, I have, during the six years I have served in Congress, earnestly advocated the enactment of this legislation. With the permission of the House I will insert in the Record at this point an argument in support of the bill prepared by Mr. KEY:

This bill is identical in its provision with H. R. 54, which was considered and passed by the House of Representatives in the Sixty-fourth Congress, and a like bill was passed in the Sixty-third Congress by the House. Neither of these former bills ever reached final consideration in the Senate, though both were approved by the Senate Committee on Pensions and placed upon the calendar.

I would like to invite the attention of the House to some very striking comparative figures presented by the first 12 months of the great world war now going on and the War with Spain, with which this bill has to do. In the present war, from April, 1917, to June, 1918, about 800,000 American soldiers and sailors and marines have been engaged mostly upon the western front in France. In that time, I am informed from reliable sources of information, that the casualties from wounds and diseases were 8,634. In the Spanish War for a similar period the casualties from wounds and diseases were 12,000. I speak of deaths in both instances. In the War with Spain there were about 335,000 Volunteers and 100,000 Regulars, 435,000 in all. It will be noted with about double the number of men in the present conflict for the first year there was almost one-third less deaths than in the first 12 months during the War with Spain. I only mention these facts to give some idea to those who entertain different views that the War with Spain was not entirely a frolic.

I am informed that from 20 to 25 per cent of the veterans of the War with Spain have reentered the United States military or naval service and are now serving in the great world war. In event they should suffer from wounds, injuries, or diseases leading to their death their dependent relatives would not come within the purview of the pending bill as they would undoubtedly take advantage of the far more liberal provisions of the war-risk insurance act.

From the best information and data the Committee on Pensions of the House of Representatives was able to secure when this and the similar bills I have mentioned were before it for consideration, there would not be more than about 4,000 needy widows who would seek pensions and obtain same in the first year or two after the bill becomes a law; and in view of the fact that only about 400,000 veterans of the Army and Navy of the United States whose widows or minor children could possibly have title, it is not believed that there would ever be any large number of applicants for pension or that the bill if enacted into a law would ever call for any very large expenditure of money.

No Member of this body is more earnestly opposed than I am to saddling upon the taxpayers of this country unmerited and

unwise pensions, and I will always oppose efforts leading to granting by special or general legislation pensions to those in my opinion not entitled thereto; but I believe in this case that the needy widows and minor children of our brave Spanish War veterans are entitled to the pensions which this bill seeks to provide, and I believe a majority of this House concurs with me in this view and will pass the bill just as they passed the same bill in the Sixty-second, Sixty-third, and Sixty-fourth Congresses. I urge that this be done not only because it is just and proper in my opinion, but also because for too long these pensions have been denied. I think the provisions of this bill should have been enacted into law six years ago.

The bill provides for only widows of soldiers and sailors who actually served 90 days during the War with Spain, received an honorable discharge, and the widow is now not in receipt of a net income in excess of \$250 per annum. Exactly the same language is used in this bill as in the law of June 27, 1890, as amended May 9, 1900, relative to dependent widows of Civil War soldiers and sailors.

It provides for minor children until they are 16 years of age.

This bill does not provide pension for the widow or the minor children of a soldier or a sailor of the Regular Establishment unless he actually left the confines of the United States and participated actively in the War with Spain.

Of course it is impossible, as shown by the report accompanying this bill, which is identical with the report on that point filed in the Sixty-third and Sixty-fourth Congresses with the bill just like this introduced by me, to state the exact cost of this bill in event it becomes a law. However, from the best available information which could be obtained by diligent effort of the Committee on Pensions during the Sixty-third, Sixty-fourth, and Sixty-fifth Congresses it is not believed that the first few years' annual cost of this law would be in excess of a million dollars, with a gradual increase annually until a maximum of perhaps two and a half to three million would be reached.

Of course, this is but a small fraction of the amount of money which will be annually turned into the Treasury by the Pension Bureau on account of the death of aged pensioners from the Mexican, Indian, and Civil Wars.

Mr. Chairman, on account of the pressure of other business we are anxious to get this measure through as speedily as possible, and I will reserve the balance of my time, and ask that the bill be read under the five-minute rule, or that the gentleman on the other side use some of his time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone desire to be recognized in opposition to the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a brief digest of pension legislation, including this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a brief digest of pension legislation, including this measure. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBBINS. I want to ask the gentleman from Colorado a question, if he will yield.

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBBINS. I am very much interested in this bill, and I should like to know why the rate of pension for Spanish-American War widows has been fixed at \$12, when we recently fixed the pensions of widows at \$25?

Mr. KEATING. This is the form in which the bill passed the Senate. It was the amount fixed in the bills which passed other Congresses, and the Association of Spanish-American War Veterans and others interested felt that it was best not to attempt to raise the rate at this time.

Mr. ROBBINS. I am a Spanish War veteran myself, and I am very much interested in this bill, but I should like to see the amount fixed at \$25.

Mr. KEATING. I sympathize with the gentleman's suggestion. There is just as much reason why the widow of a Spanish-American War veteran should have \$25 as the widow of any other veteran, but I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that an effort has been made for a number of years to secure this legislation. As I said before, it has passed this House three or four times. At last it has gone through the Senate. We have an opportunity to-day to put the bill through in its present form. I hope the House will pass it in that form, so that it may become a law at once. The question of raising the amount can be considered hereafter.

Mr. ROBBINS. I shall favor its passage in this form rather than imperil its passage by amending it.

Mr. CANNON. I certainly approve of the bill and shall vote for it. The gentleman from Colorado says there is just as much reason for giving \$25 a month to the widow of a Spanish War

veteran as there is to give that amount to the widow of a Civil War veteran. The gentleman must recollect that it was a long time before Civil War widows got \$8 a month.

Mr. KEATING. Yes; I appreciate that, and then there is the difference in age to be considered. The gentleman is quite right.

Mr. CANNON. There is the question of age, and all that kind of thing. Widows of Civil War veterans are in the main too old to marry again, and some of them are helpless. This is the most generous service pension bill for widows of soldiers of the Republic that has ever passed, everything considered, and I quite approve it, because it is only within the last few years that a service pension was granted to widows of the Civil War up to \$12, and I believe it is only during this Congress that it has been increased to \$25.

Mr. KEATING. The thought I had in mind was that while the Spanish-American widow is younger than the Civil War widow, she is very likely to have dependent children, and not much can be done in these days of the high cost of living with \$12 a month for the widow and \$2 a month for each dependent child.

Mr. DENISON. Are not the widows of Spanish-American War soldiers who lost their lives in the service entitled to the benefits of the pension law passed some time back by this Congress?

Mr. KEATING. If she can show that the soldier died of disability incurred in the service, a Spanish-American War widow can secure \$25 under existing law, but the bill under consideration is a service pension. I will say to the gentleman that it has been extremely difficult in some cases to secure proof that the death of the soldier was due to disability incurred in the service. The Pension Bureau is not disposed to lay proper emphasis upon the effects of malarial fever. Personally I think those soldiers who served in the Tropics and contracted malaria there have seldom recovered from the effects of the disease, and that frequently complications have ensued, and some of the deaths attributed to tuberculosis and other diseases are really traceable to the malaria contracted in the Tropics.

Mr. DENISON. There is no distinction between the widows of soldiers of the Civil War who lost their lives in the service and those who have died from other causes, so far as the amount is concerned.

Mr. KEATING. So far as the widows of Civil War veterans are concerned, they all get \$25 a month, without regard to the cause of death.

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman think there ought to be a distinction made in that respect between the widows of the Spanish-American War veterans and those of the Civil War?

Mr. KEATING. As I suggested a few minutes ago, considering the high cost of living and all the attendant circumstances, it would be extremely desirable to place all the Spanish-American War widows on the same plane. We are face to face, or at least think we are, with a legislative fact, and we feel that there is an opportunity now to secure for those widows a pension of \$12 a month. Under all the circumstances your committee feels that it is best to pass the legislation at that rate and leave the question of increase to future Congresses.

Mr. DENISON. If the bill passes as it is reported, the status of the war widows will be about this: That the widow of the Civil War veteran who lost his life in the service and the widows of those who died since of other causes are each entitled to \$25. The widow of the Spanish-American War veteran who lost his life in the service will be entitled to \$25, but the widow of a veteran who died from other causes will only be entitled to \$12 a month.

Mr. KEATING. And the widows of the soldiers of the Regular Establishment will be entitled to \$12 a month.

Mr. DENISON. I am certainly in favor of the bill, but I do not understand why the difference.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. I did not hear the first part of the gentleman's statement, but has attention been called to this: This bill proposes a pension to the widows of Spanish War veterans several years earlier than was done in the case of widows of the Civil War, where the soldier's death is not shown to have been of service origin. In other words, it is now only 20 years since the War with Spain, while the widows of veterans of the Civil War were not granted a pension without proof that the soldier's death was due to service, until over 25 years following the close of the Civil War, and then the latter only got \$8 at the start. In these respects this bill is more liberal than was the old laws relating to Civil War widows.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman is quite right, and that matter was called to the attention of the committee by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I will.

Mr. BARKLEY. My attention has been called to two or three cases where the soldier has become helpless since his service, but unable to demonstrate to the Pension Office that it was due to disease or injury contracted in the line of service. He can not draw a pension, and the Pension Committee takes the same view—that unless he can trace his condition to disease or injury contracted in the service he is not pensionable, even by special act. How does it happen that a man who actually served in the war, who is helpless, who, by reason of malaria or some other disease, is unable to prove that it was contracted in the service, is not entitled to a pension, but as soon as he dies his widow will be entitled to a pension? Does not the gentleman think that some legislation ought to be passed liberalizing these strict requirements in the Pension Office?

Mr. KEATING. Perhaps the best answer is that the Spanish War veterans themselves, the men who actually did the fighting, have, in so far as they have expressed themselves officially, asked that the widows might be recognized first. I think that is a fact that should be recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that these veterans of the Spanish-American War ask for legislation for the widows of their comrades before they ask for legislation for themselves. [Applause.] And so to-day the Spanish-American War Veteran Association is urging that we care for this legislation first.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that is proper and the correct attitude for these men to assume; and yet it seems to me that some correction ought to be made where a man is himself helpless, has a family, wife, and children to support, but is unable to do anything himself for them, having been a Spanish-American War veteran and can not draw a pension because he is unable to prove that his present condition is traceable to the service. I am not averse to the widows getting a pension when entitled to it, but justice requires that the soldier himself ought to be pensioned, too, so that he might enjoy some of its benefits while alive.

Mr. KEATING. As I stated, in response to a question a few moments ago, I think the Pension Office should revise its rulings concerning the results of malarial fever, and in that way some of the cases referred to by the gentleman would be cared for.

Mr. VAN DYKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. VAN DYKE. I want to just make a statement that the veterans of the Spanish-American War throughout the country at the present time ask that we take care of their comrades' widows, and it is to relieve that situation that we are trying to get this legislation through to-day.

Mr. PARKER of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of New York. On page 2 there is a provision to pay \$2 a month to orphans. I have in mind two cases where the soldier died from disease that was contracted in the Philippines, but it was not traceable to service disability. His wife is also dead, leaving children under the age of 16. How do you interpret this clause in the bill? Would the children get the pension of \$12 that the mother would have been entitled to had she lived, or will they only get \$2 a month? It seems to me that \$2 a month for a minor is a small pension. I am not going to try to amend the bill, because \$2 is better than nothing. Do they get \$12 a month and the \$2 in addition?

Mr. KEATING. They will receive the mother's pension.

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; the gentleman is quite correct. That has always been the policy of the pension law in such cases.

Mr. LITTLE rose.

Mr. KEATING. I will yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to confirm what the gentleman from Colorado just stated in regard to the attitude of the Spanish-American War veterans in preferring this legislation for the widows of their comrades before they ask it for themselves. Since I have been here I have never received a request from a Spanish War Veterans' Association of my State asking me for general legislation for the veterans, but they have continually come to me with requests that I support this bill and see that it went through. Ten or twelve years ago, when I was the department commander of the Spanish-American War veterans in the State of Kansas, we took the position then, and it was unanimous, that before we asked anything for the boys themselves we would try and get the widows on the pension roll, so that when the boys passed on the women and the children would be provided for. The gentleman from Colorado

[Mr. KEATING] has stated exactly the attitude of the Spanish-American War veterans. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] has repeatedly suggested that the veterans themselves who were disabled and crippled ought to be pensioned, and I doubt not at the proper time that matter will be presented and attended to, but in the meantime the veterans want the widows provided for first.

Mr. LANGLEY. I thank the gentleman for calling attention to my efforts in behalf of the Spanish War veterans. I agree with him, however, and with the Spanish War Veterans' Association, that the widows should be cared for first, and you can not make this bill too liberal for me. I am heartily for it, and I wish it gave them all \$25 a month. I was merely seeking to call attention to some pertinent facts that happened to be within my knowledge, and I thought it an opportune time to say a word for the Spanish War veterans themselves, and that is why I have been making these interruptions.

Mr. LITTLE. I hope that the House will now take the golden opportunity to put into the statute book a provision for these ladies. You must remember that it is 20 years now since that war began, and those who were young women then have begun to go down hill, and if you are ever going to help them, for God's sake do it now.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does not the gentleman think, as suggested by my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], that cases like those to which he referred should be provided for, especially in view of the added difficulty, as compared with Civil War veterans, that these Spanish War veterans have labored under in getting up proof of service origin of disability? In fact, does he not think that it is about time they should all be pensioned who are disabled, without regard to proof of the connection between their present disability and their service?

Mr. LITTLE. I do.

Mr. LANGLEY. I think so, too. It is not quite as long after the War with Spain as it was after the Civil War before a service-pension law was passed for the Civil War veterans, but, under present conditions, I do not think we should delay any longer.

Mr. LITTLE. It is too long in both cases.

Mr. LANGLEY. I have had such a bill pending for a long time, and I hope it will pass in the near future.

Mr. LITTLE. Well, I am for it.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Colorado yield again?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. While we are discussing this question I would like to get a little information about other widows. What is the status of the widow of a soldier who fought down on the Mexican border about a couple of years ago? I want to know whether that is considered war or not, and what is the status of the widow of a soldier who fought down there on the border?

Mr. KEATING. My impression is that her pension would be \$12 a month. She would come under the regular service.

Mr. DENISON. I asked the question for this reason: The widow of a lieutenant who went down there with the forces from my own district, Lieut. Bryden, applied for a pension after her husband died. He came back home after his service was over and the troops were taken to Chicago, which was a much colder climate than the Mexican border. He there contracted a cold, from which he afterwards died. She has been unable to prove that his death was the result of his service, and the Pension Office has denied her a pension recently.

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

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. How long was her husband in the service?

Mr. DENISON. All of the time that they were down on the border.

Mr. McCLINTIC. It was more than 90 days?

Mr. DENISON. Oh, yes; a year, I think.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman has run afoul of the Pension Office in this case, as a number of Spanish-American War veterans and their widows have in the cases to which I referred a short time ago, in connection with the results of malarial fever. I suggest to the gentleman that he introduce a special bill for the widow of his constituent.

Mr. DENISON. I intend to do that, of course; but I was under the impression that they already had a pensionable status.

Mr. KEATING. They have a pensionable status; but the difficulty in this case is that the widow has not presented sufficient evidence to satisfy the Pension Office.

Mr. LANGLEY. It is purely a question of proof under the existing law. If the evidence is not sufficient to satisfy the Pension Bureau, they will deny her a pension.

Mr. KEATING. But the gentleman might succeed in convincing the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DENISON. The point I make is that the widows of those soldiers still are not entitled to a pension unless they can make the proof that their husbands died from causes resulting from their military service.

Mr. KEATING. They are not entitled to a service pension. The bill now under consideration is a service pension.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Did the officer die before he was discharged?

Mr. DENISON. No; he died immediately after he was discharged.

Mr. LANGLEY. It is all a question of proof.

Mr. PARKER of New York. Mr. Chairman, to revert to the same question I asked before, if the mother is dead, then she, of course, can not apply for the widow's pension; but will the children, then, under this act, still be entitled to receive the \$12 a month as well as the \$2?

Mr. KEATING. The same law applies.

Mr. PARKER of New York. Then they will be entitled to the \$12 and the \$2 additional if the mother was dead before this bill becomes a law.

Mr. KEATING. And they were under 16 years of age.

Mr. PARKER of New York. Under 16 years of age, of course.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Do I understand from the gentleman that, irrespective of the merits of the bill, it is his opinion that it is this bill now or nothing?

Mr. KEATING. That is my judgment.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Under the present conditions.

Mr. KEATING. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves the balance of his time, and if nobody desires to be heard in that position the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That from and after the passage of this act if any volunteer officer or enlisted man who served 90 days or more in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the War with Spain or the Philippine insurrection, between April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, inclusive, service to be computed from date of enlistment to date of discharge, or any officer or enlisted man of the Regular Establishment who rendered 90 days or more actual military or naval service in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps in the War with Spain or the Philippine insurrection between April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, inclusive, or as a participant in the Chinese Boxer rebellion campaign between June 16, 1900, and October 1, 1900, and who has been honorably discharged therefrom, has died or shall hereafter die leaving a widow without means of support other than her daily labor, and an actual net income not exceeding \$250 per year, or leaving a minor child or children under the age of 16 years, such widow shall upon due proof of her husband's death, without proving his death to be the result of his Army or Navy service, be placed on the pension roll from the date of the filing of her application therefor under this act, at the rate of \$12 per month during her widowhood, and shall also be paid \$2 per month for each child of such officer or enlisted man under 16 years of age, and in case of the death or remarriage of the widow, leaving a child or children of such officer or enlisted man under the age of 16 years, such pension shall be paid such child or children until the age of 16: *Provided*, That in case a minor child is insane, idiotic, or otherwise permanently helpless, the pension shall continue during the life of said child, or during the period of such disability, and shall commence from the date of application therefor after the passage of this act: *Provided further*, That said widow shall have married said officer or enlisted man previous to the passage of this act: *Provided, however*, That this act shall not be so construed as to reduce any pension under any act, public or private.

Mr. WELTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 8, after the word "and" insert the words "in addition."

Mr. WELTY. So that the bill will read—

without means of support other than her daily labor, and, in addition, an actual net income not exceeding \$250 per year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WELTY. The language, without the words "in addition," should be clear enough to mean that if the widow's net income is \$250 in addition to her earnings, without this proposed amendment; but I find that the Pension Department as well as the courts are inclined to construe the law against the beneficiary and in favor of the Government, and I think that the language can not be too clearly expressed, so that there can be no doubt of the intent of Congress.

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

Mr. WELTY. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. I think the language of the bill is perfectly clear as it is framed now. The Pension Bureau so construed that. It is similar to the language of the previous acts. It does not mean the income from her labor, but a net income independent of whatever she may earn herself.

Mr. WELTY. I know, but several Members of the House came to the conclusion that the Pension Department would construe the language otherwise. That is why I offered the amendment.

Mr. LANGLEY. I think the amendment is wholly unnecessary.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELTY. I will.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I have sent to the Clerk's desk an amendment to strike out all of line 8 and all of line 9 to and including the word "year," so as to permit widows to receive a pension without regard to the daily labor or income of \$250. Would not the gentleman from Ohio now consent to have my amendment voted on, and if adopted, as I think it should be, it would clear up the entire situation; and if it be not carried, then the gentleman can offer his amendment, which will improve it in some respects.

Mr. WELTY. Well, a pension is for the support of those who really deserve it and need it, for the widows especially who have children and who do not get anything at all; and I do not think we should open the doors wide and give everyone a pension.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I have simply tried to place the widows of the Spanish War soldiers somewhat near the footing the widows of the soldiers of the Civil War sustain. It seems to me they ought not to pay a pension dependent on an income, and besides those who have had experience with pension matters know that more than any other provision causes trouble. There is more difficulty in making investigations to learn a widow's income, the value of her property, the renting of it, and all that than all the rest of the things put together. It seems to me unwise, improper, and it is unjust—

Mr. WELTY. This refers to net income.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Is it not a fact that the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan will also obviate any feeling on their part that this is any charity—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That is true.

Mr. LITTLE. Which is very embarrassing.

Mr. WELTY. That may be true, but some of the widows of the Spanish-American War have now been shifting for themselves for almost 20 years and many have not been able to show that the death of their husband could be directly traced to an injury received while in the service, and yet death no doubt often was the result of a weakened condition caused by the foul and unhealthy camps, from which they never fully recovered. But the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] should not forget that the House passed a similar bill on three different occasions, and each time was turned down by the Senate. I am not saying this is a just bill to these widows who have thus suffered, but to me it appears the best possible bill which the Senate will accept, and my amendment simply tends to clarify the language. I have great respect for the opinion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], for he has made a special study of pension matters, and if he tells the House that the Pension Department has construed this very language as indicated by my proposed amendment, I shall not further press the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio will be voted down, and trust when the gentleman from Michigan offers his amendment it will be voted down.

So far as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio is concerned, I do not think it is necessary. The Pension Bureau has construed similar language, so that I do not think there can be any question that the \$250 per year income mentioned is in addition to the income derived from the woman's daily labor.

I think the amendment is unnecessary; but another reason why I ask that it be voted down is that the friends of this legislation are anxious to insure the passage of this bill.

The Members of the House know the history of this struggle to secure pensions for widows of the Spanish-American War veterans. The bills have always died in the Senate. We could get them through the House because of our rules, which would permit us to shut off debate and get action. Now, for the first time, a bill has been put through the Senate, and I ask the friends of this legislation to refrain from carrying amendments, in order that we may pass this bill to-night and send it to the President.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KEATING. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. I think there is no doubt whatever that the gentleman is correct that, with the punctuation of this law, the



comma before the word "and" sets off the additional income just as truly as if you used the two words "in addition."

Mr. KEATING. I will say to the gentleman that the objection expressed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WELTY] occurred to me some time ago while I was examining this bill. I spoke to a gentleman who was supposed to be a pension expert, and, while I am not at liberty to give his name, he assured me that the decisions of the Pension Office were as I have stated them.

Mr. FESS. If the gentleman would permit, I had some sympathy with the amendment that is offered by the gentleman from Michigan, but I believe that the position that the author of the bill has taken—

Mr. KEATING. I am merely acting on behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEY], who is chairman of the committee, who is not able to be here to-day on account of illness.

Mr. FESS. I will modify my statement and say the bill that is now under consideration. The statement that has been made by the gentleman from Colorado, I think, is very pertinent, in view of the fact that the House has passed this three times. We have been unable to have it acted upon in another body, and therefore I think it very wise that it be passed without amendment, if possible.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the gentleman's statement that the words "in addition" will add nothing to the force, but it would mean what it would then mean, I am going to vote against that amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I hope the gentleman will have no cause to regret it.

Mr. WELTY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the opinion of Members of the House here that it does carry the same force, I withdraw my amendment, for, as indicated by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING], who is in charge of the bill, it would be best to pass the bill without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i," for this bill is similar to the one heretofore passed on three different occasions by the House, and since the Senate has passed the same we should let well enough alone and be thankful, even though Congress has granted a pension of \$25 to widows of the Civil War.

However, it does seem an injustice to see a widow of the Spanish-American War, with a family to keep, only receiving \$12 per month, and thus be compelled to be away from home and earn her own living as long as the children needed a mother's care. I do hope that this bill will pass the House.

It has been 20 years since the boys responded to a call of their country, and at no time did they ask any legislation in the way of pension for themselves, but they do ask that the country see that their widows and minor children should not suffer and be thrown on charity when they are no more.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment, as indicated, and hope that this bill will pass the House just as it came from the Senate, so that it can not be defeated in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, lines 8 and 9, strike out the following words: "Without means of support other than her daily labor, and an actual net income not exceeding \$250 per year."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to be in the position of seeming to oppose this bill or endanger its passage, but I very much object to passing a measure even under those circumstances with a provision in it which is very objectionable. I think those lines should be stricken out. It is hard to believe the Senate would refuse to accept the House amendment or that the passage of the bill would be delayed if it were amended as I think it ought to be. Now, every Member here has had more or less experience with pension matters. The older Members—those longer in service, I mean—will remember that the pension laws, not those in force now but some of those formerly in force, contained a provision that the widow was denied a pension unless she could show that her annual income was below \$250. They all remember, too, how much trouble it caused. I had several of those cases. I have had hundreds of pension cases altogether, but the few involving widows' incomes caused more trouble than all the rest, and I believe that has been the experience of others. There is no more disagreeable fact to establish, no fact more difficult to establish, no investigation that causes more difference of opinion, ill feeling, than the matter of going into the income of an applicant, the appraisal of the property,

the determination of the rental value, what did you do with this money, how much did you expend on repairs, and why did you do it, and why did you not carry it to net income, and all that. All can be obviated by striking out those words. And in common justice to the widows of the soldiers of the Spanish War and that they may be placed on an equal footing with the widows of soldiers of other wars I insist that those words have no place in this bill. I can not believe that the Senate would object to the amendment. I can not believe that it would delay the passage of this bill one hour, but just take time enough to have it called to the attention of the Senate and the conferees fix up the matter.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me there?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will.

Mr. LANGLEY. It strikes me the Senate must have had some reason for putting that language in.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Heretofore, or in other bills, the House has put in a similar provision. The committees of the House have reported bills with similar provisions and the House has always rejected them.

Mr. LANGLEY. I am in some sympathy with the gentleman's argument, but I am afraid it will delay this bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Let it be delayed so that it can be corrected, but final passage will not be in danger.

Mr. LANGLEY. I would rather see it speedily passed, and then it can be fixed later.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It was stated yesterday by several Senators that we are to be in session until October without intermission, and we will have plenty of time. Let this bill be right.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. To my certain knowledge the gentleman has been present through several Congresses in which this bill regularly came up and probably has, like myself, voted for it three times running now.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. And the gentleman, as an experienced legislator, knows, whatever might be the academic judgment of the majority of the Senate, when the bill as he would perfect it would be before the Senators, the very delicacy of legislation under this old Dome is in getting a bill around where anybody will consider it at all. That is the particular obstacle, it might be suggested, if it were not against the rules to say, so, that is against us in another Chamber.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The bill will go to conference, and undoubtedly the conferees of each House will report an agreement to this amendment. And whoever heard of a conference on a pension-bill report being held up?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. What?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That is, one of any consequence. I do not believe for a moment that this bill will be held up.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Then vote for it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I do not want to vote for something that we will not get when we can vote for something we will get.

Mr. CARY. Does the gentleman think that we can change that at the next session rather than doing it now and not delay this bill?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, it will be observed that this bill carries \$4 a month more to the Spanish-American War widows than the first bill that Congress enacted making provision for the payment of pensions to the widows of the Civil War—a very generous increase. That bill was passed when the Treasury of the United States was in comparatively good condition. We were at peace. To-day we are at war, and people are called upon to buy bonds, and thrift stamps, and war-savings stamps, and are called upon to pay heavy taxes in order to carry on the war and meet the ordinary expenses of the Government. I think, when we pass a law of this kind, the provisions of the law, the safeguards that are thrown about it, should take those things into consideration, and I am very glad that the bill which has been reported does provide that the widow who does not need the pension should not at this time be paid the pension. I think they have made a wise discrimination. We ought not do the unnecessary thing now.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with regard to sending this bill to conference, I think we ought to pass it as it is, without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t," if we are really in favor of this legislation. [Applause.] We could improve it by amendment, but we might jeopardize its passage by such action. You send it to conference and you may not have a bill during this

session. We ought to pass it now. There are other objections to the bill that I would like to see corrected. I have some misgivings as to whether the amount any such widow might receive for daily labor would be included in the \$250. But I am informed by the chairman that the committee that reported this bill had considered this matter and that there was no question but that a widow would be entitled to this pension if she had an income of \$1,000 a year from personal services or for her daily labor, if she had an income of \$250 or less from other sources. At any rate, this seems to be the desire and intention of Congress. In determining the question as to whether a widow is entitled to a pension under this act, the amount such widow receives for personal services is not to be considered. That seems to be agreed to. And therefore I am inclined to think we ought to pass the bill as it has been reported by the committee and let it become a law. If the thing that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] complains of does become burdensome, after this war is over, when the Treasury is in a little better condition, if it is thought wise to give a pension to a widow of such a soldier, even though she have an income of \$5,000 a year, it can be taken care of then. I think, under these conditions, the committee has wisely made some limit as to payment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That no agent, attorney, or other person engaged in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting any claim under the provisions of this act shall, directly or indirectly, contract for, demand, receive, or retain for such services in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting such claim a sum greater than \$10, which sum shall be payable only on the order of the Commissioner of Pensions; and any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this section, or shall wrongfully withhold from the pensioner or claimant the whole or any part of a pension or claim allowed or due such pensioner or claimant under this act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall, for each and every offense, be fined not exceeding \$500 or be imprisoned not exceeding one year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. I move to strike out, on lines 10, 11, and 12, page 3, the following words, "a sum greater than \$10, which sum shall be payable only on the order of the Commissioner of Pensions," and insert in lieu thereof "any sum or fee therefor."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAKER: Page 3, lines 10, 11, and 12, after the word "claim," in line 10, strike out the following: "a sum greater than \$10, which sum shall be payable only on the order of the Commissioner of Pensions," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "any sum or fee therefor."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Iowa made an appealing statement that if you amend the bill, cross a "t" or dot an "i," you would be sure to lose the bill, and that no opportunity should be had for an amendment. There is all reason why the proper amendment should be allowed. The rest of us are in favor of this legislation. There is no question about it. But there is no possible excuse to-day under the procedure of the Pension Bureau, where claims are prepared and made out, where the affidavits are prepared and where Members of Congress look after the cases, and where there is no expense to the applicant, for having \$10 taken from the widow or the minor child. It is wholly unjustifiable.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RAKER. In just a moment. No man under the pension law to-day can justify a charge of \$10 or any other sum to the widow of any soldier under the present procedure of the Pension Bureau.

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

Mr. RAKER. Not just at present. Every assistance is given to them to secure the pension. This \$10 is solely and entirely for the purpose of maintaining bureaus here in Washington for the purpose of taking out of these widows' portions \$10, and nothing else. The Government is appropriating this money for the pension attorneys. The time has come when that sort of a provision ought to be taken out of these pension bills. There can be no justification for it. There is no reason for it. There is no occasion for it; and instead of the amendment that I offer here being a charge, it strikes out the permission of a fee and makes it a felony for a man to retain or charge any sum for assisting or preparing the papers.

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

Mr. RAKER. Any attorney, any notary public, anyone in a clerical position is always ready and willing to assist the claimant in getting her papers properly made out so she can get her money. There is no question about it. There is no doubt in it.

This is clean graft to the lawyer and to the firms that are here in Washington grafting from these widows. I am using my words advisedly, and the Members of this House know it.

Now I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. LANGLEY. This is a voluntary provision. You do not have to employ an attorney. There are many widows in my district who will not have to employ an attorney.

Mr. RAKER. Why not vote to strike it out?

Mr. LANGLEY. I would if it were not for the danger of preventing the early passage of this bill.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, we are here for several months. We are not going to adjourn. We are here for proper legislation, and there is no reason for robbing these widows out of this \$10. It is wrong and should be stopped. There can be no justification for it.

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

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. If the gentleman struck out this provision with the safeguards that are placed about it, would not the grafting lawyers be able to take any sort of sum from these widows?

Mr. RAKER. No; not with the language that follows. It says:

That no agent, attorney, or other person engaged in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting any claim under the provisions of this act shall, directly or indirectly, contract for, demand, receive, or retain for such services in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting such claim—

Any sum or fee therefor. Now, any "such person who shall violate any of the provisions of this section or shall wrongfully withhold from the pensioner or claimant the whole or any part of a pension or claim allowed due such pensioner or claimant under this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor," and so forth. That is as it ought to be. Ninety-nine per cent of the claims are voluntarily presented now. But I want to tell you the agent sends out the word, and when you in your district do the work for them Mr. Pension Agent draws down \$10 for the work that you do. That is what the situation is.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman still believes that "a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush"?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; I believe that "a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush," but I do not think this House can justify taking illegitimately \$10 away from these widows.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am talking about a bird "in the bush." Does the gentleman believe that "a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush"? [Laughter.]

Mr. RAKER. Oh, that trite old saying, that old, nonsensical provision, amounts to nothing. [Laughter.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. What I am afraid of is that the gentleman's cross-eyed amendment will never find its way back from the Senate.

Mr. RAKER. If it is adopted, it will get back all right. It is the same old cry. If you do not give these fellows just what they demand, then the cry is raised that to amend the bill properly it might endanger its passage. That is moonshine, pure and simple. I want this legislation to pass and become a law. To correct any glaring errors in it is the duty of every Member and the business of the committee and the House. Because the wrong is carried in prior laws it is no reason that it should be continued in this. There is no better time to lop off this "little graft" on the widows and minors than at the present time. I am strongly for this bill and shall vote for it, would like to see this amendment adopted, and then the bill would be in fine shape.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. RAKER. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 9, noes 43.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the bill pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (S. 4444) to pension widows and minor children of officers and enlisted men who served in the war with Spain, Philippine insurrection, or in China, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the bill was passed.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed and move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, no quorum!

Mr. SIMS. You are on the Water Power Committee. Are you going to do that sort of a job?

Mr. RAKER. I am going to make a point of no quorum when I want to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California makes a point of no quorum. The Chair will count.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. In case the Chair would find a quorum is not present, would the vote come on the bill? The Chair had declared the bill passed, and I had started to make a motion to reconsider and lay on the table when the gentleman from California interposed the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. What is it that the gentleman wants to know?

Mr. KEATING. I want to know, if a quorum is not present, whether a vote will come on the passage of the bill?

The SPEAKER. Yes; it is an automatic call.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOSTER. If a quorum does not develop the bill fails?

The SPEAKER. We will stay here and get a quorum.

Mr. RAKER. There is a quorum here, and we should spend whatever time is necessary.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan rose.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Do I understand the Speaker to say that he had not indicated that the bill had passed?

The SPEAKER. Oh, no. The Chair did not say anything of the sort. He said it had passed, and immediately the gentleman from California raised the point of no quorum. It simply precipitates an automatic roll call. There are only 110 Members here, not a quorum, and the Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the passage of the bill. Those in favor of the passage of the bill will answer "yea" when their names are called; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 228, nays 7, answered "present" 3, not voting 193, as follows:

YEAS—228.

Alexander	Dallinger	Hamlin	Lobeck
Almon	Decker	Hardy	London
Anderson	Denison	Harrison, Miss.	Loneragan
Aswell	Denton	Harrison, Va.	Lufkin
Ayres	Dickinson	Hastings	Lundeen
Bankhead	Dillon	Haugen	McArthur
Barkley	Dixon	Hawley	McClintic
Barnhart	Doolittle	Hayden	McFadden
Beakes	Drane	Heflin	McKeown
Bell	Dunn	Helvering	McLaughlin, Mich.
Beshlin	Dupré	Hensley	McLemore
Blackmon	Eagan	Hilliard	Mansfield
Bland, Va.	Eagle	Holland	Mapes
Booher	Edmonds	Huddleston	Martin
Borland	Elliott	Hull, Iowa	Mays
Bowers	Ellsworth	Hull, Tenn.	Miller, Minn.
Brand	Esch	Humphreys	Miller, Wash.
Brodbeck	Evans	Husted	Mondell
Browne	Fairchild, D. I.	Hutchinson	Montague
Brumbaugh	Fairfield	Igoe	Moon
Burroughs	Ferris	Jacoway	Moore, Pa.
Byrnes, S. C.	Fess	Johnson, Ky.	Moore, Ind.
Campbell, Kans.	Fields	Johnson, Wash.	Morgan
Candler, Miss.	Focht	Kahn	Mott
Cannon	Foster	Keating	Nelson
Cantrill	Frear	Kennedy, Iowa	Nicholls, S. C.
Carlin	French	Kettner	Nichols, Mich.
Carter, Okla.	Gallagher	Kinkaid	Oldfield
Cary	Gallivan	Kitchin	Oliver, Ala.
Chandler, N. Y.	Gandy	Knutson	Oliver, N. Y.
Church	Garrett, Tex.	Kraus	Olney
Clark, Fla.	Gillett	La Follette	Osborne
Classon	Godwin, N. C.	Langley	Overmyer
Cleary	Good	Larsen	Overstreet
Coady	Goodwin, Ark.	Lazaro	Padgett
Collier	Green, Iowa	Lea, Cal.	Park
Connelly, Kans.	Greene, Vt.	Lee, Ga.	Parker, N. J.
Copley	Griest	Leshner	Parker, N. Y.
Cox	Griffin	Lever	Platt
Crisp	Hadley	L'hecum	Pratt
Crosser	Hamill	Little	Rainey, H. T.
Curry, Cal.	Hamilton, Mich.	Littlepage	Rainey, J. W.

Raker	Sears	Taylor, Colo.	Welling
Ramseyer	Shallenberger	Temple	Welty
Randall	Sherley	Thomas	Whaley
Riordan	Shouse	Timberlake	Wheeler
Robbins	Sims	Tinkham	White, Me.
Roberts	Sinnott	Towner	Williams
Rodenberg	Sloan	Van Dyke	Wilson, Ill.
Rogers	Smith, Idaho	Venable	Wilson, La.
Romjue	Snook	Vestal	Wilson, Tex.
Rose	Steagall	Vinson	Wingo
Rouse	Steenerson	Walker	Winslow
Rubey	Stephens, Miss.	Walsh	Woods, Iowa
Sanders, La.	Stiness	Wason	Woodyard
Schall	Tagne	Watkins	Wright
Scott, Mich.	Taylor, Ark.	Webb	Zihman

NAYS—7.

Blanton	Connally, Tex.	Garrett, Tenn.	Quin
Buchanan	Garner	Jones	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Helm	Sisson	Sumners	
------	--------	---------	--

NOT VOTING—193.

Anthony	Fairchild, G. W.	LaGuardia	Scott, Pa.
Ashbrook	Farr	Lehibach	Scully
Austin	Fisher	Longworth	Sells
Bacharach	Flood	Lunn	Shackelford
Baer	Flynn	McAndrews	Sherwood
Black	Fordney	McCormick	Siegel
Bland, Ind.	Foss	McCulloch	Slayden
Britten	Francis	McKenzie	Slemp
Browning	Freeman	McKinley	Small
Buttett	Fuller, Ill.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Smith, Mich.
Butler	Fuller, Mass.	Madden	Smith, C. B.
Byrns, Tenn.	Gard	Magee	Smith, T. F.
Caldwell	Garland	Maber	Snell
Campbell, Pa.	Glass	Mann	Stafford
Caraway	Glynn	Mason	Stedman
Carew	Goodall	Meeker	Steele
Carter, Mass.	Gordon	Merritt	Stephens, Nebr.
Chandler, Okla.	Gould	Morin	Sterling, Ill.
Clark, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	Mudd	Sterling, Pa.
Claypool	Graham, Pa.	Neely	Stevenson
Cooper, Ohio	Gray, Ala.	Nolan	Strong
Cooper, W. Va.	Gray, N. J.	Norton	Sullivan
Cooper, Wis.	Greene, Mass.	O'Shaunessy	Sweet
Costello	Gregg	Paige	Swift
Crago	Hamilton, N. Y.	Peters	Switzer
Cramton	Haskell	Phelan	Talbott
Currie, Mich.	Hayes	Polk	Templeton
Dale, N. Y.	Heaton	Porter	Thompson
Dale, Vt.	Hcintz	Pou	Tillman
Darrow	Hersey	Powers	Tilson
Davidson	Hicks	Price	Treadway
Davis	Hollingsworth	Purnell	Vare
Delaney	Hood	Ragsdale	Voigt
Dempsey	Houston	Ramsey	Volstead
Dent	Howard	Rankin	Waldow
Dewalt	Ireland	Rayburn	Walton
Dies	James	Reavis	Ward
Dill	Johnson, S. Dak.	Reed	Watson, Pa.
Dominick	Juul	Robinson	Watson, Va.
Donovan	Kearns	Rowe	Weaver
Dooling	Keoh	Rowland	White, Ohio
Doremus	Kelley, Mich.	Rucker	Wise
Doughton	Kelly, Pa.	Russell	Wood, Ind.
Dowell	Kennedy, R. I.	Sabath	Young, N. Dak.
Drukker	Key, Ohio	Sanders, Ind.	Young, Tex.
Dyer	Kiess, Pa.	Sanders, N. Y.	
Elston	Kincheloe	Sanford	
Emerson	King	Saunders, Va.	
Estopinal	Kreider	Scott, Iowa	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

- Mr. POU with Mr. SANDERS of Indiana.
- Mr. RUCKER with Mr. STERLING of Illinois.
- Mr. SHERWOOD with Mr. WOOD of Indiana.
- Mr. STEDMAN with Mr. IRELAND.
- Mr. PRICE with Mr. SANDERS of New York.
- Mr. RUSSELL with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.
- Mr. SMALL with Mr. LONGWORTH.
- Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. SANFORD.
- Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania with Mr. KING.
- Mr. SCULLY with Mr. LEHLBACH.
- Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. SNELL.
- Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. MCCULLOCH.
- Mr. RAYBURN with Mr. STRONG.
- Mr. WALTON with Mr. SWIFT.
- Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. MCKENZIE.
- Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH with Mr. MUDD.
- Mr. WEAVER with Mr. MAGEE.
- Mr. ROBINSON with Mr. PAIGE.
- Mr. WHITE with Mr. SEGEL.
- Mr. WISE with Mr. ROWE.
- Mr. YOUNG of Texas with Mr. WALDOW.
- Mr. WATSON of Virginia with Mr. KEARNS.
- Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania with Mr. JAMES.
- Mr. DEWALT with Mr. EMERSON.
- Mr. HOOD with Mr. FRANCIS.
- Mr. HOWARD with Mr. CURRIE of Michigan.
- Mr. DOOLING with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.
- Mr. HOWARD with Mr. HAYES.

Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.  
 Mr. DIES with Mr. HEATON.  
 Mr. KINCHELOE with Mr. DABROW.  
 Mr. McANDREWS with Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. FISHER with Mr. HERSEY.  
 Mr. GARD with Mr. FREEMAN.  
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. GLYNN.  
 Mr. NEELY with Mr. DAVIDSON.  
 Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois.  
 Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. FARR.  
 Mr. DOMINICK with Mr. GRAY of New Jersey.  
 Mr. GLASS with Mr. FORDNEY.  
 Mr. FLOOD with Mr. GARLAND.  
 Mr. GRAY of Alabama with Mr. FOSS.  
 Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. HASKELL.  
 Mr. FLYNN with Mr. DAVIS.  
 Mr. GORDON with Mr. GOODALL.  
 Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. GOULD.  
 Mr. PHELAN with Mr. DYER.  
 Mr. POLK with Mr. FULLER of Illinois.  
 Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. AUSTIN.  
 Mr. SABATH with Mr. PURNELL.  
 Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. MCKINLEY.  
 Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. BROWNING.  
 Mr. TILLMAN with Mr. DOWELL.  
 Mr. STEVENSON with Mr. SNYDER.  
 Mr. SUMNERS with Mr. REAVIS.  
 Mr. DILL with Mr. HICKS.  
 Mr. BLACK with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.  
 Mr. THOMPSON with Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. LUNN with Mr. ELSTON.  
 Mr. ASHBROOK with Mr. ANTHONY.  
 Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania with Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin.  
 Mr. BURNETT with Mr. BACHARACH.  
 Mr. CAREW with Mr. COSTELLO.  
 Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. BLAND of Indiana.  
 Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee with Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma.  
 Mr. DELANEY with Mr. COOPER of West Virginia.  
 Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. BRITTEN.  
 Mr. DENT with Mr. CRAGO.  
 Mr. STEELE with Mr. BUTLER.  
 Mr. CLAYPOOL with Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania.  
 On this vote:  
 Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (for) with Mr. HELM (against).  
 Mr. HELM. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?  
 The SPEAKER. In the negative.  
 Mr. HELM. I am paired with the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. KENNEDY, and I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present."  
 Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, my colleague Mr. DALE of Vermont is unavoidably absent. If present, I am certain he would vote "yea."  
 Mr. MAPES. I was requested by my colleague Mr. CRAMTON to say that if he were present on this roll call he would vote "yea."  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
 The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors. The bill is passed.  
 On motion of Mr. KEATING, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I call from the Speaker's table H. R. 12100 and move to concur in the Senate amendments.  
 The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 12100) to amend the act approved September 7, 1916, entitled "An act to establish a United States Shipping Board for the purpose of encouraging, developing, and creating a naval auxiliary and naval reserve and a merchant marine to meet the requirements of the commerce of the United States with its Territories and possessions and with foreign countries; to regulate carriers by water in the foreign and interstate commerce of the United States; and for other purposes," with Senate amendments.  
 The SPEAKER. What is the legislative parliamentary status of this bill?  
 Mr. ALEXANDER. The House passed the bill and it comes back here with Senate amendments.  
 The SPEAKER. Does any Senate amendment require action in the Committee of the Whole?  
 Mr. ALEXANDER. It does not.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what this bill is.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is a bill that passed the House a few days ago amending the shipping act. The purpose of it is in the main to prevent American ships passing to a foreign flag without the consent of the Government, through the Shipping Board, and also to give the Government control over the shipyards and other shipbuilding facilities used in building ships. The first amendment the Senate made to the bill is on page 5, subdivision "c," where the House prohibited the entering "into any contract, agreement, or understanding to construct a vessel within the United States for or to be delivered to any person not a citizen of the United States," and the Senate added this language: "without expressly stipulating that such construction shall not begin until after the war or emergency proclaimed by the President has ended."

Mr. CANNON. I have not got a bill with the Senate amendments.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The bill has not been printed with the Senate amendments.

Mr. CANNON. I think it ought to be printed.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is a privileged bill and was reported back to the House to-day.

Mr. CANNON. It may be a privileged bill, but what the gentleman has said is just so much Greek to me. It is familiar to the gentleman, but I doubt if there are a dozen men in the House who recollect, in the first place, what was in the bill as it passed the House, and, second, who know what the amendments do.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It liberalizes the provisions of the House bill to this extent: Under the Senate amendment American shipyards may contract to build ships for foreign account provided they expressly stipulate that such construction shall not begin until the war or the emergency has ended. As the bill passed the House, shipyards were prohibited from entering into any contract or agreement or understanding to construct a vessel in the United States to be delivered to any person not a citizen of the United States. The Senate amendments provided that they may enter into a contract, provided it is expressly stipulated that the construction should not begin until after the war or the emergency has ended. As we passed the bill, they could not enter into the contract at all.

Mr. CANNON. This allows them to enter into a contract?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; but it expressly stipulates that they shall not enter into the construction until the emergency is over.

Mr. CANNON. That is one amendment. What is the next?

Mr. ALEXANDER. On page 7 the House bill provided:

Any such sale, mortgage, lease, charter, delivery, transfer, documentation, or agreement therefor shall be void, whether made within or without the United States, and any consideration paid therefor or deposited in connection therewith shall be recoverable at the suit of the person who has paid or deposited the same, or of his successors or assigns, after the tender of such vessel, shipyard, dry dock, shipbuilding or ship-repairing plant or facilities, or interest therein, or of such stocks, bonds, or other securities, to the person entitled thereto, or after forfeiture thereof to the United States—

And the Senate added this language—

unless the person to whom the consideration was paid, or in whose interest it was deposited, entered into the transaction in the honest belief that the person who paid or deposited such consideration was a citizen of the United States.

The other Senate amendments are merely verbal.

At the bottom of page 7 the word "or" is stricken out; its insertion was a typographical error. Then in line 23, page 8, the word "said" is inserted to make the reference to sections 9 and 37 more specific.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I note that in the print of the bill that we have the language in italics is the language of the two Senate amendments as reported to the Senate by the committee of the Senate. Now, what is there that we can get to show us the bill as it passed the Senate?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have examined the engrossed bill as it passed the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. And it contains the identical amendments as reported to the Senate?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Now, this language on page 7 says—

unless the person to whom the consideration was paid, or in whose interest it was deposited, entered into the transaction in the honest belief that the person who paid or deposited such consideration was a citizen of the United States.

That will, it would seem, destroy or nullify the rest of the section. He is not put on his guard and there is nothing for him to inquire about. He can go into the transaction and say that he honestly believed the man was a citizen of the United States, and that is enough to absolve him.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not think any man would do anything prohibited here and take those chances unless he was acting in good faith.

Mr. WALSH. If he says he was acting in good faith, and under the provisions of the bill if he says he had an honest belief, that ends it, whether there was any justification for him to have had that belief or not.

It seems to me that the language used in this amendment is rather unfortunate in exempting the party receiving this consideration from the operations of the act, if he simply says he had an honest belief that the person who paid or deposited the consideration was a citizen of the United States. He may have that honest belief as the result of collusion between the other parties, of which he has no knowledge.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I hardly think that is true. Of course, if the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries had framed that amendment I think they would have framed it in happier language, but it was framed by the Committee on Commerce in the Senate, and they reported it out of the committee in that form and it was agreed to in the Senate, and while it does not meet my entire approval, yet the legal department of the Shipping Board feel that it is not so serious that the bill should be sent to conference upon that account.

Mr. WALSH. I have seen bills sent to conference for matters of less consequence.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have advised with the members of my committee about it, those who are here, and who would be members of the conference committee, and we have agreed that it is advisable to take the course that I have indicated.

Mr. WALSH. As I understand the gentleman, he thinks that this language is not strictly necessary and that there is no real need for adding to the provision as reported by his committee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Senate committee thought so—

Mr. WALSH. No; but I am talking about the gentleman's committee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. And their idea was to protect the innocent purchaser, and there is reason why that may be done; but they—

Mr. WALSH. If this measure went to conference, does not the gentleman think that the idea sought to be expressed in this language might be incorporated in the bill in language that would be a little more definite and would not permit opportunities for fraud.

Mr. ALEXANDER. As I said to the gentleman, I think if the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries had framed the language it would have been happier and clearer.

Mr. WALSH. I will say to the gentleman that his committee has brought some very important measures into this House and they have been very carefully phrased and have been reported after careful consideration. It does not seem that we ought to clutter up a bill which was very carefully prepared by his committee, by language framed loosely somewhere else, and I am sorry the gentleman did not ask to have this measure go to conference.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he is sure that this amendment proposed by the committee was adopted by the Senate.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I know it was. I have examined the report.

Mr. TOWNER. I did not know whether the gentleman knew it or not.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Certainly; it was adopted by the Senate.

Mr. TOWNER. There is nothing before the House to show that the amendment was adopted by the Senate.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Senate bill is here and I have examined the engrossed copy and the report accompanying it, and there is no doubt about it, in my mind.

Mr. TOWNER. But that is not available to Members of the House. What I wanted to call attention to, and I think it is a very serious matter, is this: Two or three times bills have been sent over in just the condition that this is in. We have been taking things on faith. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] has made a very complete explanation. I have no objection whatever in this particular case, but I am quite sure that he will agree with me that these bills ought not to be passed on by the House unless they have the opportunity of really knowing what are the amendments proposed, and the

only way that this can be done is by providing that they shall be printed as Senate amendments and adopted by the Senate. Then the House may have the right to consider them and know what they mean and understand their effect. We do not always have the benefit of such complete and satisfactory explanations as has been made by the chairman of the committee, but what we ought to have in all cases are the amendments of the Senate just as they have been made, so that the House may really see them and know what they are.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I agree with the gentleman, but the rules do not provide that the bill shall be printed showing the Senate amendments unless it is referred to the committee. The rules should provide that bills shall be printed with the Senate amendments when they come over from the Senate to the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

On motion of Mr. ALEXANDER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendments were concurred in was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. WELTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the bill S. 4444.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House grant general leave to Members to extend their remarks on the pension bill (S. 4444) which has just been passed for three legislative days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend and revise my own remarks on that bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS] all make the same request. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall object unless the request is so framed as to have the extensions made within five legislative days.

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen ask unanimous consent to extend their remarks upon the pension bill just passed within five legislative days. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 1419, the water-power bill.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman kindly withhold that for a moment?

#### ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, JULY 12, 1918.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to submit another request. Mr. Speaker, I am informed from almost every source that there are quite a number of Members of the House who will not be here and can not be here to-morrow, having made a previous engagement thinking the House would recess, and that there will be no quorum to-morrow and no business done, and I am going to ask that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet next Thursday. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the distinguished chairman of the committee has not stated the reason that a great many Members will not be here, but I have been advised that a reason for the absence of a great many Members to-morrow will also preclude their being present on Thursday.

Mr. SIMS. There will be no vote on Thursday.

Mr. WALSH. Well, I think there is a disposition on the part of Members interested in this measure to have it considered only when a quorum is present, and if there is not going to be

one here Thursday there is no need of attempting to proceed with its consideration any more than to-morrow.

Mr. SIMS. In general debate, as the gentleman knows, there is never a quorum in attendance on the committee.

Mr. WALSH. You only have general debate to-morrow, and yet the gentleman says—

Mr. SIMS. Then I will change the request, Mr. Speaker, and ask that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Friday next for the same reason I stated at first.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain to the House and the country why he wants to adjourn over until Thursday?

Mr. SIMS. Because I understand there will not be a quorum here to-morrow or the next day.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Why not? A great many of us want to get home. Why should we adjourn over to-morrow or the next day?

Mr. SIMS. I make this upon the request of the leaders on both sides of the House, who think it will not delay anything.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Is there any reason?

Mr. SIMS. There will not be a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Why not a quorum to-morrow?

Mr. SIMS. That is the explanation—

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman want me to whisper in his ear?

Mr. SIMS. It is not my personal request; I am requesting this on account of the statement made to me by the leaders on both sides.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I withdraw any objection I have.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the reason?

Mr. SIMS. I have said, I do not know how often, the information is there will be no quorum here to-morrow or the next day, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has just said the water-power bill can not proceed without a quorum.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. And if we hold a session to-morrow there will be no quorum to-morrow or the next day if we are in session?

Mr. SIMS. No matter whether we are in session or not, that is my information.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, I desire to say that I am not at all mealy-mouthed about telling what the reason is. There is nothing to evade as far as I can observe. Some two or three weeks ago everyone expected there would be a recess, and accepted an invitation to go to Atlantic City to attend the national Elks' convention, a very respectable and proper thing to do, and it is very embarrassing now for Members to be held here; and, inasmuch as the chairman of the Committee on Water Power has made this request, I see no impropriety and no reason why Members should not carry out their program in the acceptance of the invitation. I am willing to accept what responsibility may devolve upon me in reference to stating the reason. Some 225 men have accepted the invitation, and it will probably break a quorum, whether we adjourn over or whether we do not.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, if I may have just a moment. I understood this bill was taken up under the express consideration that Calendar Wednesday was not to be interfered with?

The SPEAKER. That is right.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. To-morrow is Calendar Wednesday. How will that affect the arrangement that may be made about a quorum, which applies, I understand, only to the water-power bill? Now, to-morrow is Calendar Wednesday, and you do not need a quorum here to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows; but this request of the gentleman from Tennessee cuts out to-morrow, which is Calendar Wednesday. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Friday at 12 o'clock noon. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN (H. DOC. NO. 1220).

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I want to make a unanimous-consent request for a publication as a document, if I may have one moment's time. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed as a House document 10,000 copies, to be distributed through the document room of the House, of the message of the President of the United States setting forth the treaty which has just been ratified between the United States and Great Britain defining the military service and

status of the citizens of each country resident in the other country, and together therewith the general legislation carrying this treaty into effect in the United States that was carried in the annual Army bill that was passed two or three days ago.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] asks unanimous consent that 10,000 copies of the President's message on the subject of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain, together with legislation set out in the Army bill, be printed as a document and sent to the document room. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

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

The SPEAKER. On what?

Mr. CROSSER. On the general situation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks leave to extend his remarks on general subjects.

Mr. WALSH. The state of the Union?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Reserving the right to object, are these the gentleman's own remarks?

Mr. CROSSER. Yes; my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### WAR-RISK INSURANCE LAW AND ITS OPERATIONS.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a document the report that was made, at the instance of the Secretary of the Treasury and Secretary of War, by Col. Robert M. Lord, Maj. Wolfe, and Mr. Herbert D. Brown, Chief of the United States Bureau of Efficiency, with reference to the war-risk insurance law and its operations. It is a report that will be of great benefit to the bureau and of great benefit to the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that a report made by Col. Lord, and the others he has mentioned, be printed as a House document.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, well, Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, why does not the Treasury Department print it as a document?

Mr. SIMS. I do not know.

Mr. WALSH. They ought to do so. We ought not to be printing documents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of the Members.

Mr. WALSH. I object.

#### WATER-POWER LEGISLATION.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 1419.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent 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 S. 1419.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 1419, the water-power bill, with Mr. WEBB in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] is recognized.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I had commenced to make a statement, but on account of questions being asked which were very pertinent, and in trying to answer them, and having made a motion to rise, I had hardly begun my speech on the general purposes and provisions of the bill.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman pardon me if I continue those questions along the same line until the subject has been concluded, to this point, at least?

It will be recalled that we were determining, if we could, in anticipation of the purpose and the construction to be given to this law, whether a man undertaking to develop water power on one of the nonnavigable interior streams of a State would be obliged to apply to the Federal Government for authority to begin that work, or whether he could continue, as he has in the past, under the authority of the State law. Is the gentleman prepared to give any definite answer to that proposition as he is informed now?

Mr. SIMS. I will reply as I did before, that the improvement of a navigable stream, of course, depends entirely upon the consent of Congress. With reference to whether or not a pro-

posed improvement or dam would affect adversely the navigation of the river, or that a stream which is a tributary of a navigable river, if dammed for water-power purposes, would so divert the course of the stream as to materially reduce the flow of water and its depth for navigable purposes in the navigable portion of the river of which it is a tributary would be a question of fact to be determined in each case.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That we went over. All I want to try to ascertain—and I can see, perhaps, the hopelessness of it—is whether, if the gentleman or any of us were undertaking a private venture on those heretofore comparatively unnoticed streams, he would think that we ought to go to the Federal Government in the first instance or go along, as we have heretofore, and make our application to our State government as a matter of course?

Mr. SIMS. As set forth by the gentleman, I think there will be no danger to your State authorities giving no heed to the Federal Government.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. With that in mind, I would like to suggest this to the gentleman: On page 26, lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, of the bill now under consideration, there is given a definition of so-called navigable waters, as follows:

"Navigable waters" means all streams or parts of streams, and other bodies of water or parts thereof, over which Congress has jurisdiction under its authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.

On page 22 of the print of this bill we have in the text of the Senate bill—which was stricken out by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in reporting the bill back to the House—a definition of navigable waters and the purposes of this act with regard to them that it seems to me might well be substituted for the definition given in the House committee's report on page 26. The text of the Senate definition is as follows.

That the term "navigable waters" as used in this act and as applied to streams shall be construed to include only such streams or parts of streams as are in their ordinary natural condition used for the transportation of persons or property in interstate or foreign commerce or which through improvement heretofore or hereafter made have been or shall become usable in such commerce. As to all other streams or parts of streams over which Congress has jurisdiction, under its authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, permission is hereby given to construct dams therein, subject, however, to removal or reconstruction, without expense to the United States unless utilized by the United States, whenever the United States enters upon the improvement thereof for the purpose of making the same usable for interstate or foreign transportation: *Provided*, That any person who proposes to construct a dam in any such last-mentioned stream or part of stream may make application to the Secretary of War, and thereupon may receive a permit under the conditions with all the rights and privileges herein provided for streams or parts of streams used for the transportation of persons or property in interstate or foreign commerce in their ordinary, natural, or improved condition. Nothing in this section shall be construed to grant any right to occupy or use any public land.

May I ask the gentleman, if it does not trespass upon his good nature, whether he might not be willing to accept an amendment at the proper time that substituted the Senate text on page 22 for the House definition given in lines 1 to 5, on page 26?

Mr. SIMS. In reply to the gentleman I will say that, representing the action of the committee or the majority of it, of course, I could not consent unless it had been submitted to the committee and it had agreed to it. Personally I think the definition on page 26 is hardly a definition at all. It depends on the facts with reference to each stream. The definition in the Senate bill, page 22, is more definite, but whether or not it is more accurate as a legal question is something I would not want to undertake to pass on.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Would the gentleman allow me to make a suggestion right there?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The provision on page 22, the language stricken out in the Senate bill, is the gist of a Supreme Court decision covering the case of navigable streams, already passed upon by the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. SIMS. We will have plenty of time to consider that in the amending stage of the bill.

When this matter came up I had just made a statement from the hearings that there is now, or was in 1916, 6,000,000 horsepower of developed water power in the United States; that one-half, or 3,000,000 of it, would not be affected in the slightest by the passage of this or any other bill by the Federal Government, as I understand it. This 3,000,000, or one-half of all of it, was developed on streams not navigable or not situated on the public lands. The entire amount of water power that has been developed that would be subject to this bill or its provisions now amounts to 3,000,000 horsepower. It is estimated by Mr. Merrill, chief engineer of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, that there is about, as I now recall, 26,000,000 potential

horsepower undeveloped in the United States. Other estimators, perhaps less accurate—and Mr. Merrill admits that it is more or less a guess—have estimated that the potential horsepower in the United States amounts to fifty or sixty millions. It is also estimated that there is fifty or sixty millions undeveloped horsepower in the Dominion of Canada.

The power shortage in the United States has become exceedingly acute. There is a greater demand for the increase of mechanical power at this time than there has ever been before in the United States. It is more acute now, perhaps, during the war than it will ever be again, unless there is another war. But it will grow no less. The question of the development of hydroelectric power means that you are converting water power for the purpose of transmission, for the purpose of shipment, so to speak. Water power is just as potential, just as needful, and just as serviceable as is electric power. But raw material, in the first place, would have to be shipped, transported to the site of the water power, and finished products or manufactured products would then have to be transported from the water power to the markets. Therefore by converting water power into electric power we can avoid a great drain upon the traffic facilities of the country, the railroads and the rivers, for the reason that you transport the energy to the place where perhaps the raw material may be in large supply, possibly where it is cheaper to transport the raw material, if it has to be transported, than it would to transport it to the site of the water power. So, after all, this is a transportation question, a question of transportation of physical property.

For instance, here may be an iron-ore bank, a large deposit of iron, and near by, as in the case of Birmingham, Ala., large deposits of coal. If a water power exists within reach of Birmingham, although the coal may be near the iron ore, or the iron ore may be near the coal, yet if we can transmit or transport electric current by reason of the development of a water power, it can be generated cheaply, we can actually operate machinery in Birmingham near the iron ore and coal mines at a less cost than could be done if we had to transport either the coal or iron ore a short distance, or both a short distance, to the manufacturing plant. It saves an immense expenditure in motive power. Consequently the increased cost of coal alone, the great draft upon the railway motive power at present, if there was nothing else in it, would of itself constitute a very great demand for the development of hydroelectric power by the development of water powers.

Take the case on the Pacific coast. Take the State of California, where at present their entire power supply must either come from water-power produced electricity or from coal that costs \$6 or \$8 a ton, or fuel oil, which is now the chief supply of power in the State of California. The oil wells of California are gradually being exhausted. The supply is growing less and less every year. Hence the great necessity of an early development of additional water power in California because of the rapid exhaustion of fuel oil.

California has but few streams that are navigable on which water power can be developed, but there are a great number of water powers that can be created by impounding the waters in the mountains which are on public lands, and it is extremely necessary that we should have legislation with reference to further development of water power upon the public lands adjacent to those Western States, while the water-power development in the States east of the Mississippi River and, in fact, east of the Rocky Mountains, is confined almost altogether to navigable streams; not altogether, but those that would be immediately developed under the provisions of this bill would be those developed through power dams upon navigable streams.

The Senate bill which we are amending applied only to navigable rivers. The Adamson bill, which was passed by the House last Congress, applied only to the navigable rivers. The Ferris bill applied to the public lands only. All of which is combined in this one bill. The power shortage in the Eastern States, on the Atlantic seaboard, and where our great war industries are now located, is very great.

I will admit that ordinarily in the development of a water-power site for the manufacture of electricity the time required, first, in order to make preliminary surveys of the sites to ascertain what can be done in the way of financing the scheme, is considerable. It takes time, and it takes a long time, to build a tremendous dam. A water-power dam in some places, on some watercourses, is estimated to cost as high as \$25,000,000. But there are a number of Government dams, navigation dams, dams that have been built on navigable rivers for the purpose of improving navigation, that are now unavailable simply because there is no law that permits their utilization. Those dams, or the water powers produced by Government navigation dams, can be made available immediately; that is, just as soon as

the electric generating machinery and transmission wires can be constructed. The Government is getting no return, not a dollar, on the money in the navigation dams. There is a dam of that kind in Arkansas; three, I believe, in the State of Minnesota; there are three or four in the State of Ohio; perhaps one or more in Alabama, that as soon as the bill is passed and improvement made, either by the Government itself or by private capital under permit or license, as provided for in this bill, can be made available in time to be of very great benefit during the war, unless the war fortunately ends in less time than we have hope that it will end.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the chairman of the committee yield for a question?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am curious to know what the committee had in mind with reference to the utilization of these water powers by the Government. Is it the thought of the committee that Government use is only contemplated for war-time purposes, or is any use by the Government contemplated after the cessation of the war, in peace times?

Mr. SIMS. The bill provides for the development of water powers either by private capital or by the Government.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I know, but what thought had the committee in mind with reference to its utilization by the Government? For what purposes was it contemplated that it might be used?

Mr. SIMS. It is not limited, but naturally it is supposed that it will be utilized by the Government for Government purposes; but there is nothing in the bill that will prevent the Government from operating hydroelectric energy just as the Government itself may determine that its necessities require.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. I have hop-skip-and-jumped through this bill. I want to see if my conclusion is correct. It is a bill of many pages, and I regard it as a bill of importance; but I came to the conclusion after finishing the reading that no one in the United States, except a man needing a conservator, would ever buy a bond if a private individual undertook to finance one of these improvements under all the provisions of the bill. Therefore it seems to me it is a bill in effect to promote universal Government development.

Mr. SIMS. I do not understand the gentleman from Illinois to mean that the practical effect of it will be that there will be no improvement by private capital. Is that what the gentleman means?

Mr. CANNON. Precisely. I have read the bill, and if I understand it I think it is so hedged about with provisions and exceptions, with regulation by the States and then regulation by the National Government, that it seems to me no man could finance the improvement, for the simple reason that these companies do not make these improvements with their own money. They do not finance in that way. So while the bill professes to provide for financing by individuals or by citizens, it seems to me that there will never be any of that kind of financing, and it strikes me there will be no financing at all unless it is done by the Government.

Mr. SIMS. In reply to the gentleman from Illinois, I beg to say that men who are engineers and have expert knowledge of water-power development and who know its cost and the methods of financing, I think without one exception, who have been before our committee have spoken in very high terms of the bill, and have said they think there is no question that there will be development under the bill as it is reported to the House. Besides that a member of the investment banking house of Harris, Forbes & Co. appeared before the committee and made a statement as to what his firm or bank would do.

Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCCHILD. Will the gentleman mention the name of the member of Harris, Forbes & Co. who appeared before the committee?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Krauthoff, who is a very intelligent man. His statement would interest anybody. Harris, Forbes & Co. are one of the model investment banking houses of the United States, and all others that are models would act along the same line. Mr. Krauthoff stated that the firm of Harris, Forbes & Co. will not buy a bond or advance one dollar for construction purposes under this bill or under any other.

This is a broken way to discuss this subject, but after all it is a very good way to do it. The gentleman from Illinois asks a question that puts everybody's mind on the subject and that gives me an opportunity to turn to that portion of the hearing that will answer the gentleman's question. That is a very good way to do. It takes time, but we seem to have a reasonable amount of time before us. Now, I want to read to you what Mr. Krauthoff said on that very subject, as to what a good house like his will do and what they will not do with reference

to financing these propositions. On page 451 of the hearings, Mr. Krauthoff says:

I would like to give you, very briefly, some idea of the care with which we go into a public-utility situation prior to our undertaking any bond financing thereon. In the first place, the property, of course, has to be on an established and going basis. We do not finance so-called construction propositions in any stage. They have to have a record of operations and of earnings before we are interested at all. The construction-money stage has to be financed by the junior people, who get back some of their money later on through the sale of the bonds.

The first phase of our investigation is to send out an engineer to make a report on the property, including a very conservative valuation or appraisal of the purely physical property, because this physical-property valuation is what, in the last analysis, we base our bond issue on. In other words, we figure that if our bonds are well within that valuation they are safe, other factors being equally favorable. The legal phases of the situation are gone over most carefully by our attorneys, a detailed report on its business aspects is made by a member of our organization, and the earnings are reported on and verified by our accountant.

Then these various expert reports and opinions are taken together and discussed by the house in order to determine, in view of the facts brought out in the reports and opinions, whether it is conservative to loan on that property at all, and, if it is, what is a conservative amount for the proposed bond issue, and by what restrictions such a bond issue should be safeguarded? We have never handled a share of stock in our entire career, and we have no personal interest at stake in the junior end or any other end of the situation except, of course, from the broad standpoint of the economic advantages which will accrue to this country from the development of its enormous water-power resources, an advantage which was never more obvious than under the conditions which exist to-day. There will be plenty of other business coming to us if we do not care to take hold of any particular proposition—hydroelectric or otherwise. There is always a far greater demand for our funds than there are projects that we are willing to go into. In fact, out of all the projects that come to us I do not suppose that we handle one in ten, which means there is not one in ten that will meet all our requirements.

That is the statement from high authority, that they will not advance one dollar for construction purposes, that they will not buy a bond until the project is a completed, going, money-earning concern. At another place in the same hearing his statement is, as I now recall it, that the project must earn net twice the amount of the interest on the indebtedness before they will loan at any stage.

Now, a very proper question arises, very germane to the whole inquiry, How are we going to develop these vast and expensive water-power projects at all?

During war prices the labor to the extent it is used would perhaps cost twice what it would at any other time. Materials would cost perhaps twice what they did before the war. The construction work not only of the dam but the water-power dam, the generating machinery, transmission lines, distribution plants—all of it would cost double what it would in normal times. Therefore a project would have to be exceedingly inviting in the way of future profits to justify the investment of capital at this time in a 50-year contract. The license is not to exceed 50 years. As a matter of course, all money that is put into the construction is entitled to just as much in the way of a fair return as money put into the bonds 10 years after it is a going concern. They are just as much entitled to fair earnings on it as if it was money put into the purchase of bonds. I can not see how it is possible at this time for private capital to develop water-power construction at all with any hope of getting a fair return during the whole license period, in view of the prices they will be permitted to charge for a period of 50 years; but such projects as may be devoted to governmental activities or war purposes ought to be developed regardless of whether it will cost more or less, regardless of profits to be made on it, measured by dollars and cents, ought to be undertaken by the Government, provided it can develop them in time to be used for governmental purposes during the existence of the war.

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. ESCH. The bill provides for preliminary permits not to exceed three years in order to give capital and parties interested an opportunity to demonstrate whether or not they might have a suitable location for a dam. That could go on during the period of the war, and so it would be wise to pass the bill now.

Mr. SIMS. I was coming to that as one of the reasons. Naturally the question would arise, If private capital can not now finance these developments, why pass the bill? The gentleman from Wisconsin suggests the very matter that I was going to bring before the House, that, so far as the immediate development by the installation of machinery and the actual operation of it, I do not see how it can be done by private capital; but the bill provides for issuing preliminary permits for the purpose of making investigation and surveys not to exceed three years. There is no doubt that private persons and corporations already know where all of the good projects are. These projects are not like mines of hidden gold; they are on the surface. You can see where water power exists and where one can be developed, and there is no doubt that they know every available



water power in the United States at this moment. The very moment the bill is passed and a permit can be issued, the best projects will all be filed on immediately. The permits to develop will be sought immediately by those who know where these projects are, and the poor ones will not be developed at all, because the rich and great ones, the profitable ones, will make it impossible for the poor ones to operate in competition with them.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. I will.

Mr. BANKHEAD. With reference to granting permits for preliminary investigations, does the bill contemplate that only one permit can be issued on one particular site, or will more than one permit be authorized for investigation by different concerns?

Mr. SIMS. The bill, as I understand it, only authorizes the issuance of one permit at a time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That will give the party three years.

Mr. SIMS. It might extend for three years; but we provide that States and municipalities shall have the preference.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does not the gentleman think it would be better to throw the field open a little wider, so that those interested in water-power development might be on terms of equality with reference to investigations?

Mr. SIMS. I do not know whether it is practicable for two applicants to investigate at the same time. If it is, I do not see why it should not be allowed. But I know this, that those who know the good projects are going to file immediately; they will file the very moment the President signs the bill. Of course, the projects that will pay the greatest returns on the least capital will be filed on immediately, except those that may be given to States or municipalities.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The gentleman speaks about the good projects and the inferior ones, and that the good projects will be attractive and will be seized on at once because of the great returns to be made. As I understand the bill, it does not make much difference to the private investor, the private individual, who is to develop the project, because you are going to limit the returns that he can receive. You say he shall not have anything beyond a fixed return whether it is a good one or a bad one, so that the only people that are interested in this extra profit that can be made where large returns come in from the investment will be those who purchase the power from those who produce it, because, as I understand the bill, it limits the amount of returns that the individual can get.

As to all over that, he has to adopt the principle of the Ford Automobile Co., and at the end of the year, because he has made a little too much, give it back to the people who patronize him. If that be true, what difference does it make to the investor whether it is a good or bad project?

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman has asked a pertinent question, and one that ought to be answered. I intended to discuss that feature of the bill or any other bill that may be offered. It is utterly impossible, in my view of it, to regulate the price of the current to the consumers so as to say they shall make 5 per cent or any certain specified return upon the investment after meeting operating cost and interest upon the investment.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. That is what the bill provides.

Mr. SIMS. It is impracticable and impossible.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. And it is something else besides. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. It is always an attractive idea. It is always a catch phrase to say that we will give to the consumer the benefit of these things by regulation. There is hardly a water power in the United States that can supply its electric-current demand wholly by the use of the water-power plant, and why? In different States and different localities there are different situations, but in nearly all of the water powers the watercourses have a high-water season and a low-water season, and to build a dam high enough to impound water enough to have a head all the year round would make the initial cost so great and the interest upon the investment so great that it would materially reduce the net income. So, instead of building a dam high enough and expensive enough to impound water enough to supply all demands during the entire season, they build a lower dam, less expensive, which is sufficient in the high-water period, and in addition to that have a steam-power plant to supplement it in the low-water season, or during the peak of the load sometimes during these high-water seasons. So that when they begin to fix the price of power to the purchaser they will fix it based upon the average cost of operating the water and the steam plants as one, but that is not all.

Take Buffalo, for instance, for that is a good illustration. Niagara Falls are near Buffalo; there is tremendous power de-

velopment upon the American side and also upon the Canadian side. They are both at the Falls and both have the same head. The power on the Canadian side sells at \$9 per horsepower per annum, while on the American side it sells at \$18 per horsepower per annum, or double the amount. You will ask, naturally, whether or not New York has a good public-service commission. New York has. Then why not give Buffalo and the American manufacturer upon the American side power as cheaply as the Canadian power plant does on the Canadian side? It comes about in this way: On the Canadian side they can furnish all of the demand for power by hydroelectric production, while on the American side they can not furnish half the demand—at least not over half—by hydroelectric development. Consequently if they fix the price for hydroelectric power generated at Niagara Falls to Buffalo and the vicinity not at what is a fair price or what would give fair earnings upon the investment, it can not furnish half the demand, because the steam-produced power could not meet it. So what do they do? The steam-produced power makes the price and the hydroelectric producer gets double what he otherwise would, and yet they have a regulating commission, and because the commission can not regulate so as to deny Buffalo and the vicinity all the power they must have, as would be the case if they were to fix the price at a fair profit to the hydroelectric producers. If such was to be the case it would drive every steam-producing electric power producer out of business, and the result would be that Buffalo and the vicinity would famish for the lack of power. You can not regulate these things so that they can not get more than a fair profit out of it unless there is electric power enough to supply the entire demand. Then we will have other troubles. What is happening now on the Canadian side? They are producing power at cost and selling it to all consumers without any profit. The hydroelectric commission of Ontario is selling power at cost. It is a community-owned power manufacturing and distributing corporation. Two hundred and twenty-six municipalities own the whole thing. What is the result? Many American manufacturers are leaving our own side, where money is cheaper and where the market is greater, because they can not compete with the price they have to pay for power in the United States with that upon the Canadian side, and they have gone over there and are manufacturing their products at least to sufficiently supply their export demand.

What else happened? Manufacturers in the United States who had to have power have actually left the United States and gone to Norway because they could buy power there at \$7 per horsepower per annum. Now, you can not regulate unless you can regulate the source of the supply of power, because the most expensive producer will fix the price in spite of any State commission. Now, a man from Niagara Falls, a large manufacturer, told me that he was paying from \$14 to \$110 per horsepower at this time—from \$14 for hydroelectric power that he had a contract for made years ago up to as high as \$110 per horsepower at this time for power produced by steam on the American side. If the coal goes up, the power produced by that coal goes up. I said to this man, "How do you know how to price your products?" He said, "I take all the power I need and average the cost." His company has put up a \$6,000,000 concern in Norway in order to compete with the cheap Canadian power in this country. Many manufacturers in the United States are now going over into the Province of Ontario on account of cheap power. Ontario is making a great effort to reduce the cost of power all the time in order to attract the manufacturers of this country to their Province, and a great many are leaving us.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. I will.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. In view of what the gentleman says, why do you require that when the license is given to the prospective developer of power, when the license is given to him to go and develop and maintain and operate his plant, why do you specify in the license the return that he is to receive on that investment? Now, as I understood the gentleman just now, he says that can not be ascertained until at the end of the year, and then they average up the whole cost. It says:

Such surplus earnings to be paid into and held in such reserve shall be set forth in the license.

Mr. SIMS. That is reserves for depreciation or amortization.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is the maximum return which can be earned upon the net investment.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Now, can you fix the maximum return?

Mr. SIMS. Suppose there is a California development. They have got a public-service commission for regulating hydroelectric power, current, and all that sort of thing. They fix it, but if you did not allow a return that would bring about a development California would be ruined, and consequently they are not going to allow it; but the cheapest produced power will

make more money than the more expensive produced power when it is all needed for consumption.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The gentleman will find that this bill provides for the States to have a regulation of the price in every case where they have a commission. The only place where the Government interferes between the States is where they have not any commission, and if there is any charge of monopoly usually it is the fault of the State and not the fault of this law or the commission.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman allow me to suggest to the gentleman from Mississippi that the maximum return is not the maximum in the sense that they never can earn a rate above that amount, but it is a maximum in the sense that the commission has a right to require that a certain proportion of the return above that rate shall be put back into their surplus or into their amortization of the plant.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. To see if I get it right, there will be no incentive whatever to a man who is developing power to make any improvement in his machinery. If he has got an old, out-of-date plant that may yield him 10 per cent, if he makes any more than 10 per cent, why the Government is going to take it. Why should he undertake to develop the plant by putting in something on scientific principles that will produce far cheaper? Why should he do that? It will not be of any advantage to him if the commission is going to take it away from him and give it to somebody else. Why not run along in the old beaten path and just make his 10 per cent? It occurs to me that when you put a limit on the amount that these people can make, except, of course, to regulate the rates and practices, you put a stumbling block in the way of progress in matters of development.

Mr. SIMS. You are speaking, of course, with reference to powers developed under this bill?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Under this bill.

Mr. SIMS. Whether the United States shall have the power to say whether he shall have any at all or not. They have the power to say that.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. We do say it, and I am very much afraid you are saying it emphatically in this bill.

Mr. SIMS. Let me call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the Government is not hunting up people to give them permits to make money for themselves.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Who does the Government expect the people of the country who are going to develop water power are going to work to make money for if it is not for themselves?

Mr. SIMS. If it is for development of water power not on a navigable stream or public lands, they can charge all they want for current, so far as the Government of the United States is concerned.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. We can induce people to work for a dollar a year and can induce people to make sacrifices for the public and give their services to the Government free in time of war, but I dare say that in times of peace the gentleman will find some difficulty in getting any considerable number of people in this country to invest their money in a water-power plant in order to make money for somebody else.

Mr. SIMS. I want to say to the gentleman, speaking for myself—and I will not undertake to represent the views of any other member of the committee—that I am not wearing my life out here to try to provide a general law that is simply to attract accumulated capital, especially, as Mr. CANNON said a while ago, when it is within the possibilities, when it is within the power, of the Government of the United States to develop every one of these powers on its own account, at its own expense, and sell the power at cost, like the hydroelectric commission does in Ontario, Canada.

Now, these investment bankers say, "You must give us this and that and the other, or we will not buy the bonds." I say, "You must do so-and-so, or we will not give you any opportunity to buy bonds." Now, the gentleman's question comes up with reference alone to guaranteeing and insuring the private investor that he will get back every cent he ever put in if the Government ever takes it over or allows a municipality to take it over. Now, when a licensee gets a 50-year permit, with 3 years' time in which to make a preliminary examination, with the best engineering talent in the country at his command, the gentleman need not be afraid of ever losing any money on any project that they will undertake. Besides, the increasing demand for power and the increasing cost of every kind of mechanical power, as well as electric power, is such that when the licensee gets his permit and license, which prescribes what he may earn for 50 years, maximum earnings, if the business is well managed, it will grow larger every year. The Government could not, unless it does it itself, sell the power at a fixed percentage on the investment and not ruin the communities

that would have power in excess of that produced by the particular project.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. May I suggest to the gentleman that if they put in the improved machinery he speaks of, it increases the earning power, and they earn the extra per cent on the money they put in the machinery just the same as they did on the other class of machinery. By putting it in they get a per cent on that right along, just as much as they would on the original investment.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I do not know whether they would or not. Here you have an old plant, one that is inefficient, and it does not develop the power that it ought to develop.

Mr. SIMS. Why do you put in an old, inefficient plant?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Because when we put it in we did not know any better. They put it in at Niagara when they first started there, and they developed 20 horsepower for so many cubic feet. That has not been so many years ago. By virtue of improvements that have been made in machinery they can now produce the same horsepower on one-half the cubic feet of water.

Mr. SINNOTT. This provides that the commission may require the power company to operate its plant efficiently, to make the necessary repairs and replacements for that purpose, and guard against the obsolescence that the gentleman referred to.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. And who will have any incentive to ascertain which is the most efficient? It occurs to me that it takes the initiative away from the private investor—from the individual. It destroys the initiative to improve, and it leaves it entirely with the commission. The man who invests his money is getting his return, and it does not make any difference to him whether he has a better machine or not.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman from Mississippi that perhaps he and I are thinking along the same line as to the possible purpose of this bill? It seems to squint at a much-proposed and often-advocated theory of Government ownership of public utilities and natural resources, but first permitting private capital to develop those natural resources at its own expense to the point where it would be profitable for the Government to take them over.

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

Mr. SIMS. Yes; that is about all I am doing. I can not refuse my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman is very generous. I assume that he will not be able to complete his very interesting remarks this afternoon, and it seems as though we should have more Members here listening to him and to the statement he is making. Considering the fact that he is the chairman of this special committee, I think it is to be regretted that more Members have not remained to listen to the opening statement by him on this important measure.

Mr. SIMS. May I have five minutes to explain that Niagara matter to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. WALSH. It is now 5 minutes to 5.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] talks about Niagara. They put in their generating plant with a head of 165 feet. One company, as I am told, on the American side has a surplus of \$5,000,000 and the other a surplus of \$1,000,000. On the other side the Hydroelectric Commission of Ontario has bought out the largest concern over there, and are proposing scrapping it and building an enormous ship canal on that side and expect to put up a new plant near Lewistown with a 306-foot head, and the increased power that they have down there with the same amount of water enables them to throw away the vast investment they have up at the Falls and make money on the whole investment.

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

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the Canadian Government put any limitation on the amount that the developers shall charge in their rates?

Mr. SIMS. That is done by the power commission, which sells at cost.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does it provide for the redistribution of the excess?

Mr. SIMS. No. They have been reducing the cost all the time.

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

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. We did not understand whether, when a plant was worthless, thrown away, and a new plant put in, the cost of both plants would be that upon which the return would be allowed by the commission.

Mr. SIMS. Certainly not. If they wear out one plant in making money and buy a new one, I do not see why they should continue to make money on the old investment when they are making more money on the new one than they did on the old one.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I do not think that ought to be true, according to the statement made by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SIMS. It ought not to be true.

Mr. Chairman, I am now at a good stopping place and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is anxious that I have a good audience on Friday, and therefore I will discontinue my remarks and move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. WALSH. I want to say to the gentleman that I think that it is due to him as chairman of the committee that there should be a larger audience here to listen to his discussion of the bill. I did not make the suggestion on my own account. I regard his statement as of great interest.

Mr. SIMS. I understand the gentleman's suggestion was not made on his own account. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WEBB, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (S. 1419) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a statement of not over one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks leave to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NOLAN. This afternoon I was unavoidably absent during the time the Spanish War widows' pension bill was under consideration. I was out of the Chamber on important business. Had I been present I would have voted for the bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask a moment to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER. How much—two minutes?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my absence, like that of the gentleman from California, was unavoidable, as I went to visit a department on business for a constituent from whom I received a very important letter. Before going I went to the desk of the pair clerk and was paired. I left the Chamber knowing that under the unanimous-consent agreement the general debate on the water-power bill was to continue certainly all of the remainder of this day, and in all probability all of some succeeding days, during which no vote would be taken. But I was greatly surprised on my return a few minutes ago to know that during my absence the Spanish War widows' pension bill had in a most unusual manner been voted on. In three previous Congresses I voted for a similar bill, and would of course have voted to pass the bill to-day had I been present. I did as much, I think, as did any other gentleman to get the bill before the House this time and to secure its passage.

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

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I am aware of the gentleman's earnest desire for the enactment of this legislation, and I think it is unfortunate for the gentleman's record that he was not here when the bill was passed. He has been agitating and criticizing me for objecting to it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Why, Mr. Speaker, that is entirely gratuitous, because during the debate on Friday last I did not criticize the gentleman at all. I simply urged him not to object to the consideration of the bill. I did not criticize his action. Knowing how apt the gentleman is to become irascible when criticized, I refrained from anything of the kind. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I would like to testify to my friend's urgency on this measure, because he asked me as a member of the Com-

mittee on Rules if I would not assist in bringing it out, and we then went into the Chamber and brought it out.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 313. Joint resolution providing for the disposition of moneys represented in the Alfred Bernard Nobel peace prize awarded in 1906.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, under its previous order, until Friday, July 12, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 12702) to make the French national holiday a legal holiday in the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILL: A bill (H. R. 12703) granting transportation rates of 1 cent per mile to and from their home towns for soldiers and sailors and nurses on furlough during the period of the war and for six months thereafter; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HADLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 418) directing the United States Food Administration to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, favoring the expansion and development of the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. DALE of New York: Resolution of the union-label trades department of the American Federation of Labor, urging the repeal of the zone system as applied to second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Washington Heights Taxpayers' Association, of New York City, urging the passage of the bill introduced by Congressman SMITH for two ice-breaking vessels for New York Harbor; also, memorial of the Philip N. Cassidy Democratic Association, favoring 1-cent mileage for sailors and soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Central Labor Union of Brooklyn and Queens, relative to the Mooney trial; also, petition of citizens of Watertown, N. Y., against war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of bankers of Monroe County, Wis., pledging our loyalty and support to the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of William Deiches & Co., of Baltimore, Md., favoring the repeal of zone law affecting mailing rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means. Also, petition of Conrad Anschutz, for the Henry W. Lawton Camp, No. 5, Spanish-American War Veterans, favoring Senate bill 4444; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Mercantile Trust & Deposit Co., the Maryland Bankers' Association, and the Fidelity Trust Co., all of Baltimore, Md., against the passage of Senate bill 4426; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Connecticut, favoring war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Memorial of Lithuanians of Haverhill, Mass., pledging unswerving allegiance to the United States and loyal support of its cause in the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAGEE: Memorial of the Free Methodist Church, of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. William A. Glasgow and other residents of the village of Fabius, N. Y., favoring war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petition of the International Brotherhood of Foundry Employees, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring bill for Government control of all telegraph companies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition for national war prohibition signed by numerous residents of Pine Valley, Chemung County, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of P. D. Smith, of New Castle, Pa., favoring passage of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Resolution of loyalty to the Government of the United States adopted by the Lithuanian residents of Worcester, Mass., in convention assembled on July 4, 1918; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, July 10, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, day by day we call upon Thy name that we may be imbued with wisdom from on high and be workmen that need not be ashamed. We are not satisfied that our Nation expresses the highest achievements of human philosophy in government; we desire at the end to accomplish the will of God. Before us is the great achievement, working together with God in the accomplishment of a great design. Lead us this day with wisdom and grace, with gentleness, with forbearance, and with courage, that we may do Thy will, and that we may have Thy sanction and blessing upon the work of our hands. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### MOVEMENT OF SOLDIERS' MAIL (S. DOC. NO. 266).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 5th instant, certain information covering the operation of the War Department as to the movement of the mails to and from our troops and auxiliaries abroad, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

### PETITIONS.

Mr. FERNALD presented a petition of Victory Lodge, No. 308, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Lisbon Falls, Me., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KNOX presented a petition of sundry citizens of Westmoreland County, Pa., and a petition of sundry citizens of Beaver County, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the substitution of the oath required of enlisted men for the oath required of officers, in order to relieve those who object on conscientious grounds to the oath prescribed by law for officers, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Marion Center, McKees Rocks, Oakdale, Moon Run, Cliff Mine, and Carnegie, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Nanticoke, Pa., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of Victory Lodge, No. 308, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Lisbon Falls, Me., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COLT presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from sundry citizens of Greater Providence, R. I., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which was ordered to lie on the table.

### THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO MEXICAN EDITORS (S. DOC. NO. 264).

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which I report from the Committee on Printing, to publish the address made by the President of the United States to the visiting editors from the Republic of Mexico. I had it referred to the committee. If I had known at the time, and in the confusion could have heard distinctly, I would not have objected to its consideration; but I am glad it has gone through the course it has. It went to the committee and is favorably reported, and the estimated cost is \$10.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. PENROSE. Let it be read for information.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 281), as follows:

*Resolved*, That the address made by the President of the United States to the Mexican editors at the White House on June 7, 1918, be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to the printing of the address, but I wish to state that the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] in presenting the address and asking that it be printed as a public document wanted to have it printed for the purpose of sending it into Mexico. If I am informed correctly, all the papers of Mexico have already published this address, together with another letter that was sent to Mexico in parallel columns. I do not think that the address itself has done any good in Mexico, and I think that it ought to be published for use in the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The Senator is misinformed about the purpose of the Senator from California. As I understand it, many of the business interests connected with interests in Mexico are writing for this document, so that their agents in Mexico may distribute the document, as far as possible, to those with whom they come in contact, and I thought it a very wise provision that such a distribution should be made of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is agreed to.

### TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE CONTROL.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I report the following joint resolution favorably from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. PENROSE. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and the report will go to the calendar.

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope that the joint resolution will be read. I do not know what it is about.

Mr. PENROSE. I do not either, but I suspect what it is about.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let us have our suspicions verified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the joint resolution by title.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 309) to authorize the President, in time of war, to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems or any part thereof and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor.

Mr. SIMMONS. So far as I am concerned, that is a sufficient reading.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I renew my objection, if it is necessary to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and the joint resolution will go to the calendar.

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 4818) granting a pension to Jenny E. Aisenman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 4819) granting an increase of pension to Eliza M. Miller; and

A bill (S. 4820) granting an increase of pension to Faion Brady; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 4821) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Skillings (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

A bill (S. 4822) granting an increase of pension to Caroline E. Sweet; to the Committee on Pensions.

### ADDRESS BY SENATOR COLT (S. DOC. NO. 265).

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I wish to ask consent to have printed as a public document the address of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] delivered at Bristol, R. I., on the Fourth of July. I think it is one of the most patriotic addresses that has been delivered on a war subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a public document.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I think it ought to be referred to the Committee on Printing.