

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 14067) for the relief of certain employees of the Philadelphia post office; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 14068) granting an increase of pension to Charles Bernhart; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 14069) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Joseph Santucci for the loss of watchmaker's tools and clockmaker's tools while in the military service of the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOEY: A bill (H. R. 14070) granting an increase of pension to Levi N. Lunsford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 14071) granting a pension to George E. Wade; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3601. By Mr. CAREW: Petition of American Steamship Owners' Association, of New York City, favoring the granting of the officers and men of the Coast Guard the same rank and pay as the officers and men of the Navy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3602. By Mr. DYER: Petition of H. D. Lee Mercantile Co., protesting against the taxing of advertising; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3603. Also, petition of Missouri State Chiropractors' Association, favoring chiropractic legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3604. Also, petition of St. Louis Union Trust Co., favoring House bill 13259; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3605. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Business Men's Association of Ottawa, Ill., protesting against the McNary bill for stamping the cost price on sole of shoes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3606. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of P. K. Murphy, Dr. Patrick J. Clare, William Jos. O'Brennan, Carl Knop, C. E. Codd, Frank M. Fossett, Michael J. Redding, M. F. Farrell, M. J. Gahan, M. J. Neary, John T. Doyle, Thomas E. Carey, R. V. Quinn, Rev. Joseph P. Hanley, and Daniel Murphy, all of Baltimore, Md., and J. J. Isenoing, Huntington, W. Va., regarding the Mason bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3607. Also, petition of W. W. Lanahan & Co. and Citizens National Bank, both of Baltimore, Md., regarding sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3608. Also, petition of W. H. Winstead Co., Baltimore, Md., regarding House bill 13015; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3609. Also, petition of Baltimore Trades Unionist, E. A. Smith & Co., Radio Engineering Co., Merchants and Manufacturers Association, W. Howard Gibson, Hugh Auld, John H. Donaldson, Daniel Orem, Corp. Alfred Tennyson, and veterans foreign wars; F. G. Yingling, Matthew J. Hughes, Arthur W. Seippel, Marshall Winchester Co., and Henry Stockbridge, all of Baltimore, Md., regarding Federal post-office employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3610. Also, petition of American Flint Glass Workers' Union, Cumberland, Md., regarding Senate joint resolution 171 and Senate bill 1233, repeal of espionage law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3611. Also, petition of United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., Baltimore, Md., regarding metric system; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

3612. Also, petition of headquarters Post 61, American Legion; Association Western Union Employees, Local No. 60; S. S. Kresge Co.; and B. B. Burgunder, all of Baltimore, Md.; and American Legion, Frederick, Md., regarding soldiers' bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3613. Also, petition of John J. Reahl, Cumberland Coal Co., Chesapeake Co., Henry G. Von Heine, Wilcox & Zeigler, Emerson & Morgan Coal Co., E. A. & B. M. Watts, and E. S. Brady & Co., all of Baltimore, Md., regarding Senate bill 4089; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3614. By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of Harvard Post, No. 119, American Legion, Worcester, Mass., favoring immediate action on the legion fourfold optional bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3615. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of president of the parents' association public school No. 93, George Lickel, Eva Hat Manufacturing Co., Lillian E. Brocker, and W. Hanrahan, all of New

York City, favoring higher pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3616. Also, petition of sundry citizens of the nineteenth congressional district of New York, favoring the freedom of Ireland, and Anna Michell Upjohn, of New York, regarding relief of Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3617. Also, petition of Charles Francis Press, of New York, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Thompson bill, a tax on advertising; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3618. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Franklin H. Giddings, regarding increased pay for rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3619. Also, petition of Lovell & Covel Co., regarding 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3620. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of sundry citizens of Bryan, Melbers, and Fremont, Ohio, favoring the passage of the Raker bill, House bill 1112, known as the parole of Federal prisoners bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, May 14, 1920.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 11, 1920.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (George A. Sanderson) read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1920.

To the SENATE:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SELDEN P. SPENCER, a Senator from the State of Missouri, to perform the duties of the Chair this legislative day.

ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SPENCER thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer for the legislative day.

CALLING THE ROLL.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Glass	McKellar	Simmons
Ball	Gronna	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Borah	Hale	Moses	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	Harris	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Calder	Harrison	Nelson	Smoot
Capper	Henderson	Norris	Spencer
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Stanley
Comer	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Sterling
Culberson	Kellogg	Owen	Swanson
Curtis	Kendrick	Phipps	Thomas
Dial	Kenyon	Pittman	Trammell
Edge	Keyes	Pomerene	Underwood
Elkins	King	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Fernald	Lodge	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
Gay	McCormick	Robinson	Warren
Gerry	McCumber	Sheppard	Williams

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent, due to illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-four Senators have answered to their names. The Senate resumes the consideration of House joint resolution 327.

TERMINATION OF WAR WITH GERMANY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) terminating the state of war declared to exist April 6, 1917, between the Imperial German Government and the United States, permitting on conditions the resumption of reciprocal trade with Germany, and for other purposes.

Mr. STERLING. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the further consideration of the conference report on the civil-service retirement bill.

Mr. LODGE. Before that request is put, I wish to state that I do not think, under the unanimous-consent agreement, we can take up any outside matter while there is anyone here who

desires to speak upon the pending measure. I understand that one of the Senators desires to speak upon it.

Mr. STERLING. I understand that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] desires to speak on the pending measure, but I hoped that he would yield long enough that we might dispose of this conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that objection is made to the request of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. LODGE. A motion to take up the conference report would set aside the business of the unanimous consent. Certainly, nothing can be done in the way of other business except by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that objection had been made to the request of the Senator from South Dakota, and therefore the request has failed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11927) to increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Coast Guard through the temporary provision of bonuses or increased compensation.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12272) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921; recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 249 to the bill and agrees to the same with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; insists on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 93 and 116; asks a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HAUGEN, Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan, and Mr. LEE of Georgia managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

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

S. 2448. An act for the relief of certain officers of the United States Army, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9944. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to accept on behalf of the United States the donation by Sedgwick Post, No. 10, Grand Army of the Republic, of its memorial hall property in Bedford, Taylor County, Iowa, for Federal building purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CAPPER presented a memorial of sundry citizens of McPherson, Kans., remonstrating against universal military training and praying for the enactment of legislation providing for physical education, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Cottage Hill Union, No. 801, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, of Waterville, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation imposing an additional tax on farm lands, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Commerce of Wichita, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Steagall bill legalizing exchange charged on bank checks, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. From the Committee on Military Affairs, I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 13587) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I give notice that on Monday next if an opportunity presents itself I shall ask the Senate to take up the bill for consideration.

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 4377) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Sandy Point Civic League, Tettington, Va., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 4378) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court for the Southern District of New York to hear

and determine the claim of the owner of the French auxiliary bark *Quevilly* against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4379) granting a pension to Margaret L. Burns; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANDELL:

A bill (S. 4380) for the relief of Captain C. Newton, jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNOX (for Mr. PENROSE):

A bill (S. 4381) for the relief of certain officers in the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4382) granting an increase of pension to Cecilia McCullough (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 4383) granting an increase of pension to John P. Wright; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 4384) for the relief of William Casey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 4385) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 197) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time for the payment of annual installments on the purchase price for land in the Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian Reservations; to the Committee on Public Lands.

AMENDMENTS TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment relative to the salaries of clerks and stenographers, from and including July 1, 1920, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GAY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$40,000 for a post-office and courthouse building at New Orleans, La., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$135,000 for the enlargement, extension, etc., of the United States post-office and courthouse building at Alexandria, La., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$80,000 for the completion and equipment of the post-office building at East Las Vegas, N. Mex., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

FREIGHT CONGESTION.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution, which I ask to have read to the Senate. I think it will involve no debate at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 362) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby directed to furnish at the earliest possible date information to the Senate showing the causes for the present freight congestion in the principal cities of the United States and what efforts have been taken or are being taken or should be taken to relieve the present congested condition and to promptly move the freight tendered to the railroads.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I offer this resolution because I know that a very serious freight congestion exists. My information is that it is chiefly at some 15 principal American cities. The Interstate Commerce Commission has the matter under consideration, and there are reasons why this resolution should be passed and that the information the Interstate Commerce Commission may have may be laid before the Senate. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

TEXTILE ALLIANCE (INC.).

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, last week in discussing the dyestuffs bill I made some references to the Textile Alliance (Inc.). I am this morning in receipt of a letter from the

secretary of that association taking exception to some of my assertions. I think it is but fair that the letter should be inserted in the RECORD, and therefore ask unanimous consent to have that letter inserted in the RECORD with a copy of an accompanying letter from the Department of State.

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

TEXTILE ALLIANCE (INC.),
New York, May 13, 1920.

The Hon. CHARLES S. THOMAS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have to-day received a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8 which contains a report of your speech on that date in the matter of the dye bill. There are inaccuracies or errors in the speech which we feel that we must without delay call to your attention.

The Textile Alliance (Inc.) is not "the moving power behind the dye bill"; it is not "the inspiration of the dye bill"; it is not "charged with the duty of securing dyes that are absolutely indispensable to the textile industry of this country," and it was in no respect whatever responsible for the statement made by witnesses before the Senate or other committee that Germany during the war had accumulated 250,000 tons of dyestuffs.

As a matter of fact the Textile Alliance (Inc.) is acting purely as an administrative agency for and at the request of the War Trade Board Section of the Department of State, and its relations with this department are shown by the inclosed copies of letters from it dated September 29, 1919, and October 10, 1919. In this respect the agency selected might equally well have been the American Express Co. or other profit-making corporation.

It has had no part whatever in the effort to secure protection for the American dye industry other than to present a statement to the committee of the House of Representatives in refutation of erroneous statements made regarding its functions and actions. Its officers have even refrained from the free expression of their personal opinion.

It is also incorrect to say that not a pound of dye can be received in this country excepting through the Textile Alliance (Inc.). In proof of this statement we beg to refer you to the War Trade Board Section of the Department of State, which has issued licenses in amounts unknown to the Textile Alliance (Inc.) for the import of dyes through other sources, and in particular we call your attention to the following shipment recently published in the Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, of New York, April 28:

Inward manifests, Hamburg-American steamer *Carib*. Grasselli Chemical Co., 374 casks alizarin.

For your further information we beg to state that the Textile Alliance (Inc.) is a membership corporation, organized under the laws of New York State. The voting members are the designated representatives of the principal textile trade associations, excepting that one representative is designated by a committee of a trade in which there is no comprehensive organization. It is incapable of making or retaining a profit. All of its activities during the war on behalf of the United States Government have been performed at cost, and, with the exception of the general manager, secretary, and treasurer, no officer, director, or member of the committee receives a salary or other compensation.

In view of the injustice that you have done to this organization, we request that you will correct the erroneous statements in your speech.

Yours, very truly,

TEXTILE ALLIANCE (INC.).
WILLIAM B. DENTON,
Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 29, 1919.

Mr. A. M. PATTERSON,
President Textile Alliance (Inc.), New York.

SIR: Negotiations are now being carried on in Paris by the representatives of the allied associated Governments for the purpose of securing the early delivery of German dyes at prices similar to those described in annex 6 of part 8 of the treaty of peace with Germany. For your convenience there is inclosed herewith a copy of War Trade Board Ruling 819, in which the provisions of annex 6 are set forth in full. The War Trade Board section of the Department of State has determined to permit the importation of vat dyes from Germany in quantities sufficient to supply the requirements of the consumers of the United States for six months' period, October 1, 1919, to April 1, 1920; and it may be desirable that manufacturers in

the United States be enabled to avail themselves of the benefits of such plan as may result from the current negotiations in securing the above-mentioned quantities of vat dyes. To bring this about it would be necessary to designate a central agency, to act as an intermediary between the consumers of dyes in the United States and the allied authorities from or through whom the dyes are to be secured. The Department of State would be prepared to designate the Textile Alliance (Inc.) as such agency to perform the following services under the terms and conditions hereinbelow set forth:

1. The War Trade Board section of the Department of State will issue allocation certificates to consumers in the United States, stating that said consumers are entitled to secure the importation from Germany of vat dyes specified in such certificates.

2. The War Trade Board section of the Department of State would advise consumers of such arrangements as may result from current negotiations and will also inform them that the Textile Alliance (Inc.) has been designated to act in the capacity described in this letter.

3. The Textile Alliance (Inc.) will accept from consumers holding the above-mentioned allocation certificates orders for vat dyes in amounts not exceeding amounts specified in such certificates.

4. The prices to be paid for the dyes so ordered will be the prices agreed upon in Paris and communicated to the Textile Alliance (Inc.) by its representative in Paris hereinafter mentioned in paragraph No. 5. The terms and method of payment for all dyes ordered through the Textile Alliance (Inc.) will be prescribed by the Textile Alliance (Inc.) to accord with such arrangements as may result from the pending negotiations, and they will be subject to the approval of the War Trade Board section and subject also to the conditions hereinbelow in paragraph No. 6 contained.

5. The Textile Alliance (Inc.) will send a representative to Paris. Said representative will receive by cablegram from the Textile Alliance (Inc.) complete information as to the dyes which have been ordered through the alliance as described above, and he will place these orders with or through the allied authorities and will attend to all the details connected with the acquisition of, and payment for, the dyes and their shipment to the Textile Alliance (Inc.) for distribution to the consumers who have ordered them. In all these matters the representative of the alliance will receive the cooperation and advice of Dr. Charles H. Hertzy, who is now in Paris as a representative of the War Trade Board section.

6. The Textile Alliance (Inc.) will be entitled to charge a commission for the services rendered by it, which commission shall be sufficient to defray all expenses incurred in carrying out the plan and performing the acts described in this letter; but it is to be understood that the alliance will not retain any profits arising out of this transaction and that any overplus remaining out of commissions collected, after the payment of all expenses, will be distributed pro rata among the consumers by whom such commissions shall have been paid.

The department desires to be advised at an early date whether the Textile Alliance (Inc.) would be willing to perform the services described in this letter, provided the situation would seem to make such an arrangement desirable.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM PHILLIPS,
Acting Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 10, 1919.

The TEXTILE ALLIANCE (INC.).
New York.

GENTLEMEN: Referring to the department's letter of September 29 setting forth the proposal that the Textile Alliance (Inc.) should be designated as the agency to effect the importation and distribution of German dyes proposed to be secured as a result of negotiations then being conducted in Paris, and referring also to your letter of October 2, in which you inform the department that the Textile Alliance (Inc.) was prepared to act in the capacity aforesaid (subject to an exception which has since been withdrawn), the plan outlined in the first-mentioned letter has been finally completed in all substantial respects; and accordingly the Textile Alliance (Inc.) is hereby designated as the agency to effect the importation and distribution of German dyes under the conditions set forth in the above-mentioned letter of September 29, 1919.

The supervision of the operations of the above-mentioned plan will be conducted for the department by the War Trade Board section, and you are requested to consult with the chief of said section with respect to all further arrangements neces-

sary for the consummation of the purchase, importation, and distribution of dyes which will be secured under said plan.

I am, gentlemen, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM PHILLIPS,
Assistant Secretary.
(For the Secretary of State.)

INSCRIPTIONS ON ARLINGTON AMPHITHEATER.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have two telegrams in reference to the names of Lee and Jackson being inscribed on the amphitheater at Arlington, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

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

Senator E. D. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you to use your influence to have names of Lee and Jackson carved on amphitheater at Arlington.

JULIUS H. WALKER,
State Commander American Legion, South Carolina.

ST. MATTHEWS, S. C., May 10, 1920.

Hon. E. D. SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of Calhoun County Post, American Legion, at full meeting to-day, we wish to enter strongest protest against elimination of names of Lee and Jackson from list of American heroes to be carved on marble columns, Memorial Amphitheater, in Arlington National Cemetery. Action contemplated is not only extremely unjust to sons and grandsons of men who followed Lee and Jackson and Grant and Sherman, and who gave their lives side by side in great World War, but it is most unfortunate just at this time, when a friendly spirit of broad patriotism is manifest throughout our country. We feel in our protest we voice not only the sentiment of every southern State, but all broad-minded men of Nation.

GEORGE W. WANAMAKER, JR.,
Commander Calhoun County (S. C.) Post, American Legion.

TERMINATION OF WAR WITH GERMANY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) terminating the state of war declared to exist April 6, 1917, between the Imperial German Government and the United States, permitting on conditions the resumption of reciprocal trade with Germany, and for other purposes.

[Mr. REED addressed the Senate. See Appendix.]

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gronna	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Harris	New	Smoot
Brandegee	Harrison	Norris	Spencer
Calder	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Stanley
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Swanson
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Page	Thomas
Cole	Kenyon	Phelan	Townsend
Culberson	King	Pomerene	Trammell
Curtis	Knox	Ransdell	Underwood
Dial	Lodge	Reed	Wadsworth
Dillingham	McCormick	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	McCumber	Shields	Warren
Fernald	McKellar	Simmons	
Gay	McNary	Smith, Ariz.	
Glass	Myers	Smith, Md.	

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] are detained on committee work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-seven Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS—VETO MESSAGE.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, yesterday the President saw fit to veto the legislative appropriation bill, and based his veto on his objection to section 8, relative to the printing, mimeographing, or multigraphing of Government periodicals. This section was proposed by me as chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing in accordance with the following recommendation which that committee made to Congress in its recent report on Government periodicals and field printing (S. Doc. 265, 66th Cong., p. 10):

The committee further recommends that it be given general supervision over all Government publications so as to bring about much-needed coordination in Government printing, and that the committee be empowered to pass on the publication or discontinuance of all Government journals, magazines, and periodicals from time to time instead of having the same specifically provided for by law. It is believed this supervision should be vested in some body not connected with any particular department of the Government, and, from the work it has already done in this connection, the committee is of the opinion that the authority may as well be intrusted to it as to any other governmental agency.

The efforts of the Joint Committee on Printing the past year to effect substantial economies in the public printing and binding have been bitterly opposed by some Government officials and denounced by certain outside influences. These outside influences have reaped substantial personal profits from Government publications. Such abuses, which involved the direct appropriation of public property to private use, were exposed by the report which the Joint Committee on Printing submitted to Congress. Since that report was made public certain influences, both within and without the departments, have left no stone unturned to assail and undermine the work of the committee.

One of the influences to which I refer is Roger W. Babson, who, on his retirement from a \$5,000 Government position in the Department of Labor, took over the Bulletin from the Committee on Public Information without any compensation whatever to the Government. This transaction was revealed to the public in the report of the committee.

Babson, in a letter to me under date of April 16, 1920, protested against the committee's report and expressed his bitter opposition to the section on which the President bases his veto, and declared that he intended to become the "protector of the departments in Washington against those who are attempting to gag or censor them." It is evident, therefore, that Babson has made use of the President or his advisers in carrying out his threat and "determination to end" the censorship which, without the least foundation, he has charged against the committee.

The President or his advisers have been most grievously misled in this veto. I am sure the President did not understand the situation when he vetoed the bill. Here is the real situation that exists:

The legislative bill passed by the Sixty-fifth Congress and approved by the President on March 1, 1919, contained a provision that thereafter no Government journal, magazine, periodical, or similar publication shall be printed unless "specifically authorized by Congress," but added that such publications as were then being printed might, in the discretion of the Joint Committee on Printing, be continued until the close of this session of Congress, when—and I quote from the law itself—"if authority for their continuance is not then granted by Congress, they shall not thereafter be printed."

Under this authority from Congress, which was approved by the President, the Joint Committee on Printing undertook a careful investigation of all Government periodicals, the result of which is set forth in its report submitted on April 12, 1920. This report showed that 266 journals, magazines, and periodicals were being published by various branches of the Government at a cost of approximately \$2,500,000 per annum.

As a result, either of the regulations adopted by the committee or the voluntary acts of the departments themselves, 111 of these publications, costing approximately \$1,200,000 per annum, have been discontinued. This leaves 155 publications, the continuance of which was authorized by the committee until the end of this session of Congress, which is the extent of the authority that the committee has under the present law.

Nearly all of these 155 publications, which include many of the most important issued by the Government, particularly those relating to agriculture, commerce, and labor, will automatically go out of existence at the end of this session of Congress unless they shall have been specifically authorized by Congress in the meantime. In view of the large number of these publications and in order to make sure of their continued publication, the committee proposed section 8 to the legislative bill vetoed by the President. The chief purpose of this section was to give the Joint Committee on Printing power to permanently authorize these publications. It appeared entirely impractical for Congress itself to go into the merits of each one of the 155 or more periodicals, and the committee, therefore, felt that its proposal was in the interest of the publications themselves and not for the purpose of censoring or suppressing them.

The fact is that if the President is really seeking to relieve the departments from any restrictions on their printing by Congress he ought to examine the provision that is annually contained in the sundry civil appropriation act. That provision is far more drastic than that proposed in either section 11, which he approved on March 1, 1919, or in section 8 of the bill just vetoed by him.

The provision I refer to is to be found on page 173 of the sundry civil bill, H. R. 13870, which has just passed the House. Similar provisions have been contained in the sundry civil acts for many years. It provides that no money appropriated for printing or binding for any executive departments shall be expended for any printing "except such as shall be certified in writing to the Public Printer by the respective heads or chiefs thereof to be necessary to conduct the ordinary and routine

business required by law of such executive departments or establishments of the Government."

The provision also states that "all other printing required or deemed necessary or desirable by heads of executive departments or other establishments or offices or bureaus thereof shall be done only as Congress shall from time to time authorize." By this provision none of the periodicals which have been continued under section 11 could have otherwise been published at all if the law had been complied with by the departments.

I observe that the President says he is in entire sympathy with the efforts of Congress and the departments to effect economies in printing and in the use of paper and supplies, but that he does not believe such a provision as this should become law. I am very glad, indeed, that the President is in sympathy with the efforts to effect economies in printing, and I only wish that his sympathies in this regard might find some substantial evidence on his part or some act of some of his chief executive officers showing their belief in economy.

Everyone, with the possible exception of some Government officials who seem to have deliberately blinded themselves, knows the critical situation the country is in as regards its supply of paper. This shortage of paper has seriously affected the Government. We do not know from day to day whether we will have enough paper at the Government Printing Office to publish the next day's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or even a sufficient supply to print presidential vetoes.

Under date of February 16, 1920, this situation was again called to the attention of the departments by the committee. They were then advised that the Government Printing Office may soon be without sufficient paper to print even such publications as may be really necessary to the Government business. All the heads of the departments and other establishments of the Government were requested to at once advise the committee as to what publications might be suspended, at least temporarily, in order to conserve the rapidly diminishing supply of paper for such printing as was absolutely essential.

To this request the committee received substantially no responses from the departments that were of any practical value whatever. Some of the departments seemed insistent upon continuing their mad orgy of printing in utter disregard of the fact that the paper supply of the Government may soon come to an end. As a matter of fact, some of the heads of the departments even had the boldness to propose increased expenditures for printing rather than to submit to any economies at this time.

For example, the Secretary of Agriculture, who had just come into office, proposed to the committee that the covers of Farmers' Bulletins be printed in variegated colors like Joseph's coat at an increased cost of three or four times the present price of printing such covers in black and white. I hold a sample in my hand [exhibiting].

The Secretary of Agriculture further proposed that the distribution of Farmers' Bulletins be placed entirely in the hands of his department instead of four-fifths of them being allotted to Members of Congress. I call to your attention the fact that the Department of Agriculture during the past two years turned over nearly 1,000,000 copies of its publications to one private individual, who thus assumed for his advantage the distribution of publications for which employees of the Department of Agriculture are paid. If Congress should also turn over to the Department of Agriculture the distribution of bulletins which are now allotted to its Members, what assurance have we that that department will not in turn deliver these publications in bulk to some private individual who may thereby profit from the work which Members of Congress are now glad to undertake freely for their constituents?

The President cites as an example of the administrative authority by the Joint Committee on Printing to which he objects the resolution which it adopted on April 2, 1920, directing that the free distribution of Government publications to any private individual, corporation, or agency be restricted to lots of not exceeding 50 copies, without application to the Joint Committee on Printing. This resolution was adopted for the very purpose of checking the abuse to which I have just referred. The committee found that from January 5, 1898, to February 19, 1920, three Government departments alone had furnished 1,319,495 Government publications to a single private individual.

I do not believe that anyone who has the real interest of the Government and the public at heart can object to such a regulation checking a flagrant misuse of Government publications.

The President also calls attention to a letter which I, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, addressed to the Public Printer under date of March 19, 1920, replying to a request from the Public Printer for a ruling by the committee as to the application that should be made of section 89 of the printing

act of 1895 which restricts the printing of reports, publications, and documents to 1,000 copies each unless otherwise authorized by Congress.

The committee had ascertained, upon investigation, that this section of law restricting printing had been almost utterly ignored by the departments for many years. As a result of this deliberate violation of the law, the departments have been continually appealing to Congress for deficiency appropriations to provide for their printing excesses.

The report of the Joint Committee on Printing shows that in three years departmental officials had more than 30,000,000 copies of their speeches printed at the Government Printing Office at a cost of \$109,066.35. These speeches and the envelopes used in mailing them required a total of approximately 1,500,000 pounds of paper. Including the cost of printing, envelopes, and the transportation in the mails, the speeches of these officials cost the Government \$442,798.73. All of this was charged to the Public Treasury.

In contrast to this procedure by speech-making officials of the departments, it is but fair to point out that Members of Congress are required by law to pay out of their own funds the actual cost of printing all speeches distributed by them.

Another abuse which prompted the committee to call the Public Printer's attention to the gross violation of the 1,000-copy law was a so-called Health Almanac, of which the Public Health Service printed 100,000 copies at a cost of \$2,929.46. I observe in its calendar for May that a notable event to be commemorated on May 30 is the fact that Surg. Gen. Rupert Blue was born on that day. To most of us this day is sacred as Memorial Day, but the Health Service calendar designates it as "Decoration Day," a term which is objected to by the true friends and relatives of those who sacrificed their lives on the field of battle.

A similar calendar was also printed in large numbers by the Bureau of Mines. In the Bureau of Mines calendar the "historical event" proposed to be commemorated on August 27 is the fact that Van. H. Manning was made Director of Mines on that date. The "historic event" as noted for December 15 is the fact that Mr. Manning was born on that date. I nearly overlooked the fact that the "historical event" printed for January 27 is that Samuel Gompers was born on that date. All of these, of course, are events of great historical significance, and I presume that in due time we will have bills proposed declaring them public holidays.

The last proviso of section 8, to which the President objects, is that making the law regulating Government periodicals apply also to mimeographing, multigraphing, and other processes used for the duplication of typewritten and printed matter, other than official correspondence or office records. The President says that under this provision the committee apparently will have power, for example, to prevent even the making of carbon copies of anything other than official correspondence and office records. I believe if the President had taken time to read section 11 of the act which he approved on March 1, 1919, in connection with section 8 of the legislative bill, he would never have made any such statement.

The sole purpose of the committee in proposing this provision was to meet a situation that has recently developed in the departments from the installation of large numbers of mimeographing and multigraphing machines. To evade the restrictions placed upon printing, some of the departments have undertaken to mimeograph or multigraph publications that in all common sense and due regard for economy ought to be printed. A preliminary investigation of such work by the departments in Washington shows that there are now nearly 100 duplicating and mailing units in the departments themselves outside of the Government Printing Office. These units contain nearly 500 duplicating machines, such as mimeographing and multigraphing, 265 mailing devices, at a total cost of approximately \$300,000, and that they employ 428 persons at an annual salary roll of \$433,000. If there is to be any supervision over departmental printing at all, it should include such substitute processes for printing.

I have here a few samples of periodicals that are now being mimeographed and multigraphed by the departments. For instance, here is the Quartermaster Service News for February, containing 62 mimeographed pages. Here is a bulletin issued by the Recruiting Publicity Bureau, of New York City, with a colored cover inclosing 24 pages of mimeographed work. Similar, also, are copies of the Army Recruiting News and various other publications which I have before me.

Mr. President, when 155 publications were ordered discontinued by the Joint Committee on Printing, what did some of the departments do? Did they stop issuing the periodical or magazine? No; they were issued just the same but were not

printed; they were lithographed or mimeographed, costing the Government of the United States twice as much as they did before. But what do some officials care about a law Congress passes?

Mr. President, the time will come when an announcement that one is in sympathy with reforms will be understood by the people of the United States as meaning that the practices of the past and all the wicked waste on the part of the departments may go on unmolested. If Congress undertakes to pass legislation to prevent wicked waste or economize, some official will make the statement that he is in sympathy with the reform but does not like the legislation. If it reduces expenditures or limits appropriations, of course he does not like the legislation. Officials, with few exceptions, never do, for it interferes with the sweet will of the Government spenders. I know one thing. The time will come when the American people will see that a change is made. The taxpayers of this country are not going to allow this practice to continue, and Representatives or Senators who stand in the way of reforms of this character will hear from their constituents as soon as their constituents understand the situation.

Mr. President, since the committee began its investigation of mimeographing and multigraphing it has acquired a stack of exhibits of such work which would reach almost to the gallery of this Chamber if displayed in a pile, and that does not begin to cover the mass of such stuff with which the departments have swamped the mails and the newspaper offices of the country.

Since I made my last statement on the floor of the Senate in relation to the waste of print paper, I have received mail of every character from every part of the United States, from people sending me Government publications and telling me that they have been receiving them for years; that all they do with them is to throw them in the wastebasket, and pleading with me to see that the sending is discontinued. I do not believe there is a Senator who has not had similar experience.

For instance, I have here a so-called "Memo for the press," which the Secretary of the Navy issued to the newspapers last night, covering the statement which he expects to make to the Senate Subcommittee on Naval Affairs this afternoon. Without discussing the propriety of a witness sending out advance copies of testimony that he expects to give before a committee, I do not hesitate to say that there is not a newspaper in the country that could print one-tenth of the 61-paged "memo" which the Secretary of the Navy has submitted to the press for release "after he begins his fifth day's testimony."

The Comptroller of the Currency is also flooding the country with letters and circulars bombastically setting forth his marvelous administration of the banks. Not content with sending me one copy here in Washington, he also addressed a duplicate to Provo, with a request that an "answer would be appreciated."

The President bases his objection to section 8 on the further ground that it is an interference by the legislative branch of the Government on particularly departmental or administrative matters. In this he entirely overlooks the fact that the Joint Committee on Printing is not a committee of Congress as such but is a separate and distinct statutory body, and almost analogous to the Civil Service Commission or any other independent establishment of the Government. The membership and duties of the joint committee are fixed by law as set forth in the printing act of January 12, 1895. For many years, and without question heretofore, the committee has exercised many duties relating to printing for the departments as well as for Congress. The act of 1895 provides that the joint committee shall fix upon standards and award contracts for paper for printing for all branches of the Government service. The printing of the Agricultural Yearbook, prepared by the Department of Agriculture itself, is placed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, as is also all printing for the Patent Office. The law also provides that even the annual reports of the executive offices shall be printed in a certain form unless otherwise provided by the Joint Committee on Printing.

As a matter of fact, the Government Printing Office was established by Congress as a congressional printing office. The printer was at first elected by both Houses of Congress, and was called the Congressional Printer. After a time some question was raised as to the constitutionality of Congress electing the printer, and his appointment was then vested in the President and the title changed to the Public Printer, but it does not appear that this was done with any intention by Congress of relinquishing its control over the Government Printing Office.

Further than the power of appointment, the President does not appear to have any control over the Public Printer, who makes his report direct to Congress. The printing act of 1895 and the many amendments to that law vest the Joint Committee on Printing with substantially the authority of a board of directors for the Government Printing Office. Its jurisdiction as such has never heretofore been questioned by any administration or any Congress.

Even the present building occupied by the Government Printing Office was erected by the Public Printer under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, as provided by law—Twenty-eighth Statute at Large, page 420—and the site it occupies was acquired by the committee under authority of a concurrent resolution of the Fifty-second Congress.

I am of the firm opinion, therefore, that the President has been deliberately misinformed concerning the duties and purposes of this committee, and that his advice did not come from qualified officers in the executive departments, but rather from outside influence, to which I have already referred. I shall take occasion in the very near future to advise the public as to the character of this influence.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM AT WEST POINT.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Record a letter from Mr. George M. Brown, of St. Louis, Mo., relative to the educational system at West Point.

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

CERTAIN-TEED PRODUCTS CORPORATION.

St. Louis, U. S. A., May 11, 1920.

HON. SELDEN P. SPENCER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Yesterday's paper reported that Dr. Eliot, of Harvard, had complained of the educational system at West Point, and gave as proof the failure of West Point men during the war.

I wish to make an earnest protest against this claim of Dr. Eliot, both in regard to any failure of West Point men during the war and further in regard to the educational system at West Point.

As you will probably remember, I graduated at West Point in the class of 1890 and resigned after two years to enter business. In my business experience, which is extended throughout the world with this company, and is also extended to other various business interests, various patriotic organizations, war work, charity work, etc., I have come in contact with every kind of employer and employee and in contact with all kinds of people, both in public and private life.

As an employer we have dealt with graduates of practically all the well-known colleges. We have a number of Harvard men in the business, my son-in-law, Mr. R. M. Nelson, being a Harvard graduate and also secretary and treasurer of this business. My only son is a junior at Yale, so I am not lacking in appreciation of other colleges. I mean no disrespect to them when I go on record as saying I think there is no better line of education in any college than that given at West Point for meeting the problems which we must face in everyday life and under all sorts of conditions.

I will not undertake to go into many reasons for feeling this way—my letter would have to be too long—but I do want to appear to be able to qualify as having a right to pass on such a matter, and then to add my testimony in the most favorable way possible to the West Point system of education and to West Point as an institution, and of course I am very proud of the record the West Point men made during the war. Their losses in battle in percentage, I believe, were at high-water mark of any known class entering the war. I haven't the figures on this, but understand there are such figures available at West Point, and I am sure their losses were not sustained without a corresponding showing of good results.

I would greatly appreciate it if you could present West Point's case in some way in this matter. Having graduated at Yale yourself, it would be most appropriate if you can do this.

Very truly, yours,

GEO. M. BROWN.

PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY AND COAST GUARD—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. PAGE submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11927) to increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Coast Guard through the temporary provision of bonuses

or increased compensation having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

"That, commencing January 1, 1920, commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Public Health Service shall be paid, in addition to all pay and allowances now allowed by law, increases at rates per annum as follows: Colonels in the Army and Marine Corps, captains in the Navy, and assistant surgeons general in the Public Health Service, \$600; lieutenant colonels in the Army and Marine Corps, commanders in the Navy, and senior surgeons in the Public Health Service, \$600; majors in the Army and Marine Corps, lieutenant commanders in the Navy, and surgeons in the Public Health Service, \$840; captains in the Army and Marine Corps, lieutenants in the Navy, and passed assistant surgeons in the Public Health Service, \$720; first lieutenants in the Army and Marine Corps, lieutenants (junior grade), acting assistant surgeons and acting assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, and assistant surgeons in the Public Health Service, \$600; second lieutenants in the Army and Marine Corps, and ensigns in the Navy, \$420: *Provided*, That contract surgeons of the Army serving full time shall receive the pay of a second lieutenant.

"Sec. 2. That the right and benefits prescribed under the act of April 16, 1918, granting commutation of quarters, heat, and light during the present emergency to officers of the Army on duty in the field are hereby continued and made effective until June 30, 1922, and shall apply equally to officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Public Health Service: *Provided*, That such rights and benefits as are prescribed for officers shall apply equally for enlisted men now entitled by regulations to quarters or to commutation therefor.

"Sec. 3. That, commencing January 1, 1920, warrant officers of the Navy shall be paid, in addition to all pay and allowances now allowed by law, an increase at the rate of \$240 per annum.

"Sec. 4. That, commencing January 1, 1920, the pay of all enlisted men of the Army and Marine Corps and of members of the female Nurse Corps of the Army and Navy is hereby increased 20 per cent: *Provided*, That such increase shall not apply to enlisted men whose initial pay, if it has already been permanently increased since April 6, 1917, is now less than \$33 per month.

"Sec. 5. That all noncommissioned officers of the Army of grade of color sergeant and above as fixed by existing Army Regulations and noncommissioned officers of the Marine Corps of corresponding grades shall be entitled to one ration or commutation therefor in addition to that to which they are now entitled. The commutation value shall be determined by the President on July 1 of each fiscal year, and for the current fiscal year the value shall be computed on the basis of 55 cents per ration: *Provided*, That Army field clerks and field clerks Quartermaster Corps, whose total pay and allowances do not exceed \$2,500 per annum, shall be paid an increase at the rate of \$240 per annum: *Provided further*, That such Army field clerks and field clerks Quartermaster Corps, whose total pay and allowances exceed \$2,500 but do not exceed \$2,740 per annum, shall be paid such additional amount as will make their total pay and allowances not to exceed \$2,740 per annum: *Provided further*, That this section shall not be construed to reduce the pay and allowances of any Army field clerk or field clerk Quartermaster Corps.

"Sec. 6. That, commencing January 1, 1920, the following shall be the rate of base pay for each enlisted rating: Chief petty officers with acting appointments, \$99 per month; chief petty officers with permanent appointments and mates, \$126 per month; petty officers, first class, \$84 per month; petty officers, second class, \$72 per month; petty officers, third class, \$60 per month; nonrated men, first class, \$54 per month; nonrated men, second class, \$48 per month; nonrated men, third class, \$33 per month: *Provided*, That the base pay of firemen, first class, shall be \$60 per month; firemen, second class, \$54 per month; firemen, third class, \$48 per month: *Provided further*, That the rate of base pay for each rating in the Naval Academy Band shall be as follows: Second leader, with acting appointment, \$99 per month, with permanent appointment, \$126 per month; drum major, \$84 per month; musicians, first class, \$72 per month; musicians, second class, \$60 per month: *Provided further*, That the base pay of cabin stewards and cabin cooks shall be \$84 per month; wardroom stewards and wardroom cooks, \$72 per month; steerage stewards and steerage cooks, \$72 per month; warrant officers' stewards and warrant officers' cooks, \$60 per month; mess attendants, first class, \$42 per month; mess at-

tendants, second class, \$36 per month; mess attendants, third class, \$33 per month: *Provided further*, That the retainer pay of those members of the Fleet Naval Reserve who, pursuant to call, shall return to active duty within one month after the approval of this act and shall continue on active duty until the Navy shall have been recruited up to its permanent authorized strength, or until the number in the grade to which they may be assigned is filled, but not beyond June 30, 1922, shall be computed upon the base pay they are receiving when retransferred to inactive duty, plus the additions or increases prescribed in the naval appropriation act approved August 29, 1916, for members of the Fleet Naval Reserve: *Provided further*, That the rates of base pay herein fixed shall not be further increased 10 per cent as authorized by an act approved May 13, 1908, nor by the temporary war increases as authorized by section 15 of the act approved May 22, 1917, as amended by the act approved July 11, 1919.

"Sec. 7. That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion, to readjust the prevailing rates of pay of civilian professors and instructors at the United States Naval Academy: *Provided*, That said readjustment, which shall be effective from January 1, 1920, shall not involve an additional expenditure in excess of \$55,000 for the remainder of the current fiscal year.

"Sec. 8. That commissioned officers, warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted men of the Coast Guard shall receive the same pay, allowances, and increases as now are, herein are, or hereafter may be prescribed for corresponding grades or ratings and length of service in the Navy; and the grades and ratings of warrant officers, chief petty officers, petty officers, and other enlisted persons in the Coast Guard shall be the same as in the Navy, in so far as the duties of the Coast Guard may require, with the continuance in the Coast Guard of the grade of surfman, whose base pay shall be \$70 per month: *Provided*, That the senior district superintendent, the three district superintendents next in order of seniority, the four district superintendents next below these three in order of seniority, and the junior five district superintendents shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of captain, first lieutenant, second lieutenant, and third lieutenant in the Coast Guard, respectively.

"Sec. 9. That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as granting any back pay or allowances to any officer or enlisted man whose active service shall have terminated subsequent to December 31, 1919, and prior to the approval of this act, unless such officers or enlisted men shall have been recalled to active service or shall have been reenlisted prior to the approval of this act.

"Sec. 10. That any enlisted man or apprentice seaman who shall reenlist in the Navy within one year from the date of his discharge therefrom shall, upon such reenlistment, be entitled to and shall receive the same benefits as are now authorized by law for reenlistment within four months from date of last discharge from the service: *Provided*, That this section shall become inoperative six months after the date of the approval of this act.

"Sec. 11. That, in lieu of compensation now prescribed by law, commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall receive the same pay and allowances as now are or hereafter may be prescribed for officers of the Navy with whom they hold relative rank, as prescribed in the act of May 22, 1917, entitled 'An act to temporarily increase the commissioned and warrant and enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes,' including longevity; and all laws relating to the retirement of commissioned officers of the Navy shall hereafter apply to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey: *Provided*, That hereafter longevity pay for officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, and Coast and Geodetic Survey shall be based on the total of all service in any or all of said services.

"Sec. 12. That hereafter when any commissioned officer, noncommissioned officer of the grade of color sergeant and above, including any noncommissioned officer of the Marine Corps of corresponding grade, warrant officer, chief petty officer, or petty officer (first class), having a wife or dependent child or children, is ordered to make a permanent change of station, the United States shall furnish transportation in kind from funds appropriated for the transportation of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service to his new station for the wife and dependent child or children: *Provided*, That for persons in the naval service the term 'permanent station,' as used in this section, shall be interpreted to mean a shore station or the home yard of the vessel to which the person concerned may be ordered; and a duly authorized change in home yard or home port of such vessel shall be deemed a change of station: *Provided further*, That if the cost of such transportation exceeds that for transportation from the old to the new station the

excess cost shall be paid to the United States by the officer concerned: *Provided further*, That transportation supplied the wife or dependent child or children of such officer to or from stations beyond the continental limits of the United States shall not be other than by Government transport, if such transportation is available: *And provided further*, That the personnel of the Navy shall have the benefit of all existing laws applying to the Army and the Marine Corps for the transportation of household effects.

"SEC. 13. That the provisions of sections 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of this act shall remain effective until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, unless sooner amended or repealed: *Provided*, That the rates of pay prescribed in sections 4 and 6 hereof shall be the rates of pay during the current enlistment of all men in active service on the date of the approval of this act, and for those who enlist, reenlist, or extend their enlistments prior to July 1, 1922, for the term of such enlistment, reenlistment, or extended enlistment: *Provided further*, That the increases provided in this act shall not enter into the computation of the retired pay of officers or enlisted men who may be retired prior to July 1, 1922: *And provided further*, That a special committee, to be composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the Vice President, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall make an investigation and report recommendations to their respective Houses not later than the first Monday in January, 1922, relative to the readjustment of the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the several services herein mentioned.

"SEC. 14. That nothing contained in this act shall operate to reduce the pay or allowances of any officer or enlisted man on the active or retired list: *Provided*, That the allowances and gratuities now authorized by existing law are not changed hereby, except as otherwise specified in this act.

"SEC. 15. That the appropriations 'Pay of the Navy, 1920,' and 'Pay, Marine Corps, 1920,' are hereby made available for any of the expenses authorized by this act, and any part or all of the appropriations 'Provisions, Navy, 1920,' and 'Maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps, 1920,' not required for the objects of expenditure specified in said appropriations, may be transferred to the appropriations 'Pay of the Navy, 1920,' or 'Pay, Marine Corps, 1920,' respectively, as may be required."

And the Senate agree to the same.

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

C. S. PAGE,
JOHN WALTER SMITH,
HENRY W. KEYES,
J. W. WADSWORTH, JR.,
GEO. E. CHAMBERLAIN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

THOMAS S. BUTLER,
PATRICK H. KELLEY,
FRED A. BRITTEN,
L. P. PADGETT,
D. J. RIORDAN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. PAGE. I understand that the conference report received the unanimous sanction of the members of the conference committee of both Houses, and that when the matter was brought up in the House this morning it was agreed to without a single objection. It is an important measure and ought to receive immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may consider the conference report at this time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask the Senator from Vermont if this is not also a report on the Army pay bill.

Mr. PAGE. It is.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the Senator state that there was no difference between the conferees and that it is a unanimous report?

Mr. PAGE. It is a unanimous report on the part of the conferees of both Houses, and the conference report was agreed to in the House this morning without a single objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is it not a report on the Army, Navy, and Coast Guard bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is my understanding that the Army is included in the measure.

Mr. PAGE. That was taken care of in the amendment. In the original bill the Army pay was stricken out.

Mr. LODGE. It consolidated both bills.

The report was agreed to.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the peace resolution may be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the merchant-marine bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10378) to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment proposing to insert a new section, to be known as section 32.

Mr. JONES of Washington. On page 35, line 21, after the word "mortgage," I desire to offer an amendment to make it consistent with other parts of the bill. I move to insert after the word "mortgage" the words "on the hold of any vessel," so as to make the line read:

Shall be subordinate to the lien of any mortgage on the hold of any vessel duly recorded—

And so forth.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to offer a further amendment to the section. I move that each paragraph be lettered (a), (b), (c), (d), and so forth. That will enable us to deal with the paragraphs more easily in the future. In other words, in section 32, line 6, page 35, insert the small letter "a" in parentheses and then at the beginning of the next paragraph to insert the small letter "b" in parentheses, and so on for each paragraph of the section.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the paragraphs will be accordingly lettered. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 11, to insert:

SEC. 33. That section 4530 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4530. Every seaman on a vessel of the United States shall be entitled to receive on demand from the master of the vessel to which he belongs one-half part of the balance of his wages earned and remaining unpaid at the time when such demand is made at every port where such vessel, after the voyage has been commenced, shall load or deliver cargo or take in fuel before the voyage is ended, and all stipulations in the contract to the contrary shall be void: *Provided*, Such a demand shall not be made before the expiration of nor oftener than once in five days nor more than once in the same harbor on the same entry. Any failure on the part of the master to comply with this demand shall release the seaman from his contract, and he shall be entitled to full payment of wages earned. And when the voyage is ended every such seaman shall be entitled to the remainder of the wages which shall be then due him, as provided in section 4529 of the Revised Statutes: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any release signed by any seaman under section 4532 of the Revised Statutes any court having jurisdiction may upon good cause shown set aside such release and take such action as justice shall require: *And provided further*, That this section shall apply to seamen on foreign vessels while in harbors of the United States, and the courts of the United States shall be open to such seamen for its enforcement."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is agreed to, without objection.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee to state in what respect the amendment reported by the committee differs from existing law?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It differs from the existing law only in one main particular, in about the fourth or fifth line of the section. The present law reads as follows:

Every seaman on a vessel of the United States shall be entitled to receive on demand from the master of the vessel to which he belongs—

Now, here is the part affected—

one-half part of the wages which he shall have then earned, at every port which such vessel—

And so forth. The change is:

One-half part of the balance of his wages earned and remaining unpaid.

That was the real intent of the law originally; that is what its framers thought they were doing; but the Supreme Court, while it held this section to be constitutional and that we could make it apply to foreign vessels and foreign seamen in our ports, held that the language of the present law requires one-half of the wages of the entire voyage to be kept, as the seamen express it, "with the ship" until the end of the voyage. The purpose of this amendment is to carry out the real, original intention, that whenever a seaman can make such a demand he can demand half of what is then due and remaining unpaid. That is the main provision. It is very earnestly desired by the

seamen, and there is no serious objection on the part of those who operate ships.

As a matter of fact, the provision is designed to meet this situation with reference to foreign seamen. They make a contract in a foreign country for a voyage sometimes extending over three years, but under the decision referred to they can not draw on that whole voyage any more than one-half of the entire wages agreed to be paid for the voyage; in other words, the operators hold half the wages and force the sailor to go back to his home port. This provision is to enable a seaman on a foreign ship who desires to land in this country to have one-half of the wages that are remaining unpaid paid to him. It will tend to bring the foreign seamen up to a level with our seamen by giving them the remedy here in our own ports that our seamen have.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator say that the Supreme Court has held that we have jurisdiction over the foreign seamen and foreign ships?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Under the present statute we have such jurisdiction in our ports.

The Supreme Court held that act to be unconstitutional only a short time ago.

Mr. KING. A vessel, then, that sails under the Norwegian flag, for instance, with Norwegian sailors, if it touched at an American port for a day would become subject to the jurisdiction of our courts and the provisions of this proposed law, and the sailors could invoke the law for their protection?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; while in an American port. It was one of the main contentions, the Senator from Utah will remember, in favor of the seamen's act, that it would, instead of placing a great burden on our seamen and shippers, bring the wages of the seamen of other countries up to a level with our own. This provision is intended to aid in carrying out that great purpose.

NATIONAL PROHIBITION.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, a day or two ago the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] asked and obtained permission to place in the RECORD the brief and argument of the complainant in the New Jersey prohibition case. I now ask permission to put in the RECORD the opposing brief filed by Wayne B. Wheeler and others.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], who is the objector to such papers being inserted in the RECORD, is not present. He was not here at the time the Senator from New Jersey secured permission to place in the RECORD the brief to which the Senator from Texas refers. If he had been here, the request would have been objected to I am sure. I am informed by the Senator from Utah that the cost of printing that brief in the RECORD, it covering some 24 pages, was very large. I wish the Senator from Texas would withhold his request until the Senator from Utah is present.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would not have offered the brief in this instance, if the brief on the other side had not been placed in the RECORD.

Mr. KENYON. That is the trouble with printing in the RECORD of such documents. The printing of one brief draws out a brief on the other side.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I agree with the Senator from Iowa as to that.

Mr. SMOOT entered the Chamber.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator from Utah is now present, and I wish to call his attention to the request of the Senator from Texas. I am holding the matter up until the Senator from Utah can have an opportunity to object to the request granted, if he so desires.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Texas at what time the brief presented by the Senator from New Jersey, to which he refers, was printed in the RECORD?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It was printed only a few days ago.

Mr. SIMMONS. Did not the Senator at that time state that he would not object to the printing of that brief in the RECORD provided that it was agreed that he might thereafter offer the opposing briefs and have them printed in the RECORD? I ask the Senator from Texas if that was not the understanding?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Texas did offer briefs, and they went into the RECORD at the same time.

Mr. SIMMONS. He is asking that they go in now.

Mr. SMOOT. This is another matter?

Mr. SIMMONS. The present request has to do with another brief?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, I will say frankly to the Senator from Texas that if I had been in the Chamber the other day when the Senator from New Jersey offered the New Jersey briefs for printing in the RECORD I should have objected to their going in.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, let me explain the situation. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] first offered the brief of Hon. Elihu Root in one of the prohibition cases. I then asked permission to insert all the opposing briefs, but afterwards decided to have only one inserted. A day or two ago the Senator from New Jersey put in the brief which had been filed in the New Jersey case, which was a separate case from the other. I now merely ask that the opposing brief be put in, in order that both sides may be treated fairly.

I would not, in the first instance, have asked that any of these briefs go into the RECORD, I will say to the Senator from Utah. If he will remember, I first offered the briefs and asked that they be referred to the Senate Committee on Printing to be made a Senate document. The Committee on Printing made a favorable report on the request, but the Senate failed to adopt it and I had nothing further to say. The Senator from Connecticut then rose and said he would read the brief of Mr. Elihu Root unless it be allowed to be printed in the RECORD. I have been actuated only by a desire to see both sides represented fairly.

Mr. SMOOT. I think they were represented at that time fairly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is true, so far as the first case is concerned. Now, in the second case, the brief for the complainant has been published, but not the opposing brief.

Mr. SMOOT. It cost a thousand dollars for postage and to print the brief in the New Jersey case under the situation existing to-day. I am going to ask the Senator from Texas not to ask that the document to which he has referred be printed in the RECORD. I wish to say to the Senator and to the Senate that I do not know where we are going to get paper enough to meet the demands. We are doing everything in our power to provide paper; we are holding up the printing of some documents and printing them only in small quantities and just as they are distributed, at an expense of from 25 to 33½ per cent more than would be involved if we could get the paper and print the documents all at once.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator does not direct any criticism against me for the course I have pursued?

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all; but I wish to say that under the circumstances I will have to object to the document being incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under the circumstances I shall not insist on the incorporation of the brief in the RECORD.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I do not desire in any way to continue the discussion of the printing controversy, because a very important matter, namely, the merchant marine bill, is before the Senate; but in the defense of the request which I made on behalf of the State of New Jersey I wish to say just a word.

So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly satisfied to have the Senator from Texas place in the RECORD the brief in answer to the brief put in by me, but as he has already had printed in the RECORD a general answer perhaps that meets the necessity of that side of the question.

In explanation of my request to put the brief and complaint of the attorney general representing the State of New Jersey in the RECORD, I desire to say that it is not a question in my mind at all of the issue that happens to be argued in that particular case. I am not a lawyer, but from various expressions on the part of distinguished lawyers and after reading the document from a layman's standpoint, it is my conviction that that brief and complaint furnish to the country the most concise review of the principle of State rights that has in recent times been put together; and, with all due deference to the importance of many speeches made on the floor of the Senate which have filled columns and columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I believe that the people of this country will be as much interested to have the opportunity of reading in concise form a general review of the precedents with the interpretations made by the attorney general bearing on the great question of State rights, which question is involved in so much of our legislation. In that aspect the documents I have had printed are very important for the information of the American people. So I have no apology to make for using a portion of the RECORD in order that the people of this country may have that opportunity.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I think that these matters should go into the RECORD for the enlightenment of the people. And while the Senator from Utah is so watchful as to economy and is trying to save so much money for the Government in the matter of printing, I wish to call his attention and the attention of the country to the fact that I have received no less than a dozen such cards as this [exhibiting] carried through the mail under the frank of a Republican Member of Congress, signed by the League for the Preservation of Amer-

ican Independence (Inc.), Washington, D. C., and marked "From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

In big type it says:

Let us have peace.

And then under that it says:

The President said to Congress on November 12, 1919, that the war was ended, and its object accomplished—

And so forth.

Further down it asks the question in big black type:

Will the South stand for this?

Saying:

Out of that great section of the country came most of the creative genius that secured our independence, founded our Government, and framed our institutions.

What, now, would those great southern statesmen say to the proposal that their work, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, be so far undone that the Old World shall again be given control of the New?

Then the next paragraph is italicized; evidently they thought it was very important—

Would they approve the surrender at Versailles of the independence they had won at Yorktown? Will you?

What, then, is to be done?

Then it says:

Let Congress declare the state of war ended.

That is proposed to be done in the Knox resolution, I believe, which has the sanction of the Senator from Utah, perhaps.

Let the Senate declare the terms upon which we will enter again into relations with Germany and Austria.

Let Congress declare our intention to avoid foreign entanglements, as Washington and other Presidents have advised, and redeclare our independence of foreign control.

Then let us have peace!

They underscore that.

If you approve, say so promptly to your Senators and Representatives at Washington.

Then, in big, black type at the end, are the words:

League for the Preservation of American Independence (Inc.), Washington, D. C.

I know not how many thousands or tens of thousands or perhaps hundreds of thousands of these circulars, at the cost of an immense amount of money, have been distributed from one end of this country to the other; but I know that in my own State thousands of them have gone through the mail, at Government expense, under the frank of a Republican Member of Congress. If you want to economize, preach some of that kind of economy to members of the Republican Party.

In the first place, the circular is unfair, and in my opinion it is just as reprehensible as for candidates to spend immense amounts of money in presidential primaries throughout the country by employing men to go around to get voters to the polls to vote for them. That is, of course, a species of corruption; but it is no greater than with Government funds, through the frank of a Member of Congress or a Member of the Senate, to send such literature as this through the mails; and I want to insert this whole pamphlet in my few remarks.

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

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 25, 1920.]

LET US HAVE PEACE.

The President told Congress on November 12, 1919, that the war was ended and its object accomplished.

This was true then, and it is true now. But the President refuses to end the state of war and surrender the restrictive war-time measures still in his hands, which menace farm, shop, and office in every section of the country.

He refuses to end the state of war unless the Nation shall enter into a contract with 32 nations—many of which are brown, yellow, or black—under which our domestic policy and foreign relations shall be subjected to the control of these nations, and American troops be placed at their disposal for use in Europe, Asia, and Africa, to be employed in never-ceasing warfare.

A coalition of patriotic southern and northern Senators has refused thus to surrender American sovereignty or to expend American blood and tax money.

These Senators have sought to modify the contract so that we shall be enabled to do our international duty as our Nation thinks best without placing the United States in Europe's hands to be dealt with as Europe pleases.

But the President refuses to Americanize the covenant and declines to curtail the supersovereign powers of the league. He must have his league or there will be no peace, he says in effect.

The Nation must bow down to the President's league or continue suspended in a state of war. He thus hangs up America by the thumbs and coolly awaits its repentance and acquiescence.

WILL THE SOUTH STAND FOR THIS?

Out of that great section of the country came most of the creative genius that secured our independence, founded our Government, and framed our institutions.

What, now, would those great southern statesmen say to the proposal that their work, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, be so far undone that the Old World shall again be given control of the New?

Would they approve the surrender at Versailles of the independence they had won at Yorktown? Will you?

What, then, is to be done?

This:

Let Congress declare the state of war ended.

Let the Senate declare the terms upon which we will enter again into relations with Germany and Austria.

Let Congress declare our intention to avoid foreign entanglements, as Washington and other Presidents have advised, and redeclare our independence of foreign control.

THEN LET US HAVE PEACE!

If you approve, say so promptly to your Senators and Representatives at Washington.

LEAGUE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF
AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE (INC.),
Washington, D. C.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, under the law, anything that is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD can be sent through the mails free of charge. I do not know whether the Senator from Mississippi ever used the mails for the distribution of documents or not, and I do not care, as far as that is concerned, whether he has in the past or not; but there is not a Congressman and there is not a Senator but that knows that the committee has told the Public Printer, in connection with the printing of speeches from now on, that if the paper situation is such that he can not furnish paper he is to refuse to print them.

I have seen—and this applies both to Democrats and to Republicans—carloads of public documents sold for old paper. They used to print so many of them that they could not send them through the mails. They did not have large enough mailing lists, I suppose. I have seen them loaded here by the car, not to be sent through the post office here at Washington, as most of the mail is, but they are delivered directly to cars and sent all over this country. If the Senator wants to know how much of this is going on, just let him find out from the man that buys as old print paper the public documents that are out of use, and let him go over to the House and go to the waste room and see what is there to-day. I want to stop it all.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. I think the Senator has rendered great service and has saved quite a good deal of money for the Government in objecting at times to certain things going in the RECORD, and in discontinuing certain periodicals that are of no use, and I can not believe that the Senator approves of placing in the RECORD matter of this kind—and this was placed in the RECORD, I may say, by this particular Congressman, or some Congressman—and then, at Government expense, under the frank of a Member of Congress or a Senator, distributing such literature as that through the country.

Mr. SMOOT. Why, Mr. President, I have stood upon this floor time and time again, and perhaps have violated the rules of this body in referring to speeches that have been put into the RECORD in years past by virtue of requests to print; and if the Senator will take up the RECORD at almost any time, and look at the back of the RECORD almost any day, he will find those same speeches being printed to-day. We do not have that practice in the Senate. We can stop it here, and it ought to be stopped in the House.

Mr. HARRISON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, under the law, when it goes into the RECORD, no matter what it may be, any Congressman or any Senator can order from the Government Printing Office what he wants, and it can go through the mails free of charge. Now, if we want to pass a law—and I do not know but that it would be a good thing—to take away the free circulation of documents through the mails from Congressmen and from Senators, well and good; but I do not want to be blamed for a thing that the law says a man can do, and he does it, whether it is right or whether it is wrong.

Mr. HARRISON. I will say to the Senator that I do not know it to be a fact, but I suspect that the particular Congressman whose frank is there did not send out that circular, and had nothing to do with it, but perhaps loaned his frank, so to speak, and allowed the League for the Preservation of American Independence (Inc.), here in Washington, D. C., to use it. It is wrong; it is outrageous; it is indefensible. It shows to what extremity the opponents of the League of Nations have gone.

Mr. SMOOT. That has been the practice ever since I have been here, and I know that it was the practice before I came here. The Congressman had to order the printing done, however. No association could have ordered them printed. The Congressman must take the responsibility, because in ordering them he must issue the order, and he must pay for the printing of them under the law, and he does. I have thought many a time of the question as to whether the abuse is not a greater evil than the good that comes from the privilege.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, in view of the eulogy by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] on the brief that he put in the RECORD, I think it but fair that a synopsis of the brief I offered should go in the RECORD. I shall prepare that synopsis and present it to the Senate myself, as soon as I can do it.

The prohibition amendment was submitted to the States under the method prescribed in the Constitution itself, under the method prescribed by the States themselves when they created the Constitution. That amendment was ratified by 45 of the 48 States of this Union, and the assertion that it is in violation of State rights seems to me to border upon the absurd. It seems to me that the State of New Jersey, in resisting the action of 45 of the 48 States of the Union in ratifying an amendment proposed under the Constitution, and adopted in accordance with its solemn terms, has put itself on the side of revolution and anarchy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a rule of the Senate that prevents a Senator from making remarks about a State of the Union.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not believe it represents the feeling of the people of New Jersey. I want to apologize to the State of New Jersey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator must withdraw that remark or take his seat.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I could say something, but I refrain, that immediately comes to my mind as I recall certain assertions that recently have been made by distinguished authority in an adjoining State.

The contention in the brief presented by the Senator from New Jersey is not representative of the State of New Jersey, I hope and believe. I refuse to believe that he represents the people of New Jersey if he says that they are really behind a contention resisting the solemn action of 45 of the 48 States of the American Union, acting under the method prescribed in the Constitution itself.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, again I apologize for taking the time of the Senate, but the Senator from Texas has introduced a very unnecessary and unfortunate angle into the discussion. Allow me to repeat for his benefit, if he did not understand the preliminary remarks I made in connection with the introduction of the brief and complaint, that it was not at all, so far as my presentation of it was concerned, with any particular reference to the particular question involved. I am ready to discuss the particular question involved at any time on a proper occasion, or whenever legislation is pending; but this brief, as I followed it, presents all elements, all viewpoints, many precedents in connection with the rights of the State in its relation to the Nation. It reviewed, I think, without doing so in a manner that could in any way offend even those who earnestly and sincerely believe in the strictest interpretation of the eighteenth amendment, the question of State rights, of State police power, of States' relationship to Government, and did so in a dispassionate manner and in a way that I feel should be presented to the people of the country, not because of its relationship to that particular issue, but because of its relationship to many questions that are daily coming before the Senate of the United States in the matter of State rights as compared to Federal rights.

Since my brief membership in this body I recall subject after subject that has been discussed on the floor of the Senate where the question has arisen whether the Senate of the United States or the Congress of the United States were not invading State rights, and undertaking to assert action in a way that had heretofore been looked upon as entirely within the control of the States. This brief and complaint attempted to review that general situation, and I think it is entirely out of place to raise any question as to the feeling of the people of New Jersey on the prohibition issue, or that it be introduced in any way into the discussion.

The brief was prepared by the attorney general of the State of New Jersey, following action of the Legislature of New Jersey, representing a sovereign State of the Union; and it undoubtedly represented, through the legislature, the desire of the people of that great Commonwealth. I strongly resent such aspersions and feel that it is unnecessary and entirely out of place to question in any way the feeling of the people of New Jersey, because that particular question is involved.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a question?

Mr. EDGE. I am through.

Mr. KING. I want to ask the Senator, with his permission, if he did not know that it was against this doctrine that is now so prevalent, this new federalism, that the States should assert any rights whatever? The new federalism commands that the States shall abdicate all their functions, sit down supinely, and

let bureaus and bureaucratic institutions and instrumentalities and Federal agencies and parasites operate the States.

I think the Senator ought not to declare in favor of the rights of the States. He ought to come with cap in hand and welcome this new doctrine, and bow at the feet of this new federalism.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I am very glad—following the thought of the Senator from Utah—that one State in the Union, at least, even though she may be criticized, is not deterred because of the viewpoint of others, and that one State of the Union, at least—one sovereign State, through its regular legal department—is testing to some extent the question of State rights, and its own jurisdiction in its relationship to the Government.

RATES OF INTEREST.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, on May 5 the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter addressed to me by Mr. W. P. G. Harding, governor of the Federal Reserve Board, on the question of interest rates.

For some time I had been trying to bring about a reduction of interest rates in the United States. I thought that the high rates fixed by the Federal Reserve Board of 6 and 7 per cent to the member banks necessarily had the effect of causing the member banks to raise their rates 2 and 3 per cent higher than the rates fixed by the reserve banks. Undoubtedly that is the fact. The current commercial rates are running now 8 and 10 per cent, not to mention commissions on the side; and I know of transactions involving a much higher rate and dealing with large amounts. Even acceptances that ought to have a 3 per cent rate are over 6 per cent.

There is an urgent demand for credit at this time for various purposes, for productive purposes, for commercial purposes, for purposes of distribution of the goods required by this country as well as for speculative purposes. There is an extraordinary demand, and it is natural that the banks should take advantage of that great demand to raise the rate, because, like merchants who are selling credits, they sell at the best figure they can, and when the urgent demand comes they will raise the rates as thrifty merchants of credit might do, or just as those who sell eggs might do, for that matter.

The Federal Reserve Board, however, is a Federal agency; and I desire to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Federal Reserve System was intended to give stability to credit, and should not, like a private agency, be used merely as a money-making bank for profit.

It was intended to promote uniform, reasonable rates of interest to the business men of the United States, and these high interest rates which are being authorized by the Federal Reserve Board, I think, are very harmful in their consequences.

The Federal Reserve Board is thinking much these days of deflating credit. The idea has been much exploited recently that it is a good thing to deflate credit; that there is too much credit; that credit is going too far; that it is leading to speculation of all kinds and, therefore, we must deflate credit. I will agree that when credit is being used for speculative purposes, when credit is being used to speculate in commodities for hoarding, when it is used for speculating in real estate, or when it is used for the speculation in investment securities on the stock exchange by buying stocks for the rise or selling stocks for the fall, used in that way, when there is a scarcity of credits for productive and distributive purposes, it would be well to have such credit, as far as possible, transferred from unproductive to productive purposes and in that sense deflated. But the reserve board in raising the rate to 6 and 7 per cent upon all classes of credit is not stopping speculation. The speculator can better pay an artificially high rate than the man who is engaged in a normal business can pay it, because the speculator has a speculative profit in sight.

When this sweeping raise is made over the whole country a raise of 2 or 3 per cent on the volume of all loans in the United States, amounting to many billions, it will result in an increased charge on the cost of living of between one and two billion dollars.

I am opposed to the Federal reserve banks being administered merely as a bank president or a cashier would administer this system; that is, from the standpoint of profit alone.

I fully agree that when the New York Stock Exchange raises the rate to 20 and 30 per cent and the Federal Reserve Board raises its rate to 6 per cent and 7 per cent and the member banks raise their interest rates to 8 and 10 per cent, it does depress and deflate credit in fact; it deflates the credit of the United States; it deflates the value of the Liberty bonds, and the bonds have gone down now in some cases as much as 15 per cent. There has been a loss to the bondholders of this country on those Liberty bonds and Victory bonds to the

amount of nearly \$3,000,000,000, and I object to it. I earnestly object to the policy which permits it.

I object also to the Federal reserve banks being administered in such a way that they shall be open to the charge of profiteering. The New York Federal Reserve Bank made 110 per cent last year on a 4 per cent rate. Now, this rate is raised to 6 per cent. They should make on that basis, they will make on that basis, between 160 and 180 per cent, if they transact a like volume of business this year.

I say that that sets a bad example. I say that the Federal reserve banks were not established as money-making banks. I say that the member bank which pays its depositor 2 and 3 and 4 per cent, and loans money out at 5, 6, and 7 per cent, has a margin of approximately 3 per cent on the deposits.

The Federal reserve banks do not pay anything on their deposits, and if they took the same margin of profit that a national or State bank does, they should be content with 3 per cent. It is said that if they loaned the money out at a low rate, they would be overwhelmed with applications. They are overwhelmed with applications anyway, and the reserve banks and member banks should discriminate and give the preference to applications that relate to production and legitimate, useful business, and do so at a fair rate, at a normal 3 per cent rate.

The reserve banks are administered by men of ability, courage, and discretion, and when they pass on applications they should discriminate, and they actually do that very thing.

It is not necessary to put the rate up to keep them from being stampeded. If they are the right men, they can not be induced to make loans that are not justified by the individual facts.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will it disturb the Senator to ask him a question?

Mr. OWEN. Not at all.

Mr. KING. If I understand the Senator correctly, his contention is that there has been perhaps too much loaning for speculative purposes, too much credit. I ask for information, because the Senator is a profound student of this question. How would it be possible to differentiate between the borrowers so as to restrict the loans made by the banks to what might be denominated legitimate, bona fide purposes, in contradistinction to speculative purposes?

Mr. OWEN. Whenever a bank makes a loan, it makes a loan to an individual, who presents himself for the loan, with his collateral, and it is entirely competent for the bank—and every bank actually exercises its power and its own judgment and uses its discretion with regard to every loan—whether it will make it or whether it will not make it. The bank officers know perfectly well, and if they do not know they can ascertain, whether that loan is going to be used for speculative purposes, or whether it is to be used for the normal business of the country, for production, for distribution. So it is, after all, left to the discriminative judgment of the reserve bank, when it deals with a member bank, to know whether the loans are being used for covering excessive speculative loans, which might be deflated, or whether they are being used for the normal business of the country.

When this country needs, above everything else in the world, to stimulate production, the interest rates ought not to be raised. The Bank of England does not raise interest rates upon its productive forces, or its merchants, and the Bank of England, which is the wisest bank in the world, from a merchant's standpoint, is administered by the greatest merchants in the world. The London banks had an established $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent rate on acceptances during the Great War, when the British Empire was paying 5 per cent for loans.

The Bank of England raises the interest at times to attract gold, for the English banks carry very little surplus gold, while we carry the largest in the world.

The United States has \$3,160,000,000 of gold and all the balance of the world has about \$4,600,000,000.

The Entente debt to the United States would consume twice the amount of gold the world has in order to pay it. Our excess commodity exports in a single year would nearly consume the world's gold supply if paid in gold.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I agree substantially with everything the Senator says, and I am in harmony with his statements, so often made here of late, against the determination or policy of the Federal reserve banks to increase their interest rates to the disadvantage of those who are entitled to borrow. But the Senator knows that banks are so eager to make loans if they can go to the Federal reserve and rediscount the paper, that unless something is done either to check rediscount by the Federal reserve banks, or to impose limitations and restrictions upon the banks with respect to the credit which they will extend, this policy will be continued ad infinitum.

Mr. OWEN. The officers of the reserve banks can easily prevent the abuse of those who are too aggressive, for instance.

The practice of the Federal reserve banks is so adjusted as to penalize a particular bank which imposes upon the Federal reserve banks in overdrafts. They arrange the rate on a bank indulging in overdrafts on the Federal reserve bank from a normal rate up to 10 per cent. It is perfectly competent for the reserve bank to defend itself against an improper overdraft on the part of a member bank. It is perfectly easy for the reserve bank to say to a member bank which imposes upon the reserve bank, "I will charge you an individual rate higher than the normal rate." But when a member bank comes to the Federal reserve bank, which has not used its deposits with the reserve bank at all, and asks to borrow a part of its own reserve, the reserve bank ought to be content with a rate such as a member bank earns for itself on a depositor who comes and borrows money from the bank.

I may have money on deposit on time with a member bank, and that is an actual fact. I have money now on deposit with a bank at 4 per cent. That bank charges me 7 for a loan I want temporarily. I think it is quite fair, and I am perfectly willing to pay the 3 per cent. But if I am a bank and I have a deposit with the reserve bank, and I go there and they pay me nothing on my deposits, 3 per cent is a reasonable rate for them to charge me. I will say to the Senator that Belgium had a 3 per cent rate for 50 years without a single break prior to the great World War. They do not pay in Belgium interest on deposits. France had a 3 per cent rate for 50 years before this war. Three per cent United States bonds before the war were above par. American banks only pay 2 and 3 per cent for the loan of deposits. I object to the Federal reserve act being administered in such a way as to encourage high rates of interest and thus tax and depress the productive powers of the American people at this time.

I gladly give the reserve board credit for the highest and best purposes. I do not wish to be understood as criticizing their motive in any way whatever. I am personally very friendly to its members. I am only calling the attention of the country to the fact that there should be no deflation of credit required for productive purposes at this time, when the whole world knows that the most important of all things is increased production. That is what the world wants. The very thing which is necessary to reduce the high cost of living is to increase production; and when you raise the rates to a prohibitive point you are putting a brake upon production; and that is what I strenuously object to.

I object to these artificial high rates on the New York Stock Exchange on call loans. The call loan ought to be at a very low rate, because it is payable on demand, and has behind it abundant security. But these rates have been going from 8 per cent to as high as 30 per cent, and it is advertised in all of the daily papers throughout the United States that the rates are going from 8 per cent to 30 per cent on call.

What is the effect of that? The effect is to make the country think that credit is impossible in New York. It is to make the country think that this country is going into a panic, and there is talk now, all over the country, because of these artificially high rates, that the country is going into an industrial depression. There is no need on earth for this country to go into any industrial depression. The only way the country can be forced into an industrial depression is by these artificial, fluctuating, high rates of interest which put men in jeopardy who are engaged in production.

The Federal reserve banks have over \$2,000,000,000 in gold and a reserve of over 40 per cent. They have an elastic system, and to the extent that credits are actually and positively needed for productive purposes they can supply the credits that are needed to the member banks, and they need not fear to lower the reserves for this purpose.

Moreover, the productive capacity of the United States last year was over \$65,000,000,000, and the investing purchasing power of the people can easily take up in due season the present investment securities now held on speculative loans and clear the banks of such loans. There is therefore no need to refuse loans that are truly for genuine production and distribution or to impose repressive and alarming rates of interest that may break down confidence and invite industrial depression.

This is a matter of ordinary, common, horse sense, and the Senate of the United States and the business men of the Nation ought to take notice of what is going on in regard to this question.

I called attention to these high rates a short time ago and received a report upon it, which is before the Senate. There ought to be passed by this body an act that would stop violent fluctuations of interest on the New York Stock Exchange. The

effect is that the rate goes up to 15 or 20 per cent and draws money to New York from Texas, Iowa, Illinois, and from Kansas. It comes from Kansas City, New Orleans, Dallas, Atlanta, and from St. Louis; it comes from different centers of the country to New York for speculating on Wall Street in the stock market instead of being used by manufacturers and business men.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOWNSEND in the chair). Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. OWEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I rose to ask the Senator if he does not know that money had been taken out of the Kansas City banks and that the farmers of Kansas and the farmers of Oklahoma are now in great need of credit?

Mr. OWEN. Assuredly I know it, and that is what I am objecting to. When you permit high rates, going up to 20 and 30 per cent in New York on call, of course the western banks, and southern banks, for that matter, send their money there to be loaned on call, and remove it from productive processes, and then the banks, seeing the urgent demand, raise the rates to 8 and 10 per cent on legitimate business.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator what effect the usury laws of the States have upon the high rates, as measuring the ability of a member bank in a State where they have a usury law to borrow at all from a Federal reserve bank.

Mr. OWEN. The State laws do undertake to restrict usury, of course. The ordinary rate is 6 per cent. Some States permit contracts to go up to 10 per cent. The banks have an ingenious way of avoiding that when they see fit by buying paper which has already been created, but if the reserve rate is 6 per cent and—

Mr. SIMMONS. That is not exactly what I had in mind. I understood the Senator to say that the reserve banks had now fixed 7 per cent as the loaning rate.

Mr. OWEN. Six and seven per cent. They charge the 7 per cent where the member bank puts up the bonds of the War Finance Corporation as security.

Mr. SIMMONS. And 7 per cent under some other conditions?

Mr. OWEN. Seven per cent under that condition.

Mr. SIMMONS. Suppose a State has a usury law, as my State has, limiting to 6 per cent the rate of interest that may be charged, how can a member bank in that State borrow money from a Federal reserve bank at even 6 per cent?

Mr. OWEN. The penalty is not inflicted on the borrower but on the lender.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand that. The Senator did not catch what I said. In my State a bank is not permitted to charge more than 6 per cent for money that it loans.

Mr. OWEN. The reserve bank is not in the Senator's State.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator does not allow me to finish my question. How could that bank, which could not lend its money at more than 6 per cent, afford to borrow money from the Federal reserve bank and pay 6 per cent for it?

Mr. OWEN. It can not afford to do it. It is a way to stop credit. It is a means of depressing and deflating credit in North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. Exactly. In a State where the rate is limited to 6 or 7 per cent, if the Federal reserve bank rate is fixed at 6 or 7 per cent, then the member banks in that State would practically be precluded from borrowing money from the Federal reserve banks.

Mr. OWEN. To be sure.

Mr. SIMMONS. The banks in that State, as in other States similarly situated, have already borrowed large sums of money from the Federal reserve banks, and the loans are falling due every month. They can not afford to renew the loans, if they have to pay a rate of interest so high, without taking their capital for doing business and paying the cash.

Mr. OWEN. Yes; and, of course, it involves a loss.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me, I have just paid a visit to my home city in North Carolina, and I have discovered that the banks in that section are in great distress because of the fact that they are confronted by usury laws fixing the rate at 6 per cent and the fact that they are being called to pay their loans. That makes it necessary for them to call the loans that they have been making—

Mr. OWEN. Yes; to be sure.

Mr. SIMMONS. Especially large loans that they have been making to agricultural supply men in my State, and I assume that is true pretty generally throughout the Union. There are farm furnishing houses located all about in the agricultural districts. They borrow large sums of money from the banks. They buy their produce and sell it to the farmers on time, to be

paid for in the fall after the crop is harvested. I am told that the situation caused by this high rate of interest, against which the Senator is inveighing, has become so acute that the banks—

Mr. OWEN. It will be worse, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. It has become so acute that the banks are compelled to call upon these supply houses to pay their loans at a season of the year when it is impossible for them to realize upon the securities which they have taken for goods they have sold. That is making a very serious situation, as I happen to know.

Mr. OWEN. It will help to cause an industrial depression. That is what will happen. If that is desirable and Senators wish to see that come about, they may treat the matter with negligence.

Mr. SIMMONS. But worse than that, if the Senator will pardon me, in some sections of the country it will paralyze the efforts of the farmer to produce his crops.

Mr. OWEN. I think it will.

Mr. SIMMONS. Because their supplies will be unavailable for the men with whom they have made their contracts, they will not be able to get the money to buy goods with which to carry on their farming operations.

Mr. OWEN. It will have the effect of causing industrial depression. It will have the effect of breaking the prices of products which now have a high value on the markets, making men hesitate to produce and tending to paralyze business. Some men think this desirable. I do not think so.

But the deflation of unwise credits ought to be directed by a discriminating judgment to the particular credits that ought to be deflated. There is a great volume of credit which you can not deflate. You can not deflate the \$26,000,000,000 of bonds which have been issued by the United States for war purposes. Their market value is being deflated, of course, and the War Finance Corporation under the Treasury Department has been buying up these bonds at a depreciated value. They are selling down to about 15 per cent below par. You can break down the present market value of Government credits by establishing an artificial high rate of interest. You can break down the means of credit for the railroads of the country that require help to finance themselves if you raise an artificially high rate. You can make it more difficult for them, of course, but they will pass it on to the people in freight rates, and so forth.

The banks can take advantage of the urgency of the present demand and raise the rates, if they like, and make more money. But the policy of London, the policy of the Bank of England, is a wise policy. It is a stable, reasonably low rate of interest, so that commerce shall prosper, because when commerce prospers the banks prosper and the country prospers, and when commerce is broken down the banks will have unexpected trouble from some of their most valued customers.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me, it seems to me the purpose which the Federal Reserve Board has could be accomplished in another way that would not work any material harm, by the inauguration of a policy of refusing to loan to a member bank unless satisfactory assurances were given that that member bank would not loan for speculative purposes or for any purpose that was not reasonably effective.

Mr. OWEN. If the Senator will pardon me, that is precisely what I suggested to the Federal Reserve Board, that as far as individual loans were concerned, made for merely speculative purposes, they could be reduced by causing gradual liquidation; second, by refusing to extend new loans for speculative purposes, whether speculations in stock or speculations in real estate or in commodities for hoarding. That policy could be carried out by the member banks of the Federal Reserve System if the reserve banks and the Reserve Board insist upon that policy being pursued. That policy would be harmless, but when the Federal Reserve Board adopts the false policy on the New York Exchange and raises its rates to a higher figure to check speculation and talks about deflating credits without discriminating as to what particular credit is to be deflated, the most mischievous consequences may ensue. In Detroit and in Pittsburgh and in New York now men are talking about industrial depression.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. May I ask the Senator a question? We passed through both branches of Congress an amendment to the present law authorizing the board in their discretion to graduate and progress the rate of interest from a borrowing bank when it shall have passed what they determine to be normal. Is not that along the very line that the Senator is complaining of, that they are raising the rates of interest in order to bring about a deflation which already is reacting throughout the country to the detriment of business in general?

Mr. OWEN. The purpose of the act referred to by the Senator was that where banks were unduly aggressive and were asking more accommodation of the Federal reserve bank than their fair proportion, thereby cutting off other banks from an equitable participation in the lending powers of the reserve bank, they might make this discrimination by automatically raising the rates progressively on the aggressor. I think that a wise and just policy.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I anticipated the danger there which has now become a fact. In order that they might accomplish this, it seemed to them that it was necessary to put this general law into effect, that all banks, when they have gotten above a certain per cent of their capital and surplus, should be subject to this progressive and increased rate of interest. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] and, I take it, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] have suggested that they should have used their discrimination and restricted the loans in those particular cases where it was pernicious or might not be indicated to be for the best interests of the country, but they have applied that rule throughout the entire country when there are banks which should have been encouraged to borrow more than any fixed per cent of their capital and surplus, especially in the agricultural sections, where the bread-and-meat question will be the paramount question for the next two or three years.

Mr. OWEN. My attention is called to "Big profits made by reserve banks," an article in to-day's Evening Star:

SOME BANKERS URGE INTEREST ON THEIR RESERVE.

According to Gov. Harding, of the Federal Reserve Board, the 12 original banks of the system will make about a hundred million dollars gross profits during the fiscal year ending with June 30, an excess of some \$10,000,000 over the net of the previous fiscal period.

These reserve banks were not intended as money-making banks. I have no objection to their making money. I am quite in favor of their making enough to have a substantial reserve; and Congress turned over to them practically 100 per cent as reserve, and in that way showed the good will of Congress to these banks and a desire to strengthen them. I desire them to be strong; but what I am calling attention to is that the administration of the reserve act in such a way as to raise the rate in a sweeping fashion over good and bad alike, over the productive and the unproductive alike, making no discrimination with regard to it, results harmfully by exciting the country into the belief that we are going to the "demolition bow-wows" when we are in no danger whatever of doing anything of the kind if we pursue a sound policy.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. As I understand the argument of the Senator from Oklahoma, this high rate of interest was introduced in the hope of stopping speculation in stocks.

Mr. OWEN. I understand that it was.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. But it seems to have gone further now, and is affecting the commercial and the industrial interests of the country. There ought to be some stop put to it. It has gone too far. They scattered their shot too much. They shot at one class of people and are hitting another class.

Mr. OWEN. They are setting out a fire which they may not be able easily to stop. My purpose is to put some water on it right now.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I think that is right.

Mr. OWEN. I am glad the Senator from Maryland thinks I am right about it. I think other Senators should have an interest in it.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I think the purpose was not what is being done now. It was for the purpose of stopping speculation in stocks, which is all right, but now it is going too far. It is interfering with the progress of our country, with the industrial interests and commercial interests, and they are making the rates on money so high that those needing money for these purposes can not afford to borrow.

Mr. OWEN. I think that is right.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the Senator from Oklahoma will permit me, the suggestion of the Senator in regard to reaching speculations in stocks is right. They advance the rate of interest to stop that, when it is notoriously true that the stock speculator will meet any advance in interest in his speculation in stocks, while the men who are doing a legitimate business can not afford to do it.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Yes; they can not afford to do it.

Mr. OWEN. That is quite right.

I do not wish to take up any more of the time of the Senate. I have written a letter in response to the letter which was printed in the Record, the substance of which I have stated on the floor. I ask, without reading, that it may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,

May 14, 1920.

Hon. W. P. G. HARDING,

Governor Federal Reserve Board, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: I thank you for your letter of May 3, answering my letter of April 27, in which I urged the Federal Reserve Board to lower the interest rates of the reserve banks as a means of helping to restore Liberty bonds to par.

The Secretary of the Treasury and every agency of the Government, including the reserve banks and the member banks, cooperated in a strenuous drive to induce the American people to buy Liberty bonds. The people were told to buy the bonds until it hurt. They sold their property, they borrowed money, they mortgaged their homes to buy these bonds on the assurance of the Secretary of the Treasury that there was no better security, and they had a right to believe that these bonds would be maintained at par. But, my dear Governor, if you permit these high rates of interest, of which I have justly complained, the inevitable consequence will be that these Government bonds must go still lower than they are now instead of reacting to par.

The violent fluctuating high interest rates on the New York Stock Exchange which go from 8 to 30 per cent, advertised throughout the country in every important paper in the land, together with the high interest rates of the Federal reserve banks to member banks at 6 and 7 per cent, and the consequent higher commercial rates daily advertised in the public press of 8, 9, and 10 per cent, not to mention commissions on the side and discounts, are jointly impairing confidence and creating an atmosphere of suspicion, distrust, and widespread talk of pending industrial depression and industrial panic.

I have insisted that the powers of the Government should be exercised through the office of the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal reserve banks, and the Comptroller of the Currency to remove these causes, which, if persisted in, may cause a serious industrial depression and make Liberty bonds go still lower.

The claim of the New York Stock Exchange that these high and violently fluctuating interest rates on call loans are necessary for the purpose of preventing speculation is indefensible, because they do not prevent speculation. The professional operator immediately speculates in a bear market, which inevitably must follow these artificial high interest rates. The speculator can afford to pay high interest rates, but legitimate business can not. Moreover, the employment of bank credits for speculation can be prevented by harmless methods: First, by the banks refusing new loans for speculative purposes; second, by requiring gradual liquidation of old loans employed in speculation; and, third, by raising the margin on speculative loans.

The remedies I suggest are harmless to the general public. The remedy employed of high interest rates on call loans running up to 30 per cent is destructive of public confidence and threatens industrial depression.

When the Reserve Board raises the rate to 6 and 7 per cent it has the effect not of stopping the speculator but of stopping legitimate business, and putting the brakes on manufacture, commerce, agriculture, on production and distribution.

You quite misunderstand the point when you speak of my contention that the Liberty bond market recently fell because the Federal Reserve Board raised the rate of interest, which you think is disproved by the fact that the bonds fell in April, 1919, to 95 before the Federal Reserve Board raised the rate of interest. My contention is that the high rates of interest on the stock exchange, and the high rates charged by member banks on commercial loans based in part on the high rates of the reserve banks, are all factors producing this result, and when the Reserve Board recently raised the rate these bonds went down much lower than they had been before, and they must go lower still if the board persist in this policy. What I contend is that the Federal Reserve Board in raising these rates, and thus adopting the unwise policy of the stock exchange, is depreciating the market value of all securities, including Government bonds.

I understand the Reserve Board desires to deflate credit by raising the rates of interest. Assuredly raising the rates of interest will deflate credits, even the credits of the United States, of which I complain, but I am anxious the Reserve Board shall only deflate those credits that require deflation and not deflate credits of the Government and of legitimate productive business, which ought not to be deflated.

The United States was compelled to expand its credits, and issued \$26,000,000,000 of war bonds. The war resulted in an increase of \$20,000,000,000 of bank deposits, a total increase

of expanded credits of \$46,000,000,000. No substantial part of these credits should be deflated at this time. The only deflation of credit justified is the deflation of credits employed in speculative loans on investment securities, on real estate, and on commodities for hoarding by profiteers.

My dear governor, it seems to me that there is some serious misconception existing in the country with regard to what is inflation and what is not inflation. I am certainly opposed to inflation, but I am strongly in favor of the extension of business, increasing production and improving distribution, by extending credits on a stable low-interest rate.

The expansion of credit for such purposes is justified, but, of course, the expansion of credit beyond the available resources, even for the most important of purposes, is not justified. The Bank of England, conducted by the wisest merchants in the world, has not hesitated to extend credits for productive purposes even when the gold reserve was thereby seriously diminished. As you very well know, they went to a very low gold reserve during the war without ever denying credits to their business men who were engaged in legitimate industry. The London merchants had $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent acceptance rates all during the war, when the British Government paid 5 per cent.

If the people are frightened by the talk of industrial depression, by high interest rates, it has the effect of preventing production and putting the brakes on manufacture and on our entire industrial life.

I do not agree with Secretary Leffingwell that the present depression in Liberty bonds is due to the owners of Liberty bonds spending the bonds recklessly as spendthrifts. People who bought Liberty bonds do not deserve such a classification, although, of course, some individuals out of a very great number are spendthrifts. But the spendthrift quickly parts with his bonds to other people. The spendthrift theory does not explain the terrible depreciation.

If money was cheap and credits were available at low rates, it is perfectly obvious that these bonds would go to par, and just in degree that the banks of the country raise the rates to very high artificial figures to that degree the Liberty bonds and Victory bonds will assuredly fall in market value.

You advise me that the Liberty bonds "can not be brought back to par by artificial methods." They can be depressed by universal high rates of interest artificially fixed by the banks, and that is precisely what has happened and to which I earnestly object.

I do not say that the Federal reserve banks can restore these bonds to par by lending a part of their resources on these bonds at a low figure. What I do say is that the value of these bonds is depressed by the action of the Government in countenancing the scandalous interest rates on the New York Stock Exchange, the unreasonable interest rates by the member banks of the country, and the unfair interest rates by the reserve banks to the member banks.

You very justly say, my dear governor:

"There is a world-wide demand for capital, and the demand for bank credit in this country in agricultural, commercial, and industrial purposes is heavier than has ever been known before; investment demands for new construction, for the maintenance and equipment of railroads, and for the financing of our foreign trade are very great."

Are these just demands to be met by denying the credits, or are they to be repressed by raising the rates to prohibitive points, and thus retard enterprise and production, the employment of labor and capital in creating commodities?

You say the reserve banks would have been "overwhelmed with applications for loans" on Government securities if the reserve banks had continued to offer a low discount rate on paper secured by Government obligation.

I am not advocating the reserve banks lending beyond their resources at any rates or on any securities. I am protesting against the reserve banks setting a bad example to the country by raising the rates of interest on legitimate business engaged in production and distribution. I am objecting, my dear governor, to the Reserve Board taking advantage of this condition and raising these rates merely because the demand is urgent, when the proper function of the Federal reserve bank is to stabilize the interest rate, keep it at a reasonably low figure, and set a wise and just example to the member banks.

The member banks pay from 2 to 4 per cent for deposits and normally let their money out at from 5 to 7 per cent, with a margin of about 3 per cent. The reserve banks pay no interest on deposits, and 3 per cent is a rate high enough to enable them to make all the money they are entitled to make out of the public. On a 4 per cent rate the Federal Reserve Bank of New York last year made 110 per cent, and I suppose on a 6 and 7

per cent rate they will make this year about 160 per cent. This is precisely what I am objecting to. The Federal reserve banks should not be put in the attitude of profiteering or of setting the example of profiteering to member banks. The powers of the Government are not being properly exerted to stop the scandalous rates of interest on the New York Stock Exchange.

I was advised that six months ago the New York banks had nineteen hundred million dollars loaned on investment securities and the commerce of the country was suffering for credit. I believe, with the board, that these credits on investment securities and speculative loans should be diverted, as far as practicable, to productive purposes, but to raise the rates to 6 and 7 per cent upon all banks alike does not accomplish this end. It merely penalizes all business of every kind and character, regardless of whether they are using their credits for speculative or productive purposes.

What I earnestly desire to call to the attention of the board is that credits ought to be extended at a low rate to the extent of the capacity of the reserve banks for productive purposes; that member banks should be urged to do the same thing, and that the powers of the Government should be exerted against the excessive, violently fluctuating rates on the New York Stock Exchange.

Hoping that the suggestions which I have the honor to make may be of some service to the deliberations of the board and to the country, I remain,

Very respectfully, yours, ROBT. L. OWEN.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10378) to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and to provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment inserting section 33.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, after line 13, to insert:

Sec. 34. That paragraph (a) of section 11 of the act entitled "An act to remove certain burdens on the American merchant marine and encourage the American foreign carrying trade, and for other purposes," approved June 26, 1884, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 10. (a) That it shall be, and is hereby, made unlawful in any case to pay any seaman wages in advance of the time when he has actually earned the same, or to pay such advance wages, or to make any order, or note, or other evidence of indebtedness therefor to any other person, or to pay any person, for the shipment of seamen when payment is deducted or to be deducted from a seaman's wages. Any person violating any of the foregoing provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$25 nor more than \$100, and may also be imprisoned for a period of not exceeding six months, at the discretion of the court. The payment of such advance wages or allotment, whether made within or without the United States or territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof, shall in no case except as herein provided absolve the vessel or the master or the owner thereof from the full payment of wages after the same shall have been actually earned, and shall be no defense to a libel suit or action for the recovery of such wages. If any person shall demand or receive, either directly or indirectly, from any seaman or other person seeking employment, as seaman, or from any person on his behalf, any remuneration whatever for providing him with employment, he shall for every such offense be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be imprisoned not more than six months or fined not more than \$500."

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator having this bill in charge what is the necessity now of reenacting legislation dealing with this subject?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will call the Senator's attention to the only change made in the law by this provision. He will note on page 51, in lines 5 and 6, the words:

The payment of such advance wages or allotment—

Here is the change in existing law:

Whether made within or without the United States, or territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof.

The Supreme Court has upheld this section and has also upheld the right of Congress to deal with foreign seamen in our ports. The purpose of the provision is to prevent what is called "crimping" in the securing of seamen. For instance, we prevent by our law advances being made to seamen and sailors in this country. That was simply to prevent the boarding houses or the crimping houses from taking advantage of seamen, as the Senator understands. The purpose of this section is to prevent that as to sailors on ships coming from a foreign port to this country. It is a very common custom in many other countries to require advance payments on wages when seamen ship. Under this provision that practice will be stopped. That is the sole purpose of the proposed change.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 51, after line 18, to insert:

Sec. 35. That the second proviso of the first paragraph of section 13 of the act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States, to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto, and to promote safety at sea," approved March 4, 1915, is amended to read as follows:

"Provided further, That upon examination under rules prescribed by the Department of Commerce as to eyesight, hearing, physical condition, and knowledge of the duties of seamanship, a citizen of the United States found competent may be rated as able seaman after having served on deck 12 months at sea or on the Great Lakes; but seamen examined and rated able seamen under this proviso shall not in any case compose more than one-fourth of the number of able seamen required by this section to be shipped or employed upon any vessel except that any American citizen rated as able seaman under this proviso, who has served one year at sea or on the Great Lakes after securing such rating, shall not be included as composing a part of the one-fourth of such able seamen under this proviso."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, after line 14, to insert:

Sec. 36. That section 20 of such act of March 4, 1915, be, and is, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 20. That any seaman who shall suffer personal injury in the course of his employment may, at his election, maintain an action for damages at law, with the right of trial by jury, and in such action all statutes of the United States modifying or extending the common-law right or remedy in cases of personal injury to railway employees shall apply; and in case of the death of any seaman as a result of any such personal injury the personal representative of such seaman may maintain an action for damages at law with the right of trial by jury, and in such action all statutes of the United States conferring or regulating the right of action for death in the case of railway employees shall be applicable."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, after line 4, to insert:

Sec. 37. That, in the judgment of Congress, articles or provisions in treaties or conventions to which the United States is a party, which restrict the right of the United States to impose discriminating customs duties on imports entering the United States in foreign vessels and in vessels of the United States, and which also restrict the right of the United States to impose discriminatory tonnage dues on foreign vessels and on vessels of the United States entering the United States, should be terminated; and the President is hereby authorized and directed within 90 days after this act becomes law to give notice to the several Governments, respectively, parties to such treaties or conventions that so much thereof as imposes any such restriction on the United States will terminate on the expiration of such periods as may be required for the giving of such notice by the provisions of such treaties or conventions.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that that section may go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, section 37 will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 53, line 21, to change the number of the section from "12" to "38," and, in line 24, after the word "Corporation," to strike out "or other agencies created pursuant to authority of law," so as to make the section read:

Sec. 38. That the power and authority vested in the board by this act, except as herein otherwise provided, may be exercised directly by the board, or by it through the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I offer an amendment, in line 22, after the word "otherwise," to insert the word "exclusively."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Washington, under the provisions of this bill, what becomes of the Emergency Fleet Corporation? Is a consolidation effected between that and the Shipping Board?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; the Emergency Fleet Corporation remains just as it is. It is really the agency of the Shipping Board now, and is continued, so far as may be necessary, in carrying out the provisions of this proposed act.

Mr. KING. Is it to be the instrumentality by which will be effectuated all of the duties and responsibilities which are devolved upon the Shipping Board?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; not at all. It is really the instrumentality of the Shipping Board to handle and dispose of the ships, and so on; but it does not take care of the matter of discrimination or of regulating rates or revising the navigation laws or matters of policy, and so forth. It has nothing to do with such questions as those; but is the agency of the Shipping Board for the purpose of constructing ships, as it has been heretofore, and the agency to carry on dealings with reference to ships and the property of the Shipping Board.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the reason I have propounded the inquiry is that a number of suggestions have been made to me by persons who are more or less familiar with the duties of the Shipping Board and of the Emergency Fleet Corporation to the effect that the duties of both organizations could with propriety be performed by one; that the present arrangement led to more or less of duplication, to the setting up of unnecessary machinery, and they suggested a consolidation under which the Shipping Board should be fully authorized not only to perform the duties now devolved upon it by law, and such as may be devolved upon it under this bill, but as well whatever duties are devolved upon the Emergency Fleet Corporation. I ask the Senator from Washington why, in the formulation of this bill, that suggestion has not been carried into effect?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah knows that in dealing with property and making contracts and matters of similar character a legislative organization such as the Shipping Board has very little flexibility. There is no provision for suing it or that it shall bring suit or anything of that sort, so that in certain aspects the work can be much better done by a corporation. Independently of that, the two organizations are substantially the same, but the Emergency Fleet Corporation was created for the purpose of providing that flexibility, so that individuals could deal with it far better than they could with a purely legislative agency, such as the Shipping Board, which would have to have its powers more particularly defined so far as concerns its dealings with different subjects.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have listened to the observations made by the chairman of the Committee on Commerce—

Mr. JONES of Washington. If the Senator will permit me, I will add merely a word. The original shipping act, as the Senator will remember, was passed before we entered the war, and for the purpose of enabling us to build ships for which some \$50,000,000 were appropriated. Under that act it was provided that the Shipping Board, if it found it necessary to carry out the purposes of the act, could create one or more corporations to do the things necessary to be done. Under that authority it created the Emergency Fleet Corporation. That was the only corporation that was created. That corporation is, as I have said, practically the same as the Shipping Board; that is, the five members of the Shipping Board are trustees of the Emergency Fleet Corporation. I think there are two additional members, but if this bill passes as now framed the members of the Shipping Board will constitute the trustees of the corporation.

The original act also provided that the Shipping Board might create additional corporations or agencies. We have stricken out that authorization, because we thought they ought not to create any additional corporations; that the one now in existence was enough, and we did not think it was wise to disturb the whole organization; but for the reason which I stated a while ago, that a person can deal much more flexibly with a corporation in matters of contract and with reference to obligations than he can with a legislative agency such as the Shipping Board, we did not make any change in the status of the Emergency Fleet Corporation.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator will remember that during the war there was some complaint that the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation did not cooperate and integrate as they should have done; that there was too much machinery; that the organizations were too widely separated; and that they did not properly function. As to whether or not those criticisms were warranted, I am not prepared to state, but I do believe there was too much machinery, either in the Shipping Board or in the Emergency Fleet Corporation, or in both, and that there is too much machinery now in either one or both of those organizations.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say to the Senator—and I think I know what I am talking about with reference to this phase of the matter, at any rate—that the real difficulty during the early part of the war was that the Shipping Board and the manager, I might say, or the chairman of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, did not work very well together, because the manager of the corporation did not have the authority that the manager of a corporation usually has, and he was hampered, restricted, and limited by the Shipping Board.

Finally, however, the by-laws of the corporation were so amended as to vest the powers of the Emergency Fleet Corporation practically in the manager, who was the chairman, and that enabled the Emergency Fleet Corporation then to go ahead and do the business that it was really intended to do. That was really the difficulty originally.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

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

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Is it not a fact that the Shipping Board created the Emergency Fleet Corporation?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, yes; the Emergency Fleet Corporation is an agency of that organization.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. And in this bill it is provided that they shall do the same thing, is it not?

Mr. JONES of Washington. We do not provide that; we simply leave that as it is now.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It is left as the law was originally written.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. So that the coordination depends upon the discretion with which the board selects those who are to function for it?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, yes.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, at the top of page 54, to insert:

Sec. 39. That if any provision of this act is declared unconstitutional or the application of any provision to certain circumstances be held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provisions to circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 6, to insert:

Sec. 40. That when used in this act, unless the context otherwise requires, the terms "person," "vessel," "documented under the laws of the United States," and "citizen of the United States" shall have the meaning assigned to them by sections 1 and 2 of the "shipping act, 1916," as amended by this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 12, to insert:

Sec. 41. That section 2 of the "shipping act, 1916," is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. That within the meaning of this act no corporation, partnership, or association shall be deemed a citizen of the United States unless all the stock and securities of such corporation, partnership, or association are at all times wholly and bona fide owned by citizens of the United States, and, in the case of a corporation, unless in addition to such requirement, its president and directors are citizens of the United States, and the corporation itself is organized under the laws of the United States, or of a State, Territory, District, or possession thereof.

"A corporation shall not be deemed to be so owned by citizens of the United States (a) if the title to all of its stock and other securities is not vested in such citizens, free from any trust or fiduciary obligation in favor of any person not a citizen of the United States; or (b) if all the voting power in such corporation is not vested in citizens of the United States; or (c) if, through any contract or understanding, it is so arranged that voting power in such corporation may be exercised, directly or indirectly, in behalf of any person who is not a citizen of the United States; or (d) if by any other means whatsoever control of any interest in the corporation is conferred upon or permitted to be exercised by any person who is not a citizen of the United States: *Provided*, That for the purpose of operating vessels exclusively in foreign commerce a corporation, partnership, or association organized and officered as provided in this section shall be deemed a citizen of the United States if at least 75 per cent of its stock and other securities are at all times bona fide owned by citizens of the United States, free from any trust or fiduciary obligation in favor of any person not a citizen of the United States."

Mr. EDGE obtained the floor.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. CALDER. I wish to offer an amendment to this section.

Mr. EDGE. Perhaps the amendment is the same. I was going to offer an amendment, on page 54, line 17, after the word "unless," to insert the words "at least 90 per cent of," which will make the three or four lines beginning on line 15 read:

That within the meaning of this act no corporation, partnership, or association shall be deemed a citizen of the United States unless at least 90 per cent of all the stock and securities of such corporation—

And so forth.

I think it is very indefensible to pass any act providing something that we know perfectly well is impossible of enforcement. When we require 100 per cent of the stock of a shipping corporation to be owned at all times by American citizens, we know perfectly well that we are making innocent violators out of every corporation in the country, or at least we are certainly inviting it. If one share of stock is sold on the exchange—and, of course, in the case of many of these corporations the stock is listed—the result of it would be that you could proceed under this act for violation, and if stock was owned by an American woman who married an alien the same thing would occur.

I feel that if we make the provision 90 per cent we are in every way protecting American interests and we are not passing laws that we know perfectly well are unenforceable.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey if it would not be more

difficult to keep within the 10 per cent than to know that you could not sell any of the stock to persons other than citizens of the United States?

Mr. EDGE. In answer to that question there is unquestionably difficulty in keeping a record of it in any event; but we established a precedent at the present session of Congress in passing the so-called export finance bill, which was discussed on the floor of the Senate by a number of Senators and which presented exactly the same question. We finally decided in the case of that bill that a majority of the stock should be held by American citizens, and also that all the directors and officers should be American citizens. I believe that all the directors and all the officers should be American citizens, but I do not entirely agree with the Senator from South Carolina in his view that it would be as difficult to enforce a 90 per cent restriction as it would to enforce a 100 per cent restriction. If it is a known fact that there is a small leeway, like 10 per cent, I think the average corporation would make every effort to defend that situation. The stock records, of course, are open, and there is a way to do it; but I do not like to ask for 100 per cent when it seems unnecessary as a protection to American interests and is such an invitation for continued violation.

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

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. KING. I invite the Senator's attention to the words on page 55, with a view to inquiring whether they will not call for a modification of his statement.

Mr. EDGE. I am going to offer an amendment to subdivision (a) that would call for the same modification, as I understand.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, in line 13 there is a provision reading as follows:

Provided, That for the purpose of operating vessels exclusively in foreign commerce a corporation, partnership, or association organized and officered as provided in this section shall be deemed a citizen of the United States if at least 75 per cent of its stock and other securities are at all times—

And so forth.

The Senator's complaint was that it limited the ownership to Americans exclusively. As I interpret this, it provides that foreign residents may own at least 25 per cent of the stock of vessels engaged in foreign commerce.

Mr. EDGE. I think that is correct. That, however, is a different classification.

Mr. KING. Then the Senator's criticism would apply only to vessels that are engaged in domestic commerce, coastwise trade?

Mr. EDGE. The answer to the Senator from Utah would seem to me to be this: It is true that the mere fact that in the case of corporations engaged in foreign commerce the bill only exacts 75 per cent—that is, that the stockholders shall total not less than 75 per cent of American citizens—demonstrates that vessels owned by corporations that are organized under American laws, and are doing business abroad, are only required to have 75 per cent American citizenship-owned stock; but vessels doing a coastwise or American business solely are, under the terms of the same section, required to have 100 per cent. I do not see the reason for the difference in the requirement. I think both of them could be well 75 per cent. I am simply making as modest a modification as possible in order to meet the conditions that exist.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, just a word.

I recognize the difficulty of enforcing the law. I think there would be just as much difficulty, however, in enforcing the law as proposed to be amended by the Senator from New Jersey as there would be in enforcing it as it is proposed in the bill.

I want to read just a couple of extracts from a letter from the chairman of the Shipping Board, urging this amendment:

Believing that it is essential that our coasting fleet be wholly owned by American citizens, I respectfully suggest that section 29 of the second committee print be amended—

So as to make it read as we have it in the bill. He says, further:

Unless our coasting fleet be wholly and unequivocally owned by loyal United States citizens, it can not be rated a dependable unit in time of national emergency. Such dependability must always be insured, and this can only be accomplished by making 100 per cent bona fide American ownership the only key to our coasting trade, and in so far as consistent with present conditions, to establish the same requirement for our foreign commerce.

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

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Suppose a case where a foreigner is an heir to an American who owns a certain block of stock in a coastwise boat, and under the laws of distribution that alien received the stock. What becomes of the stock? Is it forfeited? What provisions are there in the bill to penalize the corporation, if it is to be

penalized, for permitting some alien to remain the owner of stock in the corporation?

Mr. JONES of Washington. There are no penalizing provisions. There are no penalizing provisions in the law now and as it has existed ever since we had a Shipping Board. We have made no change in that particular.

Mr. KING. How would the provision be enforced, if there is any enforcement of the provision, restricting the ownership to all Americans?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say that I do not know just how it would be done. I think probably the Shipping Board would make some rules and regulations under which they would seek to control the issuance of stock to aliens, or something of that kind; but there is no penalty.

Mr. KING. It is just a sort of a naked fulmination?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Really, that is about it.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Washington what is the present provision?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The present provision is a controlling interest, and there is no provision about enforcing compliance. This follows the present law.

Mr. EDGE. The controlling interest—which, of course, means the majority of the stock, which has been apparently the policy heretofore—is changed here to a 100 per cent basis. I have never believed in passing a law that we admitted while it was before the Senate could not possibly be enforced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] to the amendment of the committee.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 55, at the end of line 20, it is proposed to insert a semicolon and the following:

And provided further, That a person who resides in the United States, and who has lost the status of a citizen of the United States through marriage, shall be deemed a citizen of the United States for the purpose of determining the citizenship of a corporation, partnership, or association under the provisions of this section.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I see no objection to that amendment, Mr. President.

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

Mr. SMITH of South of Carolina. I ask to have the amendment stated again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will restate the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was restated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the chairman of the committee for a moment. I think there is nothing more difficult to preserve intact than the ownership or the control of a corporation that issues stock. The bill tries to do that, but the section only covers the question of ownership. It provides:

That within the meaning of this act no corporation, partnership, or association shall be deemed a citizen of the United States unless all the stock and securities of such corporation, partnership, or association are at all times wholly and bona fide owned by citizens of the United States.

Under that section the stock might all be owned by citizens of the United States, and all of it might be trusted or assigned to an alien, or to an alien corporation. Indeed, the modern method of transacting the business of corporations frequently results in exactly the thing I have suggested being done.

I therefore suggest to the chairman this amendment: In line 19, after the word "by," insert "and under the control of," so that the clause would read:

Unless all the stock and securities of such corporation, partnership, or association are at all times wholly and bona fide owned by and under the control of citizens of the United States,

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have no objection to that, although I am rather inclined to think that it is covered on the other page. Notice on page 55, line 1:

A corporation shall not be deemed to be so owned by citizens of the United States (a) if the title to all of its stock and other securities is not vested in such citizens, free from any trust or fiduciary obligation in favor of any person not a citizen of the United States; or (b) if all the voting power in such corporation is not vested in citizens of the United States; or (c) if, through any contract or understanding, it is so arranged that voting power—

And so forth.

If that does not cover what the Senator wishes to accomplish, I am perfectly willing to have it amended.

Mr. REED. I had not noticed the section. I am working on the bill piecemeal.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand.

Mr. REED. Nevertheless, I think it would do no harm to put the words in which I suggest.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think not.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if it is not elsewhere covered in the bill, I desire to suggest this amendment, at the bottom of page 54, at the end of line 24:

No issue, sale, hypothecation, or transfer of stock or ownership shall be valid unless recorded with and approved by the Shipping Board.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have no objection to that amendment. I am inclined to think, however, that these corporations, in the transfer of their stock, and so on, would be controlled by the authority under which they are organized. I suppose every State has laws of incorporation, and all these corporations would be organized under the laws of some State. They would control the transfer and disposition of stock. But personally I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. REED. If that rule is to be applied, it might also affect other clauses of the bill. I have no desire to make it hard for these corporations to do business, but I know of no way in the world by which the Shipping Board can determine whether a corporation's stock is really owned by American citizens except that the record of the transfer of the stock should be filed with it, and subject to its approval. If the words I have suggested go in, I think we will have come very near fixing it so that these companies will have to remain American companies.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it seems to me that the amendment is a little too broad. I do not think the board ought to have the authority to prevent a transfer of stock by any American citizen to any other American citizen, or corporation, or association, or partnership, and it appears to me that the Senator's amendment would confer discretionary power on the board, and make it necessary for them to approve of a transfer. I do not think any board ought to be permitted to determine whether or not "A," a bona fide citizen of the United States, may sell his stock in a corporation to some other citizen of the United States.

Mr. REED. I did not have the point in mind which the Senator has suggested. I have no desire to prevent the sale of stock by a citizen of the United States to another citizen, and if the Senator thinks it is too broad, I will offer the amendment in this form—

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. Would not a provision in the bill prohibiting stock exchanges from selling the stock to any one but citizens of the United States be effective?

Mr. REED. That would cover the stock exchange transaction, but as soon as it got into the hands of the purchaser on the stock exchange he might sell it to some one else.

Mr. NELSON. Would it not be a good plan to prohibit the stock exchanges from selling this stock to anybody but citizens of the United States?

Mr. REED. I think the amendment in this form practically accomplishes it. I appreciate the suggestion made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and I will change the form of the amendment so that it shall read:

No issue, sale, hypothecation, or transfer of stock or ownership shall be valid unless recorded with the Shipping Board.

In other words, they must make a record with the Shipping Board.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have no objection to the amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment as modified.

The READING CLERK. On page 54, at the end of line 24, insert:

No issue, sale, hypothecation, or transfer of stock or ownership shall be valid unless recorded with the Shipping Board.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Missouri a question. Has the Senator considered this situation, which I think might arise under his amendment?

The holders of stock can indorse their certificates in blank and hand them over to a foreigner or a foreign corporation to be held in their treasury. In that way really the foreigner controls the concern. Of course, he could not become the equitable owner of the stock until he had finally secured the action of the Shipping Board, but actually it would deprive the

American management of real control, because it would only be voted when the foreigners were of a mind to surrender it. I am not prepared, on the spur of the moment, to suggest whether that is any real danger or not, but it ought to be effectively controlled if it is a danger. I leave it for the conference committee to consider in case the amendment is agreed to in its present form.

Mr. REED. I sought to cover that by the amendment which I have just offered.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I did not hear it read.

Mr. REED. My amendment was to insert in the clause "unless all the stock and securities of such corporation, partnership, or association are at all times wholly and bona fide owned by citizens of the United States," the words "and under the control of," so that it will read "wholly and bona fide owned by and under the control of citizens of the United States."

That may not be broad enough to cover it, but supplemented by this language on the next page in the text of the bill as offered, I think it would:

A corporation shall not be deemed to be so owned by citizens of the United States (a) if the title to all of its stock and other securities is not vested in such citizens, free from any trust or fiduciary obligation in favor of any person not a citizen of the United States.

Perhaps the two together cover it, although I will repeat to the Senator from Connecticut, who has come in since I made the remark, that the control of stock is one of the most difficult things in the world to handle.

Mr. EDGE. Let the amendment to the amendment be read as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state it as modified.

The READING CLERK. On page 54, at the end of line 24, insert:

No issue, sale, hypothecation, or transfer of stock or ownership shall be valid unless recorded with the Shipping Board.

Mr. EDGE. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. EDGE. I am in sympathy with the object the Senator is attempting to attain, but by incorporating the word "valid" into a law would we not in effect raise the question of validity on the ordinary sale of stock? If a company should cease to qualify as being under 100 per cent American control, by using that language would we not really raise the question of the actual validity of the sale of stock?

Mr. REED. I intended to do that. I intended to make it so that one of these corporations which has the benefits of this law could not sell its stock to foreigners.

Mr. EDGE. I do not think the Senator understands my suggestion, if he will permit me. As I understand the section, the moment a company permits one share of stock to go out of the hands of an American owner, it automatically ceases to function under the bill.

Mr. REED. Oh, no.

Mr. EDGE. It ceases to be a company which can operate under the bill; that is certainly correct. Therefore, I make the point, why should we then in any way attempt to raise the question of the validity of the sale, when they automatically go out from under the act anyhow?

Mr. REED. Merely because we will not know whether their stock has gone into the hands of foreigners unless there is some place where they must register the transfer.

Mr. EDGE. I agree with the Senator on that.

Mr. REED. And the only way to compel them to register the transfer is to make a sale invalid until it is so registered. Then the owner of the stock, in order to have his stock of value, it seems to me, would necessarily take it to the board and register it.

Mr. EDGE. I am in entire agreement with the Senator that it should be registered with the Shipping Board. That is the only method. But the word "valid" seems to me to be rather a dangerous word to use.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of my friend from Missouri whether his amendment would in any way interfere with the usual custom of hypothecating stocks with banks for loans? As the Senator knows, one of the easiest methods employed by business men to obtain money is to go to a bank and give the note of the individual or the corporation and pledge the stock of a corporation as collateral security for the obligation. I fancy that the stocks of these corporations may be used for loans. Would the amendment offered by the Senator forbid the acceptance by the banks of an indorsed certificate as collateral for a loan to be made to the owner?

Mr. REED. I think it would compel a registration of the transaction with the Shipping Board. I believe we are forced

to do that, even though it to some extent interferes with the freedom of movement of the stock, because the very thing we are trying to do is to keep this stock from getting into the hands of foreign holders. If you permit it to be hypothecated without a registration of it, it might speedily be hypothecated to some foreign shipping corporation, and in that way the control would pass from us. I know of no way to avoid that without interposing some sort of an obstacle, which we might like to avoid if we could do it, and still keep the corporation securely within the United States.

Mr. KING. I appreciate the point my distinguished friend is making, but it seems to me that it is going to interfere with the usual course of business and make it very difficult at times for individuals to obtain a loan speedily. It occurs to me that a provision might be attached to the bill, or the amendment of the Senator might be so modified as that where notice was given to the Shipping Board that stock had been pledged for a loan, that would accomplish the purpose.

I am in entire sympathy with the position the Senator takes, and his desire to restrict the sale of this stock to foreigners, and yet I believe that his amendment will interfere materially with business operations and prove quite embarrassing to those who own the stock and who will be compelled to utilize it in their business for the purpose of securing loans. However, I shall not object to the amendment offered by the Senator.

I ask the chairman of the committee a question, in view of the statement just made by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] and the acquiescence in that statement by the Senator, although the RECORD does not show his acquiescence. The Senator from New Jersey stated that under the provisions of the bill if one share of stock passed into the hands of an alien, no matter by what process that ownership was obtained, automatically the corporation would cease to be permitted to enjoy the benefits of the bill, even though that transfer were made against the wish of all the rest of the stockholders and of the board of directors of the corporation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the situation would be met by the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, because it is provided by that amendment that the sale, transfer, and so on, shall not be valid until it is recorded with the Shipping Board. So that would prevent a fraudulent passing of a share of stock. The language of the section is that—

A corporation shall not be deemed to be so owned by citizens of the United States (a) if the title to all of its stock and other securities is not vested in such citizens, free from any trust or fiduciary obligation—

And so forth.

Mr. KING. Let me make this inquiry of the Senator: Suppose stock, by devolution upon the death of the owner, passes to some alien as an heir. What occurs then? Does the corporation, pending the settlement of the estate, cease to have the benefits of this act? Is it to be outlawed and penalized?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think it would be under this act.

Mr. KING. It seems to me that that would be unfortunate. Suppose some citizen of the United States dies who owns a share of stock in a corporation, and his son, or daughter, or some other heir, is an alien—

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Let me ask the Senator if that problem can not be met very easily by amendment? The Senator knows that under the laws of some of the States certain kinds of property may not be owned by aliens, and that in the event of the death of an owner and inheritance by an alien a period is fixed by law within which the alien heir must dispose of the ownership of the inherited property.

Mr. KING. I am directing attention to the provision because in legislation heretofore enacted that question received attention, and, as I recall, there was some provision that the stock must be disposed of within a certain time. It does seem to me that it is too severe a penalty to visit upon a corporation to deny it the benefits of this act simply because some man dies and he happens to have a relative who is his heir residing in some other country.

Mr. EDGE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. EDGE. I again draw attention to the fact that it was just to meet such a possible situation, where a corporation, the management, the officers, and directors would be absolutely helpless, that I suggested an amendment to reduce the necessary amount of stock to be owned by American citizens to 90 per cent. That is purely an arbitrary figure, but it is to admit of some little leeway so the law would not be continually violated even innocently.

The benefits of the act, I think, are such that if a corporation were engaged in coastwise trade and its vessels carrying freight and passengers to American ports, as provided under the coastwise laws and this act, would suddenly have their stock pass into the hands of an alien in some way or other, and if anyone desired to start proceedings, they would automatically have to give up their service under a strict interpretation of the act. I do not see any real gain in passing that type of legislation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say to the Senator from Utah and the Senator from New Jersey that their suggestions will be given very careful consideration in conference. If the Senator from Utah can in the meantime frame some provision that will meet the situation, I shall be very glad to have it presented, and the vote can be reconsidered.

Mr. KING. With that understanding, I have no objection to the amendment being agreed to. I shall prepare an amendment during the interim and submit it to the Senator to-morrow.

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

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on agreeing to the committee amendment, inserting section 41 as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. It has been suggested that an amendment be prepared to this section by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] covering the question we have just been discussing. If we agree to the amendment now a further amendment would be precluded.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have just stated that if the Senator from Utah would prepare an amendment covering the provision he would like to have inserted, I would be glad to reconsider the amendment.

Mr. REED. Very well.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 21, to change the number of the section from "13" to "42," and in line 22, after the word "act," to change the date "1919" to "1920," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 42. That this act may be cited as the merchant marine act, 1920.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have one more amendment to present. It is to take care of the hiatus that was suggested by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] with reference to the board. I think it would be well to have that cared for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. Add a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. That the present members of the board shall continue as such until their successors, provided for in this act, shall be appointed and qualified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That completes the amendments of the committee to the bill, except those that were passed over. I shall not ask the Senate to consider the bill further to-day.

RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, May 15, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, May 14, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou Great Creator and Dispenser of every good, our Father in heaven, help us to prove ourselves worthy recipients by conforming our lives to what we know to be right in the eternal fitness of things; conformed by the still small voice and the revelation of the heart of Christ, by His teachings, incomparable character, and sublime death on Calvary; that we may hallow Thy name and grow day by day into the likeness of our Maker. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

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

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. For what?

Mr. GARNER. That the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] may have 20 minutes in which to address the House.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Of course, I like to be accommodating, as the gentleman knows, but I would like to go ahead with the business of the House.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the disposition of the conference report called up by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] asks unanimous consent that immediately following the calling up of the conference report the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] have leave to address the House for 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SELLS. Reserving the right to object, this is pension day in the House, and there are two bills on the calendar which the Committee on Pensions and the Committee on Invalid Pensions expect to call up. Could it not be arranged that the gentleman's speech be deferred until after the consideration of those bills?

Mr. GARNER. There is no danger of the gentleman's bills not being passed.

Mr. SELLS. No; and I do not anticipate that there is any danger that the gentleman will not be permitted to speak.

Mr. GARNER. If we stayed here until we passed the pension bills everybody would go home, and nobody would hear the gentleman from South Carolina. Nobody is going to stay here and consider pension bills, because there is no opposition. So I thought you could defer that matter until the gentleman had made his speech, and then gentlemen could go home and you could pass your pension bills. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER]?

Mr. SELLS. I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

REFERENCE OF BILL.

The SPEAKER. The bill S. 2977, an act to amend section 8 of an act to provide for the sale of desert lands in certain States and Territories, and so forth, is on the House Calendar, and the Chair, without objection, will refer it to the Union Calendar.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Fuller Civil War pension act, and I also wish to incorporate in my remarks the act itself and the instructions to the Pension Bureau.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. OSBORNE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Fuller pension bill and incorporate in the remarks the bill itself. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the New York Times of May 10 headed, "Save the Postal Service."

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

EFFICIENCY OF PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 11927, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] calls up the conference report on the bill H. R. 11927, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11927) to increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Coast Guard through the temporary provision of bonuses or increased compensation.

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

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

The statement was read.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11927) to increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy

and Coast Guard through the temporary provision of bonuses or increased compensation, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

"That, commencing January 1, 1920, commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Public Health Service shall be paid, in addition to all pay and allowances now allowed by law, increases at rates per annum as follows: Colonels in the Army and Marine Corps, captains in the Navy, and assistant surgeons general in the Public Health Service, \$600; lieutenant colonels in the Army and Marine Corps, commanders in the Navy, and senior surgeons in the Public Health Service, \$600; majors in the Army and Marine Corps, lieutenant commanders in the Navy, and surgeons in the Public Health Service, \$840; captains in the Army and Marine Corps, lieutenants in the Navy, and passed assistant surgeons in the Public Health Service, \$720; first lieutenants in the Army and Marine Corps, lieutenants (junior grade), acting assistant surgeons and acting assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, and assistant surgeons in the Public Health Service, \$600; second lieutenants in the Army and Marine Corps, and ensigns in the Navy, \$420: *Provided*, That contract surgeons of the Army serving full time shall receive the pay of a second lieutenant.

"Sec. 2. That the right and benefits prescribed under the act of April 16, 1918, granting commutation of quarters, heat, and light during the present emergency to officers of the Army on duty in the field are hereby continued and made effective until June 30, 1922, and shall apply equally to officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Public Health Service: *Provided*, That such rights and benefits as are prescribed for officers shall apply equally for enlisted men now entitled by regulations to quarters or to commutation therefor.

"Sec. 3. That, commencing January 1, 1920, warrant officers of the Navy shall be paid, in addition to all pay and allowances now allowed by law, an increase at the rate of \$240 per annum.

"Sec. 4. That, commencing January 1, 1920, the pay of all enlisted men of the Army and Marine Corps and of members of the female Nurse Corps of the Army and Navy is hereby increased 20 per centum: *Provided*, That such increase shall not apply to enlisted men whose initial pay, if it has already been permanently increased since April 6, 1917, is now less than \$33 per month.

"Sec. 5. That all noncommissioned officers of the Army of grade of color sergeant and above as fixed by existing Army Regulations and noncommissioned officers of the Marine Corps of corresponding grades shall be entitled to one ration or commutation therefor in addition to that to which they are now entitled. The commutation value shall be determined by the President on July 1 of each fiscal year, and for the current fiscal year the value shall be computed on the basis of 55 cents per ration: *Provided*, That Army field clerks and field clerks Quartermaster Corps, whose total pay and allowances do not exceed \$2,500 per annum, shall be paid an increase at the rate of \$240 per annum: *Provided further*, That such Army field clerks and field clerks Quartermaster Corps, whose total pay and allowances exceed \$2,500 but do not exceed \$2,740 per annum, shall be paid such additional amount as will make their total pay and allowances not to exceed \$2,740 per annum: *Provided further*, That this section shall not be construed to reduce the pay and allowances of any Army field clerk or field clerk Quartermaster Corps.

"Sec. 6. That, commencing January 1, 1920, the following shall be the rate of base pay for each enlisted rating: Chief petty officers with acting appointments, \$99 per month; chief petty officers with permanent appointments and mates, \$126 per month; petty officers, first class, \$84 per month; petty officers, second class, \$72 per month; petty officers, third class, \$60 per month; nonrated men, first class, \$54 per month; nonrated men, second class, \$48 per month; nonrated men, third class, \$33 per month: *Provided*, That the base pay of firemen, first class, shall be \$60 per month; firemen, second class, \$54 per month; firemen, third class, \$48 per month: *Provided further*, That the rate of base pay for each rating in the Naval Academy Band shall be as follows: Second leader, with acting appointment, \$99 per month, with permanent appointment, \$126 per month; drum major, \$84 per month; musicians, first class, \$72 per month; musicians, second class, \$60 per month: *Provided further*, That the base pay of cabin stewards and cabin cooks shall be \$84 per month; wardroom stewards and wardroom cooks, \$72 per month; steerage stewards and steerage cooks, \$72 per month; warrant officers' stewards and warrant officers' cooks, \$60 per month; mess attendants, first class, \$42 per month; mess attendants,

second class, \$36 per month; mess attendants, third class, \$33 per month: *Provided further*, That the retainer pay of those members of the Fleet Naval Reserve who, pursuant to call, shall return to active duty within one month after the approval of this act and shall continue on active duty until the Navy shall have been recruited up to its permanent authorized strength, or until the number in the grade to which they may be assigned is filled, but not beyond June 30, 1922, shall be computed upon the base pay they are receiving when retransferred to inactive duty, plus the additions or increases prescribed in the naval appropriation act approved August 29, 1916, for members of the Fleet Naval Reserve: *Provided further*, That the rates of base pay herein fixed shall not be further increased 10 per cent as authorized by an act approved May 13, 1908, nor by the temporary war increases as authorized by section 15 of the act approved May 22, 1917, as amended by the act approved July 11, 1919.

"Sec. 7. That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion, to readjust the prevailing rates of pay of civilian professors and instructors at the United States Naval Academy: *Provided*, That said readjustment, which shall be effective from January 1, 1920, shall not involve an additional expenditure in excess of \$55,000 for the remainder of the current fiscal year.

"Sec. 8. That commissioned officers, warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted men of the Coast Guard shall receive the same pay, allowances, and increases as now are, herein are, or hereafter may be prescribed for corresponding grades or ratings and length of service in the Navy; and the grades and ratings of warrant officers, chief petty officers, petty officers and other enlisted persons in the Coast Guard shall be the same as in the Navy, in so far as the duties of the Coast Guard may require, with the continuance, in the Coast Guard, of the grade of surfman, whose base pay shall be \$70 per month: *Provided*, That the senior district superintendent, the three district superintendents next in order of seniority, the four district superintendents next below these three in order of seniority, and the junior five district superintendents shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of captain, first lieutenant, second lieutenant, and third lieutenant in the Coast Guard, respectively.

"Sec. 9. That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as granting any back pay or allowances to any officer or enlisted man whose active service shall have terminated subsequent to December 31, 1919, and prior to the approval of this act, unless such officers or enlisted men shall have been recalled to active service or shall have been reenlisted prior to the approval of this act.

"Sec. 10. That any enlisted man or apprentice seaman who shall reenlist in the Navy within one year from the date of his discharge therefrom shall, upon such reenlistment, be entitled to and shall receive the same benefits as are now authorized by law for reenlistment within four months from date of last discharge from the service: *Provided*, That this section shall become inoperative six months after the date of the approval of this act.

"Sec. 11. That in lieu of compensation now prescribed by law, commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall receive the same pay and allowances as now are or hereafter may be prescribed for officers of the Navy with whom they hold relative rank as prescribed in the act of May 22, 1917, entitled 'An act to temporarily increase the commissioned and warrant and enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes,' including longevity; and all laws relating to the retirement of commissioned officers of the Navy shall hereafter apply to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey: *Provided*, That hereafter longevity pay for officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, and Coast and Geodetic Survey shall be based on the total of all service in any or all of said services.

"Sec. 12. That hereafter when any commissioned officer, non-commissioned officer of the grade of color sergeant and above, including any noncommissioned officer of the Marine Corps of corresponding grade, warrant officer, chief petty officer, or petty officer (first class), having a wife or dependent child or children, is ordered to make a permanent change of station, the United States shall furnish transportation in kind from funds appropriated for the transportation of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service to his new station for the wife and dependent child or children: *Provided*, That for persons in the naval service the term 'permanent station,' as used in this section, shall be interpreted to mean a shore station or the home yard of the vessel to which the person concerned may be ordered; and a duly authorized change in home yard or home port of such vessel shall be deemed a change of station: *Provided further*, That if the cost of such transportation exceeds

that for transportation from the old to the new station the excess cost shall be paid to the United States by the officer concerned: *Provided further*, That transportation supplied the wife or dependent child or children of such officer, to or from stations beyond the continental limits of the United States, shall not be other than by Government transport, if such transportation is available: *And provided further*, That the personnel of the Navy shall have the benefit of all existing laws applying to the Army and the Marine Corps for the transportation of household effects.

"Sec. 13. That the provisions of sections 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of this act shall remain effective until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, unless sooner amended or repealed: *Provided*, That the rates of pay prescribed in sections 4 and 6 hereof shall be the rates of pay during the current enlistment of all men in active service on the date of the approval of this act, and for those who enlist, reenlist, or extend their enlistments prior to July 1, 1922, for the term of such enlistment, reenlistment, or extended enlistment: *Provided further*, That the increases provided in this act shall not enter into the computation of the retired pay of officers or enlisted men who may be retired prior to July 1, 1922: *And provided further*, That a special committee, to be composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the Vice President, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall make an investigation and report recommendations to their respective Houses not later than the first Monday in January, 1922, relative to the readjustment of the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the several services herein mentioned.

"Sec. 14. That nothing contained in this act shall operate to reduce the pay or allowances of any officer or enlisted man on the active or retired list: *Provided*, That the allowances and gratuities now authorized by existing law are not changed hereby, except as otherwise specified in this act.

"Sec. 15. That the appropriations 'Pay of the Navy, 1920,' and 'Pay, Marine Corps, 1920,' are hereby made available for any of the expenses authorized by this act, and any part or all of the appropriations 'Provisions, Navy, 1920,' and 'Maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps, 1920,' not required for the objects of expenditure specified in said appropriations, may be transferred to the appropriations 'Pay of the Navy, 1920,' or 'Pay, Marine Corps, 1920,' respectively, as may be required."

And the Senate agree to the same.

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

THOMAS S. BUTLER,
PATRICK H. KELLEY,
FRED A. BRITTEN,
L. P. PADGETT,
D. J. RIORAN,

Managers on the part of the House.

C. S. PAGE,
JOHN WALTER SMITH,
HENRY W. KEYES,
J. W. WADSWORTH, JR.,
GEO. E. CHAMBERLAIN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11927) to increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Coast Guard through the temporary provision of bonuses or increased compensation submit the following statement explaining the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report, namely:

The sections agreed upon in lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment retain practically verbatim all of the provisions of the bill H. R. 11927 as it originally passed the House, and in addition embody many of the features of the Senate amendment in more or less altered form. The bill as agreed upon places all of the military or quasi military services of the Government on a similar basis as regards rates of pay, and provides relief for all of them by way of temporary specific increases in compensation, retroactive to January 1, 1920, and effective until June 30, 1922, with a further provision for an investigation of the entire subject of the pay and allowances of the personnel of these services, looking toward a complete readjustment thereof within the period named.

Section 1 of the bill as agreed upon provides specific increases in the pay of commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, Marine

Corps, and Public Health Service in lieu of the various pay increases for officers proposed in the Senate amendment, as follows:

Army and Marine Corps.	Navy.	Public Health Service.	Increase as carried in bill.
Colonels.....	Captains.....	Assistant surgeons general.....	\$600
Lieutenant colonels.....	Commanders.....	Senior surgeons.....	600
Majors.....	Lieutenant commanders.....	Surgeons.....	840
Captains.....	Lieutenants.....	Passed assistant surgeons.....	720
First lieutenants.....	Lieutenants (j.g.) and acting assistant surgeons.....	Assistant surgeons.....	600
Second lieutenants.....	Ensigns.....		420

A proviso places contract surgeons serving full time on a parity, in pay, with second lieutenants.

Section 2 is substantially the same as section 7 of the Senate amendment; and extends temporarily until June 30, 1922, the benefits prescribed under the act of April 16, 1918, granting commutation of quarters, heat, and light during the war emergency to officers in the field or at sea having dependents.

Section 3 is taken from section 1 of the original bill, H. R. 11927. It relates to the pay of warrant officers of the Navy, and provides for them a specific increase of \$240 per annum.

Section 4 is based on the last clause of section 1 of the Senate amendment, and relates to the pay of enlisted men of the Army and Marine Corps and members of the female Nurse Corps of the Army and Navy. It provides an increase of 20 per cent in the pay of those receiving \$33 per month or more.

Section 5 is taken from section 3 of the Senate amendment. It provides increased compensation, by way of an additional ration or commutation thereof, for the higher grade noncommissioned officers of the Army and Marine Corps, and has the effect of making their total pay fairly equivalent to that of petty officers of the Navy of similar grade. It also contains a provision allowing to Army field clerks and to field clerks Quartermaster Corps, whose total pay and allowances do not exceed \$2,500 per year, a specific increase of \$240 per annum.

Section 6 is the same as section 2 of the original bill, H. R. 11927, with minor changes in phraseology. It provides increased compensation and fixes the scales of pay as well for the enlisted men and petty officers of the Navy.

Section 7 is precisely the same as section 3 of the original bill, H. R. 11927, and relates to the pay of civilian professors and instructors at the United States Naval Academy.

Section 8 is the same as section 4 of the original bill, H. R. 11927, as modified in section 2 of the Senate amendment. It places the officers and men of the Coast Guard on a parity, so far as concerns pay and allowances, with officers and men of corresponding grades or ratings and length of service in the Navy.

Section 9 is substantially the same as section 5 of the original bill, H. R. 11927, and provides that no back pay shall be granted to any person who shall have left the service after December 31, 1919, and prior to approval of this act, unless recalled to active service or reenlisted.

Section 10 is substantially the same as section 6 of the original bill, H. R. 11927. It relates to the payment of an amount equal to four months' pay and extends the benefits of continuous service to discharged naval seamen who reenlist within one year after their discharge. The provision becomes inoperative six months after approval of the act.

Section 11 is substantially the same as section 5 of the Senate amendment. It provides that the commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, a highly technical and specialized service, shall receive the same pay and allowances as are prescribed for officers of the Navy, with whom they hold relative rank, as prescribed in the act of May 22, 1917. It also contains a proviso placing all the services on an equality in the matter of computation of longevity or service pay.

Section 12 is substantially the same as section 6 of the Senate amendment, with some modifications and added provisions. It permits transportation in kind to be furnished for the wife and dependent children of commissioned, noncommissioned, warrant, or petty officers when they are ordered to make a permanent change of station, and provides further that the personnel of the Navy shall have the benefit of existing laws applying to the Army and Marine Corps for the transportation of household effects.

Section 13 is based on section 7 of the original bill, H. R. 11927, with amendments. It provides that the increases in pay

specified in the act shall be effective until June 30, 1922, but shall not enter into the computation of retired pay; and a further proviso relates to the appointment of a joint special committee to investigate and to report to Congress by January, 1922, the question of readjustments in the pay and allowances of the personnel of all the services.

Section 14 is substantially the same as section 9 of the original bill, H. R. 11927, and provides that nothing in the act shall operate to reduce the pay or allowances of any officer or enlisted man.

Section 15 is practically the same as section 8 of the original bill, H. R. 11927. It makes existing naval and Marine Corps appropriations available for the payment of any expenses authorized by the act during the current fiscal year.

On amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill: This amendment in title is agreed to, since it more aptly describes the scope of the legislation as amended and agreed to.

THOMAS S. BUTLER,
PATRICK H. KELLEY,
FRED A. BRITTEN,
L. P. PADGETT,
D. J. RIORDAN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have not any desire to occupy the time of the House unless there is some objection to the report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PADGETT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1923 the American Navy will be superior to the British Navy in first-line battleships by from 26½ to 40 per cent and will be capable of defeating the navies of any three nations combined, excepting Great Britain.

We will have 26.5 per cent more actual dreadnaught tonnage than Great Britain, with tremendous superiority in large guns and more modern ships, and the supremacy of the seas will once more rest with America, provided Congress will immediately enact legislation that will give a living wage for enlisted and commissioned personnel.

With officers and men dissatisfied and disheartened, with skeleton crews, with few ships in full commission, with the desertion of practically 5,000 men during the past six months, the finest and most destructive engines of naval warfare will soon become mere masses of cold steel, of little fighting value, and all because of the niggardly salaries prescribed for men who by law are compelled to stay in the military service or who disregard the shame of a destroyed character record besmirched with the charge of desertion from what ought to be the most noble service in the gift of the Government.

Underpaid officers and men mean unhappy ships, and unhappy ships mean desertions, inefficiency, and a second-class Navy in offensive and defensive warfare, despite superiority in steel tonnage.

The average age of an ensign is 24½ years, yet 21 per cent of the ensigns in the Navy are married.

The average age of lieutenants, junior grade, is 27 years and 48 per cent of them are married.

The average age of lieutenants is 31.7 years, with 68 per cent married.

The average age of lieutenant commander is 37 years, with 83 per cent married.

The average age of commander is 44 years, with 90 per cent married.

The average age of captain is 52 years, with 90 per cent married.

The conference report now before the House provides for the appointment of a committee which will report to Congress on the first Monday of January, 1921, with a complete reclassification of grades and pay for officers and men in all branches of the military service of the Government, and I am in hopes that this committee will see the wisdom of further increases in pay, not only for those men in active service, but for those who have given the best part of their lives to the service and are now on the retired list, either because of old age or because of disability incurred in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, the high cost of living has hit the retired officer and his family just as seriously as it has those in the active service, and just why the suggestion of economy should eliminate the retired patriots from participation in this really emergency measure is something hard to explain and quite unnatural.

I thoroughly approve of the economy which is being practiced by the Republican steering committee of the House, and I have taken much pleasure in assisting in this direction in every way possible, but economy and justice must go hand in hand together, otherwise there will be a serious disruption of governmental affairs which will not be easily remedied and which will incur the displeasure of the country, to the detriment of those whose honesty of purpose may be destroyed by poor judgment, and it is for this reason that I have steadfastly maintained that officers and men whose salaries have not been raised for 13 years should now be dealt with in no parsimonious manner, and that from the highest to the lowest should be made proud of the service which most of them have selected as a life's work.

I will not in all probability be a member of the committee for the reclassification of grades and pay, but I am quite certain that Congress and the people of the country generally do not desire the military service of the Government to be composed of men who must apologize for themselves or for the appearance of their families, and I shall therefore do everything in my power to bring about such increases in their pay as will make for happy ships, as well as happy homes, and until this has been accomplished the American Navy will not be a success.

Mr. Speaker, the Army and Navy are to-day in a very sad way because of disastrous shortage of officers and men, while good, experienced, able men are quitting the services, not because they want to but because they can not exist on the pay the Government allows them.

Young men are refusing to join either branch of the service because the men already in are dissatisfied and dropping out as fast as their enlistments expire.

Men whom the Government trained as specialists, on whom it depends to solve technical problems, men who were destined to spend all their lives in the Army or the Navy, and who with these careers in view were educated at Government expense at West Point and Annapolis, are abandoning their professions because the United States will not give them a living wage.

Retirements, honorable discharges, and desertions are destroying the instruments of national self-defense at a period in the world's history when America has forged to the front as the world's financial, industrial, political, social, and peaceful center.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of the House knows the editorial sentiment of the metropolitan press of the country from San Francisco to New York and from the Canadian line to the Gulf.

In a smashing editorial on October 28 of last year the Chicago Tribune referred to the "pinch-penny policy" of the Government as being destructive of both branches of the military service, as being wasteful, dishonest, parsimonious, and without justice toward men who spend their lives in the maintenance of our defense, and whom we expect to be the first to lay down their lives for our national honor and safety.

The editorial follows:

PINCH-PENNY POLICY.

Public opinion should give prompt and effective support to the proposals for increasing the pay of Navy and Army officers. An ensign in the Navy or second lieutenant in the Army gets \$1,700 a year. Each has had four years of drastic professional training. A lieutenant, junior grade, Navy, first lieutenant, Army, gets \$2,000. A lieutenant in the Navy, captain in the Army, gets \$2,400. A lieutenant commander, Navy, major, Army, \$3,000. A commander, Navy, lieutenant colonel, Army, \$3,500. A captain, Navy, colonel, Army, \$4,000. Rear admiral or commodore (lower half) Navy, brigadier general, Army, \$6,000. Rear admiral (upper half), Navy, major general, Army, \$8,000. Vice admiral, second in command of fleet, Navy, lieutenant general, Army, \$9,000. Admiral commanding fleet, Navy, general, Army, \$10,000.

Some increases are allowed for years of service. But the above sets forth sufficiently the scale of pay upon which our Government compensates (?) men who are expected to possess exacting professional acquirements and to display in our defense in times of national peril the highest qualities of character.

The policy we follow is the nadir of stupidity. Its inevitable effects are just now especially apparent. We are losing from the service much of the best material brought out by the war. While plumbers and carpenters are having their wages jumped and the cost of living has gone sky-high, many of the most spirited and intelligent of our officers' corps are leaving or planning on leaving the service because the pressure is too great. Those who remain are either those who lack initiative or are unable to make the change for one reason or another, or are able to stay because of private means, or are exceptionally willing to make heavy personal sacrifice to remain in the service of a country which seems to be willing to exploit patriotism.

This is not economy. It is waste. It is not honest. It is parsimony and injustice. We have just had demonstration of what the defense of the Nation means in intelligent effort and sacrifice. We ought to feel now, above all things, our duty to provide decently for the men who spend their lives in the maintenance of our defense, and whom we expect to be the first to lay down their lives for our national honor and safety.

On April 6 of this year the Chicago Tribune, in another characteristic editorial, "Pay for the officers," says that failure to give Army officers a decent remuneration will drive those officers out of the service, and without competent officers the

Army must dwindle to insignificance. The editorial correctly states that Army officers are quitting the service by hundreds because they lack the common necessities of life, and that failure to maintain them properly is a waste of Government energy. It says further, "We are living in the shadow of the greatest war of all times. Shall we throw away our defenses?" The editorial follows:

PAY FOR THE OFFICERS.

That lamentable lack of prescience which sends men into war without arms and information of the dangers to be met with is maneuvering in Congress to increase the pay of naval officers only.

Those who favor increases only for the Navy are our old friends the "springers to arms." They are perfectly well aware that the failure to give the Army officers a decent remuneration will drive those officers out of the service. They are perfectly well aware that without competent officers the Army must dwindle to insignificance. They must be aware that with only a feeble gesture posing as the military strength of a great Nation we shall be in a miserable posture of defense.

Pay the naval officers, who justly are the first line of defense. But pay also the Army officers, who must keep everlastingly on the alert to maintain the framework upon which in times of stress we must construct our civilian armies.

March 21 ought to be a date well fixed in the minds of those who ignore defense. They may take good advice out of reading now of what happened to the British Army on the Somme on March 21, 1918. The British were bold and tenacious. But they lacked skill. The tens of thousands of British who fell before the German advance of March, 1918, ought to remind us that defense is of two parts—preparation and accomplishment.

Skill is the one thing which reposes in the trained minds of the Regular officers. They are quitting the Army by hundreds because they lack common necessities. They have been schooled and trained for the Government defense. The failure to maintain them properly is a waste of Government energy.

This is a dangerous period in international history. Revolt and warfare have not been abolished. We are living in the shadow of the greatest war of all times. Shall we throw away our defenses?

Mr. Speaker, on March 22 of this year the Chicago Herald-Examiner declared its approval of pay increases for the Army and the Navy in a "No pay—no Navy" editorial, and, after calling attention to an 84 per cent increase in the cost of living since the present rate of pay has been in effect, it says, "No wonder the Regular officer patches his own uniform."

This editorial very properly says, "In times of peace a man with brains and executive ability will not go into a service which will not pay him enough to live on. In time of war he will. Then idealism controls." Those are true words, Mr. Speaker. The editorial follows:

NO PAY, NO NAVY.

Something over 1,300 naval officers have either resigned or applied for discharge since the war. The Navy is at present short approximately 40 per cent of the officers and men allowed it by Congress. A destroyer placed in commission this month should have had 8 officers and 120 men. She had 3 officers and 1 man.

The situation in the Army is similar. The present pay bill is of the vintage of 1908. The cost of living has increased in the 12 years about 84 per cent, according to the statistical report presented to Congress. No wonder the Regular officer patches his own uniform!

The Senate bill, known as the Wadsworth-Kelley bill, is a combination of two suggestions, one to increase the pay of enlisted men in the Navy, the other to increase the pay of officers not only in the Navy but also in the Army and allied services, such as the Marine Corps and the Nurses' Corps.

The bill calls for an increase in officers' pay not of 84 per cent but of 30 per cent. The total increase is \$60,000,000. In other words, the chairman of the steering committee prefers saving \$60,000,000 to saving the Navy.

For that is about what it amounts to. A good naval or Army officer takes a heavy responsibility. He has to have brains and executive ability. But in times of peace a man with brains and executive ability will not go into a service which will not pay him enough to live on.

In time of war he will. Then idealism controls.

But anybody who expects a man who can go into the open market and sell his ability for a dollar to take 50 cents and a pat on the back is strangely lacking in common sense. At the present rate of pay, the roster of the Navy will rapidly come to look like a directory of Leadville—lots of names, but nobody there now.

The House should pass the Wadsworth-Kelley bill; and the Representative who does not use his influence with the economical MONDELL to get a chance to pass it is in a fair way to need an extra secretary to explain the matter to his constituents.

On March 22 of this year the Chicago Daily Journal evidenced its feelings for the national defense when it said that thousands would quit the service unless the pay was quickly raised, and its editorial, "Pay for our officers," finishes with "Congress is paltering with the national safety when it holds up the increased pay bill." A very sensible conclusion. The editorial follows:—

PAY FOR OUR OFFICERS.

The American people need an efficient Army. They can get such an Army only by maintaining a sufficient number of properly trained officers. They can find and keep such officers only by paying adequate salaries, and the bill to provide such salaries is now tied up in a jangle between House and Senate.

Officers by thousands have quit the service because they can not live on their present stipend. Other thousands will quit unless the pay is raised, and that quickly. There is nothing mercenary about their attitude. They are willing to take part of their reward in the consciousness of duty done, but they can not care for their families with-

out more pay. Modern industry is eager to get men with a West Point education, and unless their country will provide livable incomes in the Army they will have to heed the industrial call.

Congress is paltering with the national safety when it holds up the increased pay bill.

Under the caption "Inadequate pay in the Navy," Frank J. Sprague says in the New York Evening Post of March 9, 1920, that salaries in practically every walk of life have been increased from 25 per cent to 60 per cent while Naval and Army officers find themselves singled out for distressingly unfair treatment at the hands of Congress and their Government, while being unable to meet their current obligations. He says:

There is a limit to what men with family duties and obligations can stand, despite that Navy spirit which has made the corps unsurpassed. With a knowledge of the conditions in the service and the disheartenment now universally felt by the officers, I know that if that simple measure of justice which in common decency is due them, and which is vital to their efficiency, is not granted, many of them will undoubtedly resign, because they simply can not support their families on their present pay.

With every industry raising its rate of compensation, every marketable product doubled in value, every mechanic demanding and receiving a living wage to meet the increased cost of living, and every college and university raising the pay of its teaching staff from 25 to 60 per cent, until the pay of a professor, with all the advantages of fixed habitation and limited duties, exceeds the pay of the captain of a battleship, officers find themselves singled out for distressingly unfair treatment and simply can not meet their current obligations, many of which are inseparable from and particularly incident to their position and imposed method of living.

If this country wants and intends to have an efficient fighting force it must pay its officers and men, who necessarily suffer many personal and domestic hardships foreign to civilian life, a reasonable and just compensation. If not, it will pay a much heavier amount as the penalty for its niggardly policy.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said in and out of Congress of the so-called propaganda of officers and men in the service to promote a living wage scale, and I am therefore glad to call to the attention of the House an editorial appearing in the Sun and New York Herald of March 30, 1920, "It isn't pernicious 'propaganda' to want to clothe and feed your children," and I will take this occasion to compliment the writer of that editorial on his wisdom.

Practically everything that is done in Congress is done because of the necessity of that particular act, and necessity might well promote activity which, in turn, is labeled "propaganda," when that particular necessity does not meet with the approval of the person in authority.

There is a "propaganda" on right now for increased pay for postal employees all over the country, and no one can successfully contradict the statement that they are the poorest paid employees in the Government service, and that the Postal Service itself is practically demoralized and thoroughly inefficient because of that fact, and yet the commission "sitting" on the reclassification of salaries for that service continues to sit, and sit, and sit, while not only employees but everybody in the country interested in adequate Postal Service is clamoring for just recognition of an existing condition.

It is true that there is not only necessity but unrest in practically every walk of life at the present time, and while industrial managers are meeting the emergency halfway we in Congress are inclined to criticize our underpaid heroes when they suggest salary increases to meet actual living expenses.

The editorial follows:

IT ISN'T PERNICIOUS "PROPAGANDA" TO WANT TO CLOTHE AND FEED YOUR CHILDREN.

In the House of Representatives and in the Senate there are legislators who say officers of the Army and the Navy have been so active in urging increases in pay for themselves and their comrades that their solicitations constitute a propaganda.

Propaganda is hateful, these lawmakers declare, and therefore they are preparing to oppose, or at best not to support, bills to raise soldiers' and sailors' pay.

If there is propaganda by military and naval officers for more pay, it is propaganda which began in the departments when their civilian heads saw the services under their direction falling to pieces as the trained and expert men in them resigned by tens and scores and hundreds because they could not live on their pay.

If there is propaganda for more pay by military and naval officers, it is not propaganda set going and maintained by the expenditure of money to attain a desired end; it is propaganda which began when military and naval officers found themselves not able to pay their bills, not able to buy the clothing their wives and their babies needed, not able to get the food their dependents wanted and ought to have.

If there is propaganda for more pay by military and naval officers, it is not financed and maintained by rich men to enforce a laudable but unpopular reform. It is propaganda which has not the money to put page advertisements in the newspapers or to sow circular letters broadcast. It is propaganda which is maintained by the personal labor of proud men who have been compelled by actual poverty to bare to the world their desperate plight.

When the word propaganda is used the hearer visualizes well-fed, well-clothed, well-paid agents skilled in the arts of persuasion, professionally keen to accomplish their object, but in many cases personally without interest in it and lacking conviction concerning it.

If anybody in Washington or outside of Washington wants to put the label propaganda on the efforts of military and naval officers to get living pay for the work they do, he may do so, but it is not the propa-

ganda of paid press agents, subsidized orators, and deceived sympathizers. It is propaganda, if the word is to be used, of loyal, hard-working, efficient gentlemen who see the national services to which they devote their lives collapsing because the men in them do not get enough money to pay the butcher, the baker, the tailor. It is propaganda, if the word must be used, of men who ask only enough to live on in their country that they may perhaps win the opportunity to die for their country; of men who serve faithfully under any hardships which affect only themselves, but who do not count it part of the duty of a rich nation's servants to clothe their families in rags, to feed their wives and children half rations, and to send their sons and daughters to work when they should be in school.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Tribune of March 27, 1920, printed a letter from a naval officer's wife, in which she said that she intended to use all her influence to compel her husband to resign from the Navy and find some other position which would pay a living wage. I think this letter might reasonably be inserted in the Record as coming, not from one, but from the wives of a thousand naval officers. The letter follows:

FROM A NAVAL OFFICER'S WIFE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TRIBUNE.

SIR: In your paper this morning there is an article pertaining to the failure of the House steering committee to take any decisive action regarding the increase in pay for the officers and men of our military forces.

I am a naval officer's wife and we have two daughters. Since the cost of living has been steadily soaring it's been a mighty difficult task to keep our girls even decently clothed. Having them well dressed is out of the question on our meager income. As for myself, an Easter suit this year would mean one-third of our monthly salary. Now, we must maintain a certain social status and my husband's uniforms must always be immaculate. Under the existing conditions all this makes life "one darn bill after another" and is causing discontent and lack of interest among both the officers and the enlisted men.

Before long, if something is not forthcoming, our Navy will be without officers or men to man the ships. Personally, I surely intend to use all my influence to compel my husband to resign and find some other position which will pay a living wage.

Is it fair that after serving the country all through its crisis their request for an increase in pay should be tossed around like an old glove and finally consigned to the scrap heap?

A NAVAL OFFICER'S WIFE.

In an editorial on Saturday, April 17, of this year, the New York Times requests Congress to "pass the pay bill," and says that if the question of increasing the pay of the officers and men of the Army and Navy were submitted to a country-wide referendum Congress would be directed to send the amended Senate bill to the President; and a little further down the same editorial says there could be no worse economy than denying the rank and file of the Army and Navy adequate pay, enough to live on decently, and driving the brightest and most efficient officers into civil life to the detriment, impairment, and decay of both services. The editorial follows:

PASS THE PAY BILL.

If the question of increasing the pay of the officers and men of the Army and Navy were submitted to a country-wide referendum, Congress would be directed to send the amended Senate bill to the President. To hold otherwise would be to doubt the loyalty of the American people to the first line of defense, the Navy, and to the Regular Army, which won imperishable fame on so many hard-fought fields in France. The Senate bill as amended by the Kelley bill, which provided for increased pay only to the enlisted men of the Navy, would raise the rate for officers and men in both the sea and land forces, including the Marine Corps, for the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service.

There could be no worse "economy" than denying the rank and file of the Army and Navy adequate pay, enough to live on decently, and driving the brightest and most efficient officers into civil life, to the detriment, impairment, and decay of both services. Despairing of obtaining justice from Congress, several hundred officers have relinquished their posts in the Navy, and in the last six months of 1919 there were 4,666 desertions of enlisted men and petty officers. This was the testimony of Rear Admiral Thomas Washington, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, before a Senate Naval Affairs Subcommittee. "Literally thousands of resignations are pending," said Admiral Washington, "not one ship in the Navy is completely manned. Battleships average 70 per cent of their full complement, and some destroyers have as few as two to six men aboard. The Naval Academy can not turn out enough officers in 10 years to fill the gaps. It is an awful showing."

On February 10 Representative CRAGO, of the House Military Affairs Committee, said that since November 11, 1918, more than 2,180 officers had resigned their commissions in the Army, or one out of every five.

"The great depreciation in the purchasing power of the dollar is exerting economic pressure on the Army which is seriously depressing its morale," wrote Secretary Baker on December 23, 1919. There have since been almost four more months of demoralization. Underpay the sea and land forces, deny them a square deal, and the result must be a slackening of discipline, a marked decline in efficiency, which would mean ever-growing insecurity of the country.

The Philadelphia Inquirer on March 26, 1920, editorially says that "Congress is unjust to the Army officers," and that "there is no excuse whatever for holding up the proposed increases of pay in the military and naval services," and says further, that "As a matter of fact, it is not economy but waste, to foster retirement of officers who have been trained for their work at Government expense."

The editorial which I regard as a good one, follows:

UNJUST TO THE ARMY OFFICERS.

There is no excuse whatever for the action of the House steering committee in holding up the proposed increases of pay in the military and naval services. The objection offered is to the increase in the case

of Army officers alone; but the others are halted meanwhile. The unfairness of this is obvious; no plea of economy can justify it. As a matter of fact, it is not economy but waste to force the retirement of officers who have been trained for their work at Government expense.

That the increase in the cost of living has made an increase of pay necessary has been completely demonstrated. Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Public Health Service, Coast and Geodetic Survey—all are in the same boat in this respect. The services of all are vital to the national welfare. Members have made many sacrifices in the past, they have accepted cheerfully lower salaries than their abilities could have commanded in private employment; but there is a limit to their power as well as their willingness to do this. The obligation to support themselves and their families is one they can not escape.

The need of governmental economy is very great. The late Senator Aldrich once named the very large sum which could be saved yearly if the Government were operated on business principles. But the trouble with the congressional method of economizing is that it too often wastes at the tap and saves at the bung hole. It lops off necessary expenditures here and there, but lets extravagance on a large scale go on as usual.

The Washington Times, on March 18, 1920, called attention to the "serious plight of the United States Navy," in the desertions and resignations of petty officers and men, and says, "These petty officers are the instructors and leaders in every department of the ships. They are really the backbone of the service," and a little further down the editorial says, "The dangerous part of the shortage is that it is the skilled men, mostly mechanics who have left the Navy, and that it is now a notoriously known fact that hundreds of costly vessels are without crews, some with just a few men to care for them."

As a final shot at Congress, Bill Price concludes his editorial with "Don't monkey with the Navy, Congress." The editorial follows:

THE SERIOUS PLIGHT OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY.

(By Bill Price.)

The grave situation in the Navy is finally forcing leaders of Congress to the conclusion that if they do not abandon time-killing and niggardly economies the United States may be confronted with a disastrously weakened condition of the fighting force upon which the country mainly depends in the event of foreign aggression or attack.

The trouble is due to the poor compensation paid to officers and men. So many thousands of valuable men have left the Navy that it is now a notoriously known fact that hundreds of costly vessels are without crews, some with just a few men to care for them.

The dangerous part of the shortage is that it is the skilled men, mostly mechanics, who have left the Navy. But even of the ordinary deckhands 70 per cent are boys under 20 years of age. The figures are really alarming. The Navy is to-day over 40,000 skilled men short, and the personnel is being depleted as fast as skilled men can get out and obtain positions paying two or three times as much money.

These petty officers are the instructors and leaders in every department of the ships. They are really the backbone of the service.

And why don't they stay in the Navy? A civilian machinist on shore, often less of an expert than his brother in the Navy, receives at least \$6 per day, with overtime, and his work is done within eight hours.

A chief machinist's mate on shipboard, whose qualifications must be high, who is a minor officer over others, and whose daily work extends over many hours, gets approximately \$2.75 per day for his first enlistment, \$83 per month. After 20 years in the Navy he will get \$99 per month. The most money the highest paid enlisted man can possibly send his family, whom he often fails to see for months at a time, is \$70. Many chief petty officers can not send home over \$40. Do you see why the Navy is being weakened? These men receive far less pay than common laborers.

The Kelley bill, which passed the House in January, carried increased pay for officers and all enlisted men. The Senate has also passed legislation along somewhat different lines. A conference of the two Houses is the necessary step to handle the matter and provide legislation to maintain the efficiency and morale of the Navy. False economy will lose the Government more in one year in deterioration of equipment and personnel than it would have to pay out in two years in increased salaries.

Don't monkey with the Navy, Congress!

Mr. Speaker, when it is generally understood that a Chicago bricklayer, carpenter, plumber, plasterer, steam fitter, or electrician earns as much money per day as the base pay of an officer in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps who has given 15 years of the best period of his life to his chosen profession, I am sure that no one will say that the very small increases carried in the conference report are anything but just and reasonable, while at the same time being much lower than salaries paid in industrial directions where the same intelligence, efficiency, and honesty of purpose are required.

In the determination of pay for officers it should be accepted as a basic principle that every officer should receive a salary which, while insuring the fullest measure of efficient service in his exacting profession, will permit him to marry, bring up and educate a family, aid him in maintaining the official and social position imposed upon him, and inseparable from his status, and leave a reasonable margin for unusual emergency, modest savings, and for safeguarding his family from want by suitable insurance.

In this I know that every Member of Congress will agree with me; and unless we proceed along those lines we can not hope for a Navy that, man for man and ship for ship, can lick anything afloat.

Mr. Speaker, men in all walks of life have several times been granted increased wages and salaries since 1914, to meet the

growing cost of living, but Army and Navy officers have not had even one increase over the pay fixed a dozen years ago.

While I fully appreciate the necessity of a thoroughly efficient and complete enlisted personnel, I also feel that nothing is more important to the Nation's safety than trained officers of a high standard of excellence, morale, and ambitious interests among those whose privilege and duty it is to keep our country safe in an emergency domestic or foreign in nature.

National defense is cheap at any price, yet a peculiar economy of our Government is now imperiling our defense. We have come through the war with a remarkable record of performance in spite of unpreparedness, and now the men who were largely responsible for the rapid and efficient expansion of our national arms are being allowed to drop into civil life because they can not live on the old salaries of the Army and Navy.

Mr. Speaker, it will be a serious matter when none but the sons of the rich can afford to hold commissions in the Army and Navy. This condition has long characterized the diplomatic service, to the great loss of the Nation.

Congress has been quite liberal in providing funds for the construction of a great Navy—soon to be the greatest in all the world—and it can not now be penny-wise in leaving battleships, cruisers, and destroyers with an insufficient quota of men, through unwillingness to pay fair wages; nor should the American officer suffer in his pride over being unable to support his family in a style befitting his station.

With everybody admitting that conditions are such that either salaries must be raised or standards must suffer, I am quite sure that Congress will not find any difficulty in completely justifying the salary increases provided for in the conference report now before the House.

The Atlantic Fleet has just put into New York Harbor after its wipster cruise and target practice off the coast of Cuba, and, although the fleet has been away from our shores for many months, it is a curious as well as a serious fact that very few wives of commissioned officers attached to the fleet met their husbands upon their arrival at New York.

Mr. Speaker, this simple statement tells a sad story. It means that wives and children can not journey to the big city, where hotels are expensive and every form of amusement costs so much; that the pay of the officer simply can not stand the strain, and wife and family are therefore told to stay at home until the head of the house can journey to them at his own expense after he has been given permission by his superior officer to "leave ship" for a few days.

A condition of this kind certainly can not make for efficiency, and is a decidedly unfair deal for officers as well as their families, and one which would not be countenanced for a moment by Members of Congress if it applied to themselves.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, when in the closing days of the last Congress the Republicans of the Senate filibustered to death the appropriation bills, their declared purpose was to force the President to call an extraordinary session of Congress in order that they might commence work upon their program of reconstruction legislation. In response to the call of the President, the Congress convened on May 19, 1919. A year has now passed and Congress, instead of enacting any legislation of a constructive nature, has devoted its time to the prosecution of a series of political investigations which for futility and extravagance are unparalleled in the history of Congress. Congress has not only wasted a year but has wasted more than a million dollars of the money of the people. Through the favor of these committees, many highly paid parasites have fastened themselves on to the pay roll of the Government, and unless the House takes some action March 4 next will find them still drawing their excessive salaries. Some of these committees have not made a report. At least one has never entered upon the specific investigation it was directed to make. The Republican leaders tell us that the Congress is to adjourn in June, and, if this is true, then the House owes it to itself and to the country to require these committees to go to work and complete their investigations before this session ends, so that there may be an end to the indefensibly extravagant expenditures. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Because of this extravagance and because of the methods pursued by these committees, I have introduced a resolution providing for the appointment of a committee to investigate the investigating committees, which, I trust, the steering committee of the Republicans will permit their Committee on Rules to consider.

In justification of the resolution I have introduced, let me call your attention to the fact that more than 50 investigations have been authorized by this Congress covering every activity of the Government during the Democratic administration. The

business of every executive department of the Government has been interfered with. Witnesses have been summoned at the expense of the taxpayers from every section of the country. The Senate has conducted as many, or more, investigations than has the House. What they have cost I do not know and can not comment upon. We do know that from the House contingent fund, as far back as February, 1920, \$150,000 was allotted for House investigations. Of course, this will not begin to cover the expense, and how much more we will be called upon to pay through this fund no one can estimate. This does not include the cost of printing the hearings or of franking the hearings through the mails. In every executive department hundreds of clerks have been employed in preparing data to be furnished upon the request of some of the employees of these committees, and while no accurate statement can be made, every man familiar with the situation will agree that the total expense to the Government of the investigations by the House and Senate will exceed a million dollars.

When we recall that these committees of the House were appointed to investigate the alleged extravagances in the executive departments, it is interesting, but depressing, to examine the statement of their own expenditures, which is contained in the hearings upon the second deficiency appropriation bill, page 1014.

A few instances will justify the adoption of my resolution:

The Committee on Expenditures in the War Department appointed a subcommittee on ordinance, of which Mr. GRAHAM was chairman. The investigating work of this committee has been practically controlled by a man named D. J. Bennett. This man filed an application with the Civil Service Commission in January, 1918, for the departmental service, stating that he would accept a salary of \$1,000 per annum. He was appointed in the War Department and served in the equipment section until November, 1918, when he was transferred to the Quartermaster Corps as a clerk, his salary being \$1,800. He made himself so obnoxious to his superior officials that when, in December, there was a reduction in personnel in that office his name was suggested for transfer to the statistical branch, which branch needed additional employees. Because his reputation had preceded him, that department at first refused to accept him, but finally agreed to give him a trial. His conduct there was such that at the end of a month they sought to transfer him, but two months elapsed before they could find a division that would take him. He was then transferred to the War Claims Board. Prying into papers with which he had no business at all, he would make notations upon them criticizing the judgment and the character of executive officers and inspectors. In some instances these files were sent to the field without knowledge of his notations and caused dissension among officials. He seemingly questioned the honesty of everybody but himself. This trait doubtless suggested his suitability for employment with the investigating committees. At any rate, he tendered his resignation one afternoon and the next morning presented at the office in which he had to that date been employed, credentials as investigator of the congressional investigating committee. He had overnight increased his compensation from the \$1,800 he received in the War Department to \$3,600 and expenses, paid by the committee investigating extravagance in the War Department. Since that time he has had access to every paper in the office of the War Claims Board. A desk is assigned to him and he has the privilege of commanding stenographic and clerical assistance. The official in charge of the War Claims Board told him that if in the settlement of any contract he could find where the Government could save a dollar he would be glad to be advised of it, but as the months have passed he has never once suggested that in any contract a saving could be made. Previous to his work in the department it is said that Mr. Bennett was a tinsmith, and this village tinsmith has been assigned by the House investigating committee to pass upon the settlements made by the War Department in the cancellation of contracts for leather, textiles, copper, and steel, involving millions of dollars. His opinion, based upon his business experience prior to entering the Government service, when he earned a salary of \$75 per month, is presented to us and to the country in reports by the chairman of the investigating committee, Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois.

In the cancellation of leather contracts millions were involved and the department had consulted the best brains in the industry. To investigate such contracts the committee summoned as an expert investigator an employee of the Rock Island Arsenal, located in the district represented by the chairman of the committee, Mr. GRAHAM. The investigator, Mr. C. D. Worley, was employed at the Rock Island Arsenal on a machine sewing leather. For the month of August, 1919, the last month he served there, he received a compensation of \$131.30. This, of course, qualified

him to pass upon the settlement of these contracts involving millions of dollars, and the committee investigating extravagance in the War Department immediately increased his compensation to \$208 a month and expenses. In October, 1919, his expenses were given as \$107.85, and in September as \$92.45. Since that time there is no mention of what became of the investigator, but I trust that he is a grateful man and he will turn up in time for the November election.

The committee on investigation of camps was, of course, seriously handicapped, because the Military Committee, not wishing to be sidetracked in a summary manner, conducted an extensive investigation of all the camps of the country, traveling from State to State at an expense to the taxpayers of \$2,500. But in order to emphasize the importance of its investigation, as compared with that of the Military Committee, the investigating committee has spent about \$25,000 instead of \$2,500. It was not difficult for them to make this expenditure, because you know that it is necessary to employ counsel to investigate camps. They therefore employed a Mr. Chatland, who was formerly employed by the Federal Trade Commission at a salary of \$333.33 per month. The committee investigating the extravagances of the War Department paid him \$1,000 per month. Of course he could not do all the legal work, so in addition to counsel they paid another gentleman for "preparing law brief."

Then there is the Ansell subcommittee. Gen. Ansell was receiving in the Judge Advocate Corps of the War Department a salary of \$4,500 per year, and commutation and heat allowance of \$1,000 when he resigned on July 21, 1919. On the next day he was employed by the committee investigating extravagances in the War Department at a salary of \$20,000 a year and expenses, and was furnished a "secretary," who is receiving a salary at the rate of \$1,500 a year.

Mr. IRELAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I regret I can not, because I have but 20 minutes and I have something else to say.

I refer to it as the Ansell subcommittee because the two Republican members constituting the majority of the committee adopted a resolution authorizing Gen. Ansell to conduct the hearings in the absence of any member of the committee, and the General has doubtless had a splendid time summoning and cross-examining officers of the service with which he was formerly connected. What I do not understand is, if the committee members will not listen to the Ansell hearings, how do they expect anybody else to read them. This committee was charged with the duty of investigating foreign expenditures.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will not, unless the gentleman questions the accuracy of my statement.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I wish to explain that the filibuster was going on on the report of this committee at that time.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman will have lots of explanations to make.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield there? The gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If you contradict the statement of fact that he has not conducted the hearings in your absence and in the absence of every other Member, I will yield. Otherwise I can not.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. During the filibuster on the floor of this House against the report of the main committee—

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Representative Flood, a member of this committee, states that he walked into the room where the hearings were held and saw Gen. Ansell conducting the hearing in the absence of any member of the committee. When he protested, Gen. Ansell stated he was proceeding by direction of the Republican members of the committee. Mr. Flood placed in the record his protest against it, and the chairman promised him it would not occur again, and on a subsequent occasion he went into the room and again found Gen. Ansell conducting the hearings in the absence of any member of the committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This Congress delegated to this committee the power to investigate, and they ought to know that they have not the power to delegate that power to anybody else.

To date I have noticed that they were investigating the court-martial system, the condition of the jails in Paris, the strategy of the Army in continuing to fight on armistice day, and many other interesting subjects, but I fear they will never get down to foreign expenditures before March 4 next.

But this extravagance is not confined entirely to the investigations of the War Department. The committee investigating the Shipping Board, according to the Clerk of the House, has

a clerk and statistician at \$700 per month. Then they have another clerk at \$200 per month. I presume these clerks were needed in order to arrange for the trip the committee made to the Pacific coast in a private car. I am informed that four members made the trip and the party did not exceed eight. They had to pay \$50 a day for the car, and in order to secure it had to buy 25 tickets, or pay fares for 25 persons. The dignity of the House was preserved, but I do not know what effect it had upon the officials of the department whose alleged extravagances were being investigated.

I trust the Members of the House will read the statement furnished by the Clerk of the House, and from it learn the extravagances of these committees. For instance, on page 1017 of the hearings you will find under the expenditures of "subcommittee No. 5, ordinance," the following:

Accountants.	Salaries.	Expenses.
George W. Storck, at \$50:		
Aug. 20, services and expenses, 4 days	\$200.00	\$193.78
Aug. 18, 19, 20, 21, services and expenses, 4 days	200.00	147.79

An expense item of \$193.78 for four days means \$48.44 a day, which, even in these days of high cost of living, is a liberal expense account for a man investigating the extravagances of Army officers who, when away from headquarters, receive no allowance for expenses other than mileage. That the same date, August 20, is included in both items is one of the matters than can doubtless be explained satisfactorily, if the investigation I ask for is ordered.

But, Mr. Speaker, how futile have been these investigations. When the original resolution for the investigation of the War Department was considered, the chairman of the Republican congressional committee stated that the investigation would be made "to secure facts as a groundwork for needed relief legislation in the immediate future." Immediate future! Why, a year has passed, and I challenge you to point to any relief legislation that has been proposed, much less enacted into law. That this was but a hollow pretense and that their true purpose was to endeavor to secure material for the coming campaign was early evidenced by the conduct of the investigations. Oh, how hopeful you were! How you longed for a thief! Surely, you thought, out of all the thousands of Army officers who were engaged in the purchase of supplies there must be some who were guilty of fraud and whose fraud you could charge up to the Democratic administration. In anticipation of the great exposures the Republican national committee assigned to daily attend the hearings, one of the best publicity men in the country. It was his business to prepare the copy to send to the newspaper correspondents revealing the fraud and corruption of the Government of the United States. Copy was sent for a while, but it soon became so patent that the copy was but partisan political propaganda that all reputable newspapers refused to publish it, and the publicity man ceased to attend. This service of the Republican national committee was based on the theory that newspaper correspondents are busy men, have not the time to regularly attend hearings, and if you give them "copy" they will publish it, and in this way you can "put over" poison gas that would not ordinarily be accepted. It is the same policy that actuates the Republican publicity committee, of which ex-Senator Jonathan Bourne is president, and Representative MARTIN MADDEN is treasurer. This committee sends out to the press for publication a series of articles entitled "Uncle Ted's Bedtime Stories." These stories detail imaginary conversations between Uncle Ted and two children, Jack and Ruth, about governmental affairs, and always attack the President of the United States, making false statements as to his official acts. They are so worded that many reputable newspapers carried them for some time before realizing the use to which their columns were being put. I sincerely trust that the gentleman from Illinois confines his activities to the duties of treasurer and is not guilty of impersonating Uncle Ted. Inexcusable as is this method of attack upon the President, it but shows the poverty of the Republican Party, that they no longer can fool grown people, and have to resort to an effort to fool the children and even wait until bedtime, when the children are sleepy, before they attempt to fool them. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

But while the publicity man was at work the committee handed out some remarkable statements. It was an idle day that there was not an intimation of fraud discovered, and at least on one occasion the statement was made that a number of Army officers would be criminally prosecuted. A year has passed and not a single man has been arrested; not a single

warrant has been issued; and not a single case reported to this House that would justify even a Republican politician in charging an official of the War Department with fraud.

Let us not forget those statements. On July 7, 1919, the chairman of the committee unearthed the most heinous of all crimes. He solemnly announced that the Council of National Defense was "a secret government of the United States." He said, "Behind closed doors, weeks and even months before the war, these seven men designed practically every war measure which Congress subsequently enacted. They devised the entire system of purchasing war supplies, planned a press censorship, designed a system of food control and selected Herbert Hoover as its director, and even determined on the daylight-saving scheme." And yet the money of the taxpayers is to-day being spent by other investigation committees to prove that prior to our entrance into the war no steps were taken to prepare for war. Could greater tribute be paid to any administration? Under the act of Congress the Council of Defense is a peace-time agency, not a war agency. Its duty is in time of peace to acquire and collate information which can be made immediately available for war purposes in time of war. How well these appointees of the President performed their duty is evidenced by the fact that the gentleman from Illinois says that every act they proposed was thereafter adopted by Congress, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM], I have no doubt, voted for every one of them.

And while you are engaged in trying to show that the Council of National Defense was unduly active in preparing for war, Admiral Sims charges that as a result of the failure of the Navy Department to follow his advice the Navy is responsible for the loss of 500,000 men and millions of dollars and delayed the ending of the war at least four months. If a citizen of any other country had made such a charge against the Navy of the United States every Member of Congress would have risen in righteous indignation and repudiated this slander of our Navy. But this is campaign year, and because you think that any attack upon the Navy will serve to discredit the administration, you have not raised a single voice in answer to this charge. Well, you may encourage such attacks, but in behalf of the Navy of the United States the Democratic Members of this House, want you and the country to know that our Navy convoyed across the sea, without the loss of a single life in combat, 2,000,000 men, who turned the tide of battle, SHORTENED the war more than four months, and SAVED more than 500,000 lives. [Applause on the Democratic side.] To serve your political purposes you have encouraged a perfectly good admiral to make charges that have destroyed his prestige in the Navy and discredited him in the Nation.

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

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I regret I can not yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I just want to say what I think about the admiral.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. You criticize the Council of National Defense as the secret Government of the United States, but the American people know that within its ranks the council had patriotic citizens at work in every community serving at a sacrifice to themselves, "doing their bit" for their country. In Washington it served as the unit around which was built the great organization of business men who came to the aid of the Government and so marshaled the resources of the country as to make possible the successful conclusion of the war in so short a time. If there was any fraud on the part of a single individual connected with any of these boards, you have had the opportunity and the means to discover it; and when, after a year's investigation, you have failed to report it, it is conclusive evidence that there was no fraud, and it is time for you to cease reflecting upon the character of these business men who so patriotically served their country.

When the armistice came, more than 26,000 contracts for supplies were canceled, and the duty devolved upon the War Department of making settlement with the contractors. In the cases settled to date the Government has paid only 12 per cent of the total amount of the contracts involved. More than 20,000 men have been engaged in one way or another in the investigation and settlements. As they are human, their judgment is not infallible. They may have made mistakes, but the result speaks well for their judgment, and you have not dared to name a single officer who has been guilty of fraud.

The people have so tired of your smelling committees that even stalwart Republican newspapers now fail to publish your reports. You can not blame them. When you charge that the Government paid more for shoes than it did prior to the war,

the American marine says, "Yes; but wearing those shoes we held the Germans at Chateau-Thierry and started them on the return trip to the Fatherland."

When you charge that the Government purchased too much ammunition, the fathers of the boys who saved this Nation answer that no man could tell when the war would end, and you could not purchase too much to make certain the early and successful end of the war.

When you charge that too much was paid for rifles, the doughboy answers that with these rifles they chased the Germans through the Argonne Forest.

When you charge that too much was paid for overcoats, Gen. Goethals tells you that he ordered coats purchased wherever they could be found, and the mothers of America tell you they rejoice that the department did not follow your plan of waiting for "bargain sales," but hastily forwarded coats to protect their boys against the unusually severe winter of 1918.

When you charge that extravagant prices were paid for food, the doughboy again answers that it was good food, and the mothers again rejoice that it did not contain embalmed beef, as in 1898.

Never before has a successful military campaign been investigated as you have attempted to investigate the conduct of the A. E. F. under Pershing. Your subcommittee endeavored to embarrass Gen. Pershing on the day he was leaving France, and he ignored you, as he should have done, advising you that in Washington, where he had sent his files, he would be at your service. Though he has been in this country since September, and in this city the greater part of the time, you have never summoned him. It shows your bad faith. Summon him! Learn from him that which you seem not to know—that WE WON THE WAR. Learn from him also that which is contained in his final report:

In closing this report, Mr. Secretary, I desire to record my deep appreciation of the unqualified support accorded me throughout the war by the President and yourself. My task was simplified by your confidence and wise counsel.

With this testimony as to the cooperation of the President and the Secretary of War with Gen. Pershing in the success of the American Expeditionary Forces, bring your political investigations to a close. We care not what you report, because the American people have long since discovered the political character of your investigations and have discounted in advance any report you may make. No Democrat opposed your making these investigations. We told you that if any officer of the Army or Navy, or any official of an executive department had been guilty of fraud we were as anxious as you to learn of it. But you have had a year in which to investigate. You have discovered no fraud, and you owe it to the taxpayers of America to put an end to your extravagant expenditures before you recess or adjourn. The time has come for you to put up or shut up. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that that can not be done.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Do I understand the Speaker objects to a unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired, and the Chair has not recognized the gentleman to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Does the Chair refuse to entertain a request for unanimous consent to proceed?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman to ask for unanimous consent. The Chair will recognize the gentleman to ask leave to extend his remarks.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, the Chair will find out about it. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think it is fair for gentlemen to ask that the business of the House be set aside for what time they wish, and then use that as leverage for getting more time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is nothing up to-day.

The SPEAKER. There is business pending.

NO QUORUM—CALL OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. No point of order can be made while a point of order is pending. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming moves a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

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

Aswell	Eagle	Kelly, Pa.	Reber
Baer	Edmonds	Kendall	Reed, N. Y.
Bankhead	Ellsworth	Kennedy, Iowa	Rhodes
Bell	Elston	Kennedy, R. I.	Riddick
Blackmon	Emerson	Kettner	Riordan
Blanton	Fairfield	Kiess	Rodenberg
Bowers	Ferris	Kitchin	Rose
Brinson	Fields	Kreider	Rowan
Browne	Focht	Langley	Sanders, Ind.
Brumbaugh	Ganly	Lankford	Schall
Burke	Gard	Lazaro	Scully
Butler	Garrett	Lee, Ga.	Sears
Campbell, Pa.	Goldfogle	Leshere	Shreve
Caraway	Good	McCulloch	Sisson
Carew	Goodall	McFadden	Small
Carss	Goodwin, Ark.	McKinley	Smith, N. Y.
Carter	Gould	McKinley	Smithwick
Casey	Graham, Ill.	McLane	Snell
Clark, Fla.	Graham, Pa.	McPherson	Snyder
Cleary	Griffin	Maher	Steagall
Cole	Hamill	Mason	Stedman
Connally	Harrison	Merritt	Steele
Cooper	Hastings	Moore, Va.	Stephens, Ohio
Copley	Hayden	Morin	Strong, Pa.
Costello	Hefflin	Nolan	Sullivan
Curry, Calif.	Hernandez	O'Connell	Tague
Darrow	Hill	O'Connor	Temple
Dempsey	Houghton	Paige	Tillman
Denison	Huddleston	Parker	Tilson
Dent	Hulings	Phelan	Vare
Dewalt	Husted	Porter	Walters
Donovan	Hutchinson	Radcliffe	Ward
Doolling	Jefferis	Ramsey	Webster
Drane	Johnston, N. Y.	Ramseyer	Wheeler
Drewry	Jones, Pa.	Randall, Calif.	Wood, Ind.
Dunn		Reavis	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and eighty-four Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. No business can be done until further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina rose.

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I rise to ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes in order to complete my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. SELLS rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SELLS] is recognized.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the Speaker permit the gentleman from South Carolina to ask unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. The Chair offered before to recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman from South Carolina is extremely grateful to the Chair for his kindness, and asks unanimous consent for permission to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman from South Carolina will be allowed to remain in the House, will he not, Mr. Speaker? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SELLS] is recognized.

PENSIONS.

Mr. SELLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 14063) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers

and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and I ask that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14063) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. HOWARD. I object.

Mr. SELLS. I move, Mr. Speaker, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 14063.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 14063. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-five gentlemen are present, not a quorum.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio moves a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Aswell	Drewry	Kennedy, Iowa	Reed, N. Y.
Baer	Dunn	Kennedy, R. I.	Rhodes
Bankhead	Eagle	Kettner	Riddick
Blackmon	Edmonds	Kiess	Riordan
Bland, Va.	Ellsworth	Kinkaid	Robinson, N. C.
Blanton	Elston	Kitchin	Rodenberg
Bowers	Emerson	Kreider	Rose
Brinson	Evans, Nev.	Langley	Rowan
Britten	Ferris	Lankford	Sanders, Ind.
Browne	Fields	Lazaro	Schall
Brumbaugh	Fisher	Lee, Ga.	Scully
Burke	Focht	Leshere	Sears
Butler	Fuller, Mass.	McClintic	Shreve
Caldwell	Ganly	McCulloch	Sisson
Campbell, Pa.	Gard	McFadden	Small
Caraway	Garrett	McKinley	Smith, N. Y.
Carew	Goldfogle	McKinley	Smithwick
Carss	Goodwin, Ark.	McLane	Snell
Carter	Gould	McPherson	Snyder
Casey	Graham, Pa.	Maher	Steagall
Clark, Fla.	Griest	Mason	Steele
Clark, Mo.	Griffin	Merritt	Stephens, Ohio
Cleary	Hamill	Montague	Strong, Pa.
Cole	Harrison	Moore, Va.	Sullivan
Cooper	Hastings	Morin	Tague
Copley	Hayden	Nicholls	Taylor, Colo.
Costello	Hefflin	O'Connell	Taylor, Tenn.
Curry, Calif.	Hernandez	O'Connor	Temple
Darrow	Hersey	Paige	Tillman
Davey	Hill	Parker	Tilson
Davis, Tenn.	Houghton	Phelan	Vare
Dempsey	Huddleston	Porter	Vinson
Denison	Hulings	Pou	Walters
Dent	Hull, Iowa	Radcliffe	Ward
Dewalt	Husted	Ramsey	Webster
Donovan	Johnston, N. Y.	Ramseyer	Wheeler
Doolling	Jones, Pa.	Randall, Calif.	Wood, Ind.
Doremus	Kelly, Pa.	Reavis	
Drane	Kendall	Reber	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and seventy-three Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. There are no reports—

The SPEAKER. The doors have not yet been opened. No business is in order.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio moves to dispense with further proceedings under the call. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. IGOE. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. IGOE. I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri demands a division. As many as are in favor of dispensing with further proceedings under the call will answer "aye."

The affirmative vote was taken.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. IGOE. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that is dilatory. The Chair is counting.

Mr. IGOE. The Constitution provides—

The SPEAKER. Within one minute the presence of a quorum has been developed. The Chair is now counting. As many as are opposed to the motion of the gentleman from Ohio will say "no."

The negative vote was taken.

The SPEAKER. On this question the ayes are 101 and the noes are 47.

Mr. IGOE. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I make the point of order that it does not require a quorum to determine that motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. IGOE. Then I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I make the point of order that that is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. IGOE. Then I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that that is dilatory. The Chair thinks that clearly it is dilatory.

Mr. IGOE. Is it not in order to appeal from the decision of the Chair?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Not when it is dilatory.

Mr. IGOE. Can not a gentleman appeal from the decision of the Chair?

The SPEAKER. When the point of order is made that it is dilatory the Chair must pass upon it. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Chair has passed upon it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of dispensing with further proceedings under the call.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Too late.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman has the right to demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LONGWORTH. What is the question, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 225, nays 52, answered "present" 1, not voting 149, as follows:

YEAS—225.

Ackerman	Echols	Johnson, S. Dak.	Murphy
Almon	Elliott	Johnson, Wash.	Nelson, Wis.
Anderson	Esch	Jones, Tex.	Newton, Minn.
Andrews, Md.	Evans, Mont.	Juhl	Newton, Mo.
Andrews, Nebr.	Evans, Nebr.	Kahn	Nolan
Anthony	Evans, Nev.	Kearns	Ogden
Ashbrook	Fairfield	Keller	Olney
Ayres	Fess	King	Osborne
Babka	Fisher	Kinkaid	Padgett
Bacharach	Foster	Klecza	Parker
Barbour	Frear	Knutson	Parrish
Bee	Freeman	Kraus	Pell
Begg	French	Lampert	Peters
Benham	Fuller, Ill.	Lanham	Platt
Benson	Gallagher	Larsen	Porter
Black	Gallivan	Layton	Pou
Bland, Ind.	Gandy	Lee, Calif.	Furnell
Bland, Va.	Gard	Lee, Ga.	Raker
Boles	Garland	Leibach	Randall, Wis.
Box	Garner	Linthicum	Reed, N. Y.
Braud	Godwin, N. C.	Little	Ricketts
Briggs	Goodall	Lonerger	Robison, Ky.
Brinson	Goodwin, Ark.	Longworth	Rogers
Brooks, Ill.	Goodykoontz	Luce	Rowe
Brooks, Pa.	Gould	Lufkin	Rubey
Burdick	Graham, Ill.	Luhning	Sanders, La.
Byrnes, S. C.	Green, Iowa	McAndrews	Scott
Byrnes, Tenn.	Greene, Mass.	McArthur	Sells
Campbell, Kans.	Greene, Vt.	McKenzie	Siegel
Cannon	Hadley	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sinclair
Chindblom	Hamilton	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sinnott
Christopherson	Hardy, Colo.	MacCrate	Smith, Idaho
Classon	Haugen	MacGregor	Smith, Ill.
Crago	Hays	Magee	Smith, Mich.
Cramton	Hersey	Mann, Ill.	Snell
Crisp	Hickey	Mann, S. C.	Stiness
Crowther	Hicks	Mapes	Strong, Kans.
Cullen	Hoch	Martin	Summers, Wash.
Currie, Mich.	Houghton	Mead	Summers, Tex.
Dale	Howard	Michener	Sweet
Dallinger	Hudspeth	Miller	Swope
Davis, Minn.	Hull, Iowa	Minahan, N. J.	Thomas
Davis, Tenn.	Humphreys	Monahan, Wis.	Thompson
Dickinson, Mo.	Hutchinson	Mondell	Timberlake
Dickinson, Iowa	Ireland	Montague	Tincher
Domnick	Jacoway	Moore, Ohio	Tinkham
Doremus	James	Moore, Ind.	Towner
Dowell	Jeffers	Morgan	Treadway
Dunbar	Johnson, Ky.	Mott	Upshaw
Dyer	Johnson, Miss.	Mudd	Vaile

Vestal
Vinson
Voigt
Volstead
Walsh
Ward
Wason

Watkins
Watson
Welling
Whaley
White, Kans.
White, Me.
Wilson, La.

Wilson, Pa.
Wingo
Winslow
Wise
Woods, Va.
Woodward
Wright

Yates
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Tex.
Zihlman

NAYS—52.

Barkley
Eland, Mo.
Booher
Buchanan
Caldwell
Candler
Cantrill
Clark, Mo.
Coady
Collier
Connally
Davey
Doughton

Dupré
Eagan
Hersman
Hoey
Hull, Tenn.
Igoe
Kincheloe
McDuffie
McGlennon
Major
Milligan
Moon
Neely

Rucker
Sabath
Sims
Sisson
Stedman
Stephens, Miss.
Stevenson
Stoll
Taylor, Ark.
Taylor, Colo.
Venable
Weaver
Welty

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Madden

NOT VOTING—149.

Aswell
Baer
Bankhead
Bell
Blackmon
Blanton
Bowers
Britten
Browne
Brumbaugh
Burke
Burroughs
Butler
Campbell, Pa.
Caraway
Carew
Carss
Carter
Casey
Clark, Fla.
Cleary
Cole
Cooper
Copley
Costello
Curry, Calif.
Darrow
Dempsey
Denison
Dent
Dewalt
Donovan
Dooley
Drane
Drewry
Dunn
Eagle
Edmonds

Ellsworth
Elston
Emerson
Ferris
Fields
Flood
Focht
Fordney
Fuller, Mass.
Ganly
Garrett
Glynn
Goldfogle
Good
Graham, Pa.
Griest
Griffin
Hamill
Hardy, Tex.
Harrell
Harrison
Hastings
Hawley
Hayden
Hefflin
Hernandez
Hill
Holland
Huddleston
Hulings
Husted
Johnston, N. Y.
Jones, Pa.
Kelley, Mich.
Kelly, Pa.
Kendall
Kennedy, Iowa
Kennedy, R. I.

Kettner
Kiess
Kitchin
Kreider
Langley
Lankford
Lazaro
Leshner
McClintic
McCulloch
McFadden
McKeown
McKiniry
McKinley
McLane
McPherson
Maber
Mansfield
Mason
Mays
Merritt
Mooney
Moore, Va.
Morin
O'Connell
O'Connor
Paige
Phelan
Radcliffe
Ramsey
Ramseyer
Randall, Calif.
Reavis
Reber
Reed, W. Va.
Rhodes
Riddick
Riordan

Robinson, N. C.
Rodenberg
Rose
Rowan
Sanders, Ind.
Sanders, N. Y.
Sanford
Schall
Scully
Sears
Sherwood
Shreve
Slemp
Small
Smith, N. Y.
Smithwick
Snyder
Steagall
Steele
Steenserson
Stephens, Ohio
Strong, Pa.
Sullivan
Tague
Taylor, Tenn.
Temple
Tillman
Tilson
Vare
Walters
Webster
Wheeler
Williams
Wilson, Ill.
Wood, Ind.

So the motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

Mr. MADDEN (on account of Postal Commission work) with Mr. BELL.

Mr. RHODES with Mr. TILLMAN.

Mr. SNYDER with Mr. CARTER.

Mr. COLE with Mr. HAYDEN.

Mr. HERNANDEZ with Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. COOPER with Mr. CARSS.

Mr. ELSTON with Mr. DRANE.

Mr. BUTLER with Mr. STEELE.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. MOONEY.

Mr. PAIGE with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. TAGUE.

Mr. MASON with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. GOOD with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. KIESS with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. SCHALL with Mr. ASWELL.

Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. KREIDER with Mr. HUDDLESTON.

Mr. SANDERS of New York with Mr. MCKINIRY.

Mr. MORIN with Mr. CLEARY.

Mr. FOCHT with Mr. DEWALT.

Mr. REAVIS with Mr. MCCLINTIC.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana with Mr. HEFLIN.

Mr. HUSTED with Mr. O'CONNELL.

Mr. WHEELER with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina.

Mr. BROWNE with Mr. SCULLY.

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. BLACKMON.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENISON with Mr. MANSFIELD.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio with Mr. BLANTON.

Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. PHELAN.

Mr. WILLIAMS with Mr. KETTNER.

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. LAZARO.
 Mr. TEMPLE with Mr. CARAWAY.
 Mr. EDMONDS with Mr. CASEY.
 Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. GARRETT.
 Mr. KENDALL with Mr. SULLIVAN.
 Mr. VARE with Mr. SMITHWICK.
 Mr. RADCLIFFE with Mr. HARDY of Texas.
 Mr. TILSON with Mr. SHEERWOOD.
 Mr. ROSE with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
 Mr. BOWERS with Mr. SMALL.
 Mr. McCULLOCH with Mr. CAREW.
 Mr. DARROW with Mr. MCKEOWN.
 Mr. WALTERS with Mr. SEARS.
 Mr. HARRELD with Mr. GRIFFIN.
 Mr. BURROUGHS with Mr. LESHNER.
 Mr. DUNN with Mr. FIELDS.
 Mr. REBER with Mr. SMITH of New York.
 Mr. MCPHERSON with Mr. DOOLING.
 Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. GANLY.
 Mr. MERRITT with Mr. STEAGALL.
 Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. DENT.
 Mr. GRIEST with Mr. HAMILL.
 Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. EAGLE.
 Mr. CURRY of California with Mr. DREWRY.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee with Mr. HARRISON.
 Mr. SANFORD with Mr. HOLLAND.
 Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. O'CONNOR.
 Mr. RIDDICK with Mr. MOORE of Virginia.
 Mr. BRITTON with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.
 Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. McLANE.
 Mr. SANDERS of Indiana with Mr. LANKFORD.
 Mr. BURKE with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.
 Mr. SHREVE with Mr. MAYES.
 Mr. HULINGS with Mr. RIORDAN.
 Mr. MCFADDEN with Mr. DONOVAN.
 Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania with Mr. MAHER.
 Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. RANDALL of California.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PENSIONS.

Mr. SELLS. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that the bill H. R. 14063 be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 14063, the pension bill, be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill, H. R. 14063, is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Robert S. Hansbury, late second lieutenant Company L, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William Bogen, late of Company M, Tenth Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William H. Heller, late of Companies E and F, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Francis P. McCue, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Gouldrick, widow of Edward Gouldrick, late of Company B, Twenty-second United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Susan M. Gregory, former widow of John R. Sherry, alias John Fitzgerald, who served in Troop F, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Fountain Tankersley, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Fred C. Swain, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John E. Coleman, late of Captain Sperry's company Umatilla County Guards, Oregon State Militia, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Socrates P. Battle, late of Company D, First Regiment Louisiana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Henry M. Agenbroad, late of Company L, Second Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Sarah M. J. Bertram, widow of Francis Bertram, late of the United States Navy, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month.

The name of Maurice Leahy, late of Battery M, First United States Artillery, and Company G, Fifteenth United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Louisa H. Highley, dependent mother of Robert A. Highley, late of Company M, First Regiment Missouri Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George W. Hook, late of Troop E, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Vint, late of Company H, One hundred and fifty-ninth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Virgil O. Adams, late of Company B, First Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank R. Wall, late of the First Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ewell V. Osborn, late of Company B, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of James P. Burns, late of Battery D, First United States Field Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George W. Mason, late of Troop A, First Regiment Kentucky Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin Hammonds, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel B. W. Stocking, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucius P. Burress, late of Company H, First Regiment North Carolina Infantry, National Guard, Regular Establishment, border defense, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of James W. Noe (insane), late of the One hundred and thirty-seventh Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James Sullivan, late of Company G, Thirty-first Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Seaburn D. Wray, late of Troop M, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Scott Engle, late of the Twenty-second Battalion United States Field Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Carey O. Amsbaugh, late of Company L, Twentieth Regiment Kansas Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Charles W. Ranger, late of Company D, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Tom S. Bailey, late of Company F, Third Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Anna Kennedy, dependent mother of Charles M. N. Stenstrom, late of the United States Marine Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James Philpot, widow of Steve Philpot, late of the Eighty-second Company United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Steve Philpot until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Charles M. Walker, late of Company F, First Regiment Montana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Gustave Pinksohn, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dr. Harris, late of Company M, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James Robinson, late of Company C, Twenty-fourth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James R. Burroughs, late of Company B, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Lawrence P. Williams, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dudley R. Sloan, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jesse Callahan, late of Company M, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Blain Pedago, helpless and dependent child of Robert Pedago, late of Company H, Thirty-first Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, Philippine insurrection, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Robert Strong, late of the Fourth Company United States Coast Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Milton Ross, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John D. Jones, late of Company A, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elmer C. Wilcox, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Marion J. Morgan, widow of Wanfred A. Morgan, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Marianne H. D'Arcy, former widow of Abraham Edmunds, late of Company E, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Henry Lee, late of Company K, Second Regiment Oregon Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Cronin, widow of James Cronin, late of Company A, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Patrick J. Blake, late of the Tenth Company, United States Volunteer Signal Corps, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William Jackson, late of Company I, First Regiment Kentucky Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Mary Hart, widow of the late James Hart, United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said James Hart until they shall reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Margaret Howell Butler, widow of Matthew C. Butler, jr., late lieutenant colonel of Cavalry, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Adam Roth, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of John J. Sharp, late of Company M, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of John M. Williams, late of Troop M, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of John Felsen, late of Company F, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram Colwell, late of Troop M, Twelfth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ellie J. Hays, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Roger I. Wershing (insane), late of Company D, Second Regiment Missouri Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Watson Smith Maher, former widow of Albert D. Smith, late of the United States Navy, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of William C. Phillips, late of Company I, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George W. Robinson, late of Company E, Second Regiment Arkansas Infantry, and Company E, Thirty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Morris E. Leighty, late of Company B, Second United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary E. Frederick, widow of Henry Frederick, late of Troop E, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary Loftain Wildey, widow of Harry Wildey, late of General Service, United States Army, and United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Harry Wildey until he reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Charles J. McCarthy, late of Battery B, Seventh Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clarence E. West, alias Earl West, late of Company M, Forty-ninth Regiment Iowa Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Marguerite B. Fitzgerald, widow of John Fitzgerald, late of Signal Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William H. Troxell, late of Company B, First Battalion Engineers, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles E. Hodges, late of Company F, Third Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Fronie Fisher, dependent mother of Walter Fisher, late of Battery C, Third United States Field Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harry W. Feldman, late of United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William R. Drain, late of Fourth Company, United States Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Pharoah Pack, late private Company E, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, Philippine insurrection, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Martin Quinn, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Mattes, late of Troop G, Sixth United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Jesse Cunningham, late of Troop C, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Floyd H. Wilkins, late of Ninety-fifth Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Grace F. Marx, widow of Adolph Marx, late rear admiral, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Brooklyn Hodges, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment, United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Francis O. Nash, late Acting Assistant Surgeon, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walter E. Crackel, late of Company F, Thirty-third Regiment Michigan Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Esther M. Openshaw, widow of Samuel Openshaw, late of Captain John D. Holliday's Company, Utah Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William Bays, late of Company E, First Regiment Nebraska Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Walter J. Miller, late of Troop E, Fourteenth United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Sewell C. Rose, late of Company H, Second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Milton L. Stover, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Henry Niberding, late of Troop M, First Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Henry Niberding, late of Troop M, First Regiment Maryland Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mildred S. Lewis, widow of Ellwood H. Lewis, late of Battery L, Fifth Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Henry M. Smith, alias Henry Ash, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of James Phelps, late of Company F, Twenty-fifth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles W. Bryant, late of Company D, Second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Emil A. Ackerman, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment Infantry, Ohio National Guard, Regular Establishment (border defense), and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Zora Schenkelberger, dependent mother of Alvin J. Schenkelberger, late of Company H, Seventy-first Regiment New York National Guard Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Rush W. Burnside, late of Company C, Third Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Katherine F. Candee, widow of Ralph Candee, late of Company F, First Regiment Connecticut Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month and \$2 per month additional for the minor child of said Ralph Candee until he reaches the age of 16 years, in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George R. Everhart, late of Companies F and L, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Madora C. Parker, late of Battery M, Second Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of William G. Rowland, late of Company A, First Battalion Oregon Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Albert D. Clark, late of Battery F, First Regiment United States Field Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alvina Sanders, formerly widow of William G. York, late of Company H, Second Battalion, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Christopher Röhrscheid, late an unassigned recruit, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James B. Waters, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Shafer, late of Capt. Foster's Company D, Col. Bee's volunteer battalion, Utah expedition of 1857-58, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Hull Itskin, late of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel H. Rodeheaver, late of Troop M, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charley Salyers, late of Company H, First Regiment United States Infantry, and Company H, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Harlem L. Gorham, late of Company K, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Millie Cislser, dependent mother of John H. Cislser, late of Company B, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Conrad C. Kalber, late of Company A, First Regiment Connecticut Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thomas J. Stevens, late of Company D, Third Regiment Kentucky Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bessie Walsh, widow of Harry F. Walsh, late of Troop H, First Regiment Illinois Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George J. Molloy, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Massachusetts Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Julius A. Nemitz, late captain and regimental quartermaster, Second Regiment Wisconsin Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Nicola Depompa, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Lovett, late of Company B, Third Regiment Mississippi Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Roy C. Murray, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment, and Company I, Eleventh Regiment, United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Flora B. Warren, widow of Louis W. Warren, late of Company H, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Louis W. Warren until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Columbus Brundage, late of Company C, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Shaw, widow of John S. Shaw, late of Battery H, Seventh Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said John S. Shaw until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Augustus O. Hartel, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Dell W. Stinchcomb, late first lieutenant Company A, Seventh Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of May Lace, widow of William Lace, late of Battery K, Fifth United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Palace Douglas, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of August H. Knippenberg, late of Company M, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charley Thomas, late of Company L, Eighth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Marshall F. Truax, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James B. Bristow, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. Bogg, late of Company K, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Willie E. Vaughan, late of Company F, Second Battalion United States Engineers, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Christina Wylie, dependent mother of John L. Wylie, late of Company D, Second Regiment New York Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anton Schwarz, late of band, Fortieth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander Emory, late of Company I, First Regiment Tennessee Infantry, and Company D, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George F. Smith, alias F. G. Kasimir, late of Troop K, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Carrie S. Warner, widow of John F. Warner, late of Battery B, Third United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William A. Morris, late of Company M, Montague County, Tex., Minute Men, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Charles F. Walker, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George W. Fariss, late of Company K, Thirty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary M. Durand, dependent mother of Patrick William Durand, alias William H. Durand, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Katherine M. Flanagan, widow of George H. Flanagan, late of Company E, Second Regiment New York Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said George H. Flanagan until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Knight F. Flanders, late of Company C, First Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Ralph L. Hackett, late of Battery B, First Regiment Maine Heavy Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of John C. Gaskins, late of Company M, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank H. Alspach (insane), late of Company K, Fiftieth Regiment Iowa Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Richard L. McGregor, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Priscilla Eggleston, widow of George A. Eggleston, late of Battery H, First Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said George A. Eggleston until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Ray W. Burdick, late of Company B, Signal Corps United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oren O. Pound, late of Company L, Third Regiment New York National Guard Infantry (border defense), and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of John W. Thompson, late of Company H, Third Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Eliza Brown, dependent mother of Jay A. Brown, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Gass, widow of Charles Gass, late of Troop C, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The names of Paul J. Barr and Roy S. Barr, minor children of John W. Barr, late of the Third Company, United States Coast Artillery, Philippine Insurrection, and pay them a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of the two minor children of the said John W. Barr until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Cornelius Conley, alias Cornelius Connelly, late of Troop B, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anson T. Lazier, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Charles J. S. Arey, late of Company D, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of George W. Keith, late of Troop C, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary Reid, now Nichols, dependent mother of William J. Reid, late of Company I, Twenty-second Regiment Kansas Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Robert C. Ladd, late of Company G, Thirty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Herbert E. Strode, late of Company L, Second Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Luke Monroe, late of Company K, Third Regiment Alabama Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of John S. Jamison, late of Battery M, Fifth Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Foster, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Virginia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abraham M. Reams, late of Company K, Fifty-first Regiment Iowa Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Lena Mauter, widow of Joseph P. Mauter, late of Company E, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan Chittenden, widow of Smith Chittenden, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna Dixon, dependent mother of Charles A. Dixon, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Rose M. Painter, dependent mother of Jesse C. Painter, late of Battery O, Third Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Patrick Kinny, late of Company E, Second Battalion Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Andrew J. Showan, late of Company M, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John F. McNeeley, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Benjamin Phillips, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Cora Booram, widow of Chester Booram, late of the One hundred and sixth Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Chester Booram until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Louisa Cary, former widow of Joseph B. Crowley, late of Company B, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Tony Jud, late of Troop C, Fourteenth Regiment, and Troop D, Fifth Regiment, United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mike Kulas, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Minnesota Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Richard J. Weaver, dependent father of John T. Weaver, late of Company M, First Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Nellie T. O'Neill, widow of Thomas F. O'Neill, late major First Regiment California Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Thomas F. O'Neill until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Edward F. Stewart, late of Company K, Thirty-first Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Morris, late of Troop K, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Frank Risner, late of Company G, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of William Winn, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Leck Patrick, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julia Tomlin, dependent mother of Archie Tomlin, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Missouri Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Simpson Hornaday, late of Troop H, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving, to include special pension of \$10, medal of honor roll.

The name of Joseph E. W. Bergbower, late of the Twenty-eighth Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Rovinsky, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, and Troop B, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Philip Dieter, late of Troop D, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and Company F, Third Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, Civil War, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Huse Walker, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frederick Hattler, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Lynn J. Heldreth, late of the Ninety-fifth Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert A. Herbst, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Henry N. Wilks, late of the Twenty-eighth Battery, United States Field Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James Nolan, Jr., late of Company G, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abbie Davis Morang, widow of Chester A. Morang, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Chester A. Morang until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Charles Augustus Morrison, dependent father of Peter Temple Morrison, late of Company C, Thirty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ewel King, late of Fiftieth Company, United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Baker, late of Company L, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of James M. Vaughn, dependent father of Albert Vaughn, late of Company C, Thirty-eighth United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Elijah Spurlock, late of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Stephen Lytle, late of Troop M, Ninth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harlan R. Hudson, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Louise Niemann, dependent mother of George Niemann, late of Company E, Third Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louise M. McArthur, widow of William G. McArthur, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Henry Puder, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Archie M. Leighton, late of Company C, First Regiment New Hampshire Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Caldwell, insane, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of David M. Bates, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Bose Cox, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Carl L. Setchell, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Minnesota Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Robert H. Foote, late of Company L, Third Regiment Iowa National Guard, border defense, and Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of John H. Clark, late of Company C, Sixty-ninth Regiment New York Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Bert Rich, late of Company M, Thirty-eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary Plum, widow of Emil Plum, late of Troop L, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and that the Commissioner of Pensions be directed to pay the claimant the pension that accrued to the soldier.

The name of Michael F. Fisher, late of Company L, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of George H. Leaycraft, alias George H. Wallace, late of Company L, First Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Betty Lentz, widow of David Lentz, late of Capt. S. B. Stafford's Company C, First Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Virginia H. Welsh, dependent mother of George Welsh, late of Company G, Thirty-second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clanton Jarrett, late of Troop A, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Pace, late of Company M, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of William T. Conway, late of Companies C and L, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Elizabeth F. McCasland, dependent mother of Murray McCasland, alias McCaslin, late of Company K, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alfred J. Hester, late captain of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, National Guard, Regular Establishment, border defense, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of John D. Hoskins, late of Company E, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Henry Mason, late of Company E, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles L. Cook, late of Troop L, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Howard F. Watters, late of Company G, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William S. Starnes, late of Company L, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$55 per month.

The name of Hugh Sizemore, late of Companies C and H, Twenty-third Regiment United States Regular Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John H. Lytle, late of Company E, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of John F. Scott, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Missouri Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James A. Fullen, late of band, Company G, and band, Eleventh and Fourteenth Regiments United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of William H. Hambleton, late of Company M, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mack Hickey, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frederick W. Duden, late of Troop D, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas F. Moore, late of Company A, First Regiment Maine Heavy Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Clark, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Daniel Guthrie, late of Company H, Seventh Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Fannie M. Buchanan, widow of Benjamin F. Buchanan, late of Company H, First Regiment North Carolina Infantry and Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Benjamin F. Buchanan until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Alfred Kirkpatrick, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Griffin, late of Company C, Fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Peter Mariann, late of Company I, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucy C. Strout, dependent mother of Roy L. Strout, late of Company L, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Huff, late of the Twentieth Battery United States Field Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William H. Riffe, late of Company H, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John B. Eakles, late of Company M, Second Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank Bachmeyer, late of Company B, Forty-fifth United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albin D. Schaefer, late chief musician of the Forty-first Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John F. Lindquist, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Louis S. Harris, late of Battery A, Third Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Settles, dependent mother of James Settles, late recruit, unassigned Cavalry, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Salyer, late of the Tenth Company, United States Coast Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Annie Heston, widow of John Heston, late of Company I, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mont Graham, late of the Sixty-first Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary E. Scifres, widow of Levi M. Scifres, late of Companies H and L, Second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Levi M. Scifres until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Harry L. Evans, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Harry Goff, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Willie Lee, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James Baker, late of Companies K and E, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James E. Wilson, late of Company L, Twenty-ninth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Degnan, late of Company K, Thirtieth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Long, widow of Orian C. Long, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Orian C. Long until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Ruth Posey, widow of William C. Posey, late of Capt. Cantrell's company, Georgia Volunteers, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Willingham, widow of William Willingham, late of Company C, Nineteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, Regular Establishment, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Robert Sweeney, late of Company E, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Michael A. Kilrow, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Hall, dependent mother of Cabell B. Hall, late of Troop C, Twelfth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, border defense, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary McJenkins, dependent mother of John E. McJenkins, late of Troop I, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and Company H, Thirty-first United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joshua H. Ervin, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jesse Baird, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emma F. Buchanan, widow of Francis A. Buchanan, late of Capt. Childs's company, South Carolina Mounted Volunteers, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Robert A. Edwards, late of Company F, Third Regiment Tennessee National Guard Infantry, Regular Establishment, border defense, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Thomas Pope, dependent father of William H. Pope, late of Company D, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harrison Roberts, dependent father of Harvey E. Roberts, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of March Agard, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Robert W. McFarland, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Aolia Lauber, widow of George Lauber, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said George Lauber until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Austin R. Flite, late of Companies D and L, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Lynch, late of Companies D and C, Fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Alexandra Mackenzie, widow of Egebert G. Mackenzie, late assistant surgeon, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frederick Dupont, late of Company I, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a

pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Roberts, late of Company I, Thirtieth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John T. Hyder, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Wainscott, late of Lieut. Willingham's Company U, Texas Volunteers, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Garrett D. Bailey, late of Company A, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Anthony D. Mitten, late captain Company M, Ninth Regiment Massachusetts Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Jane Jackson, widow of Allen M. Jackson, late of Troop C, First Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Isabella B. Slayter, widow of John T. H. Slayter, late captain and assistant surgeon, United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John W. Ramey, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Herbert Hill, late of Company G, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John S. Robison, late of Capt. James Williams's Company N, Washington Territory Mounted Volunteers, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James E. Davis, late of Company D, Two hundred and third Regiment New York Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Albert M. Gordon, late of Company E, Second Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Noble, jr., late of Troop A, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Adron Duff, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George S. Nevils, late of Company H, Forty-first Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of William B. Spencer, late of Companies I and C, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ada Johnston Cowles, widow of Walter Cleveland Cowles, late rear admiral, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ward A. Siebenthal, late of Company H, One hundred and fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Infantry, and Company G, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Jasper E. Glascock, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George B. Petteys, late of Company E, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edward Carter, late of Company C, First Regiment Colorado Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Covilla Wise, widow of William Wise, late of Company A, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Noah Lucas, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William Taylor, late of Company D, Third Regiment New York Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Wilbur C. Gabret, late of Company L, Second Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles V. Bradford, insane, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Annie E. Walker, widow of George C. Walker, late of Company L, First Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said George C. Walker until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of John H. Hopewell, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. McClarty, late of Company A, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank L. Johnson, late of Battery H, First Ohio Light Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Long, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ella Fortney, dependent mother of Benton Fortney, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Katherine Mundorff, widow of John Mundorff, late of Company E, First Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said John Mundorff until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Frank Coombs, late of Troop I, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Millie Lawson, widow of Walter Lawson, alias Walker Lawson, late of Company E, Twenty-fifth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Walter Lawson until he reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Frank C. Baylor, late of Company H, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Edward J. Conway, late of Troop G, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank L. Jewell, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ralph Waite, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bettie E. Pearson, widow of Sandy W. Pearson, late of Troop F, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Michael Burger, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Adams, late of Company H, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Agnes L. Ernst, widow of Joseph Ernst, late of Company I, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. Carr, widow of Charles Carr, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional for each of the minor children of said Charles Carr until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Rudolph B. Scheitlin, late of Company F, First Regiment District of Columbia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Edwards, late of the Fifth Battery United States Field Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Jefferson H. Murray, late of Company K, Third Regiment Georgia Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frank H. Bruce, late of the Ninety-fifth Company United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Crosby, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John A. Combs, late of Company B, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Miller, late of Company A, Eighteenth Battalion Kansas Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah McGhee, dependent mother of Oscar McGhee, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles L. Taylor, late quartermaster sergeant, Fourth Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George P. Barker, late major, Sixth Regiment Ohio Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Taylor Hensley, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Sherman E. Jackson, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nora Waters, widow of Michael Waters, jr., late of Company K, First Regiment Missouri Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Michael J. Waters until they reach the age of 16 years, in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Joseph H. Mayo, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Galen Back, late of Company M, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Amelia Skinner, widow of Emmett Skinner, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Peters, widow of James T. Peters, late of Capt. Powell's company, Tennessee Volunteers, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. Mulvey, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis H. McGee, late of Troop G, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Winfield S. Cooper, late of Company A, Second Regiment Mississippi Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Virgil Mahan, late of Company L, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Crowell Lisenby, late of Company G, Third Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Turner, late of the Eighth Company, United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louisa Johnson, widow of Daniel T. Johnson, late of Company G, Thirty-eighth Regiment, United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Georgia A. Godard, dependent mother of Monroe Godard, late of Company K, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Preston Phinney, late of Battery M, Fifth United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Hannah Brodeck, now Barney, dependent mother of David S. Brodeck, late of Troop M, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William M. Miller, late of Battery E, Fifth United States Field Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Tabitha A. Coole, dependent mother of Charles Coole, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Hiram L. Middlebrooks, late of Company H, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of William J. Norton, late of Company E, Third Regiment Connecticut Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of George G. Denning, late of Companies C and D, Thirty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Carrie Bouret, widow of William Bouret, late scout, United States Army, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Anna Burke, dependent mother of John W. Burke, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John G. Pearson, late of Company B, Thirty-fourth Regiment Michigan Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Ubert C. Ricker, late of the Eighth Company, United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Sarah Sipes, dependent mother of Comer E. Sipes, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joseph E. Hayden, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving. This pension being in addition to the \$2 per month claimant is receiving under section 4757, Revised Statutes, United States.

The name of Eva Estes, dependent mother of William R. Estes, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah L. Owen, helpless and dependent daughter of Robert Owen, late of Capt. Johnson Bedel's company, Atchison's Regiment, New York Militia; Capt. Daniel Buel's company, First Regiment (Harris) New York Militia; and in Capt. Andrew Robison's company of riflemen and infantry, Lieut. Col. John Findlay's battalion, Pennsylvania Volunteers, War of 1812, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Stanley S. Stout, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill is in lieu of the following House bills:

H. R. 582. Robert S. Hansbury.	H. R. 7067. Marianne H. D'Arcy.
H. R. 648. William Bogen.	H. R. 7075. Henry Lee.
H. R. 659. William H. Heller.	H. R. 7127. Sarah Cronin.
H. R. 669. Francis P. McCue.	H. R. 7222. Patrick J. Blake.
H. R. 676. Elizabeth Gouldrick.	H. R. 7332. William Jackson.
H. R. 679. Susan M. Gregory.	H. R. 7399. Mary Hart.
H. R. 2407. Fountain Tankersley.	H. R. 7553. Margaret Howell Butler.
H. R. 2410. Fred C. Sawin.	
H. R. 2414. John E. Coleman.	H. R. 7616. Adam Roth.
H. R. 2468. Socrates P. Battle.	H. R. 7832. John J. Sharp.
H. R. 2832. Henry M. Agenbroad.	H. R. 7845. John M. Williams.
H. R. 3062. Sarah M. J. Bertram.	H. R. 7996. John Felzen.
H. R. 3222. Maurice Leahy.	H. R. 7998. Hyram Colwell.
H. R. 3828. Louisa H. Highley.	H. R. 8054. Ellie J. Hays.
H. R. 3996. George W. Hook.	H. R. 8130. Roger J. Wershing.
H. R. 5064. James M. Vint.	H. R. 8274. Mary Watson Smith.
H. R. 5072. Virgil O. Adams.	Maher.
H. R. 5074. Frank R. Wall.	H. R. 8282. William C. Phillips.
H. R. 5202. Ewell V. Osborn.	H. R. 8331. George W. Robinson.
H. R. 5318. James P. Burns.	H. R. 8351. Morris E. Leighty.
H. R. 5356. George W. Mason.	H. R. 8427. Mary E. Frederick.
H. R. 5363. Benjamin Hammonds.	H. R. 8438. Mary Loftain Wildley.
H. R. 5384. Daniel B. W. Stocking.	H. R. 8451. Charles J. McCarthy.
H. R. 5392. Lucius P. Burress.	H. R. 8548. Clarence E. West.
H. R. 5478. James W. Noe.	alias Earl West.
H. R. 5479. James Sullivan.	H. R. 8609. Marguerite B. Fitzgerald.
H. R. 5480. Seaburn D. Wray.	
H. R. 5481. Scott Engle.	H. R. 8629. William H. Troxell.
H. R. 5486. Carey O. Amsbaugh.	H. R. 8706. Charles E. Hodges.
H. R. 5748. Charles W. Ranger.	H. R. 8935. Eronie Fisher.
H. R. 5874. Tom S. Bailey.	H. R. 8972. Harry W. Feldman.
H. R. 5893. Anna Kennedy.	H. R. 8978. William R. Drain.
H. R. 5983. Jane Philpot.	H. R. 8999. Pnaorah Pack.
H. R. 6102. Charles M. Walker.	H. R. 9018. Martin Quinn.
H. R. 6106. Gustave Pinksohn.	H. R. 9015. Thomas Mattes.
H. R. 6115. Doctor Harris.	H. R. 9019. Jesse Cunningham.
H. R. 6130. James Robinson.	H. R. 9043. Floyd H. Wilkins.
H. R. 6318. James R. Burroughs.	H. R. 9185. Grace F. Marx.
H. R. 6455. Lawrence P. Williams.	H. R. 9363. Brooklyn Hodges.
H. R. 6620. Dudley R. Sloan.	H. R. 9402. Francis O. Nash.
H. R. 6724. Jesse Callahan.	H. R. 9425. Walter E. Crackel.
H. R. 6728. Blain Pedago.	H. R. 9428. Esther M. Openshaw.
H. R. 6730. Robert Strong.	H. R. 9436. William Bays.
H. R. 6826. Milton Ross.	H. R. 9454. Walter J. Miller.
H. R. 6890. John D. Jones.	H. R. 9502. Sewell C. Rose.
H. R. 6930. Elmer C. Wilcox.	H. R. 9527. Milton L. Stover.
H. R. 6973. Marion J. Morgan.	H. R. 9689. Henry Niederding.

H. R. 9768. Jacob P. Marling.	H. R. 11940. James Nolan, jr.	H. R. 13016. Noah Lucas.	H. R. 13443. Taylor Hensley.
H. R. 9808. Mildred S. Lewis.	H. R. 11987. Abbie Davis Morang.	H. R. 13017. William Taylor.	H. R. 13445. Sherman E. Jackson.
H. R. 9851. Henry M. Smith,	H. R. 11989. Charles A. Morrison.	H. R. 13037. Wilbur C. Gabret.	H. R. 13448. Nora Waters.
alias Henry Ash.	H. R. 11993. Ewel King.	H. R. 13058. Charles V. Bradford.	H. R. 13455. Joseph H. Mayo.
H. R. 9883. James Phelps.	H. R. 11995. John Baker.	H. R. 13064. Annie E. Walker.	H. R. 13457. Galen Back.
H. R. 9903. Charles W. Bryant.	H. R. 11996. James M. Vaughn.	H. R. 13076. John H. Hopewell.	H. R. 13458. Amelia Skinner.
H. R. 9996. Emil A. Akerman.	H. R. 11999. Elijah Spurlock.	H. R. 13079. William A. McClarty.	H. R. 13463. Elizabeth Peters.
H. R. 10013. Zora Schenkelberger.	H. R. 12000. Stephen Lyttle.	H. R. 13085. Frank L. Johnson.	H. R. 13466. Henry C. Mulvey.
H. R. 10022. Rush W. Burnside.	H. R. 12003. Harlan R. Hudson.	H. R. 13104. John W. Long.	H. R. 13470. Francis H. McGee.
H. R. 10026. Katherine F. Candee.	H. R. 12008. Louise Niemann.	H. R. 13115. Ella Fortney.	H. R. 13472. Winfield S. Cooper.
H. R. 10029. George R. Everhart.	H. R. 12023. Louise M. McArthur.	H. R. 13117. Katherine Mundorff.	H. R. 13473. Virgil Mahan.
H. R. 10053. Maudora C. Parker.	H. R. 12049. Henry Puder.	H. R. 13128. Frank Coombs.	H. R. 13492. Crowell Lisenby.
H. R. 10063. William G. Rowland.	H. R. 12059. Archie M. Leighton.	H. R. 13130. Millie Lawson.	H. R. 13498. William A. Turner.
H. R. 10122. Albert D. Clark.	H. R. 12069. James M. Caldwell.	H. R. 13147. Frank C. Baylor.	H. R. 13544. Louisa Johnson.
H. R. 10201. Alvina Sanders.	H. R. 12070. David M. Bates.	H. R. 13150. Edward J. Conway.	H. R. 13550. Georgia A. Godard.
H. R. 10264. Christopher Rohr-	H. R. 12071. Rose Cox.	H. R. 13154. Frank L. Jewell.	H. R. 13611. Preston Phinney.
scheld.	H. R. 12105. Carl L. Setchell.	H. R. 13161. Ralph Waite.	H. R. 13615. Hannah Brodeck, now
H. R. 10334. James B. Waters.	H. R. 12107. Robert H. Foote.	H. R. 13194. Bettie E. Pearson.	Barney.
H. R. 10383. George W. Shafer.	H. R. 12116. John H. Mark.	H. R. 13207. Michael Burger.	H. R. 13618. William M. Miller.
H. R. 10428. Hull Itskin.	H. R. 12118. Bert Rich.	H. R. 13208. James Adams.	H. R. 13618. Tabitha A. Coole.
H. R. 10486. Samuel H. Rode-	H. R. 12120. Mary Plum.	H. R. 13214. Agnes L. Ernst.	H. R. 13621. Hiram L. Middlebrooks.
heaver.	H. R. 12132. Michael F. Fisher.	H. R. 13233. Mary L. Carr.	H. R. 13638. William J. Norton.
H. R. 10497. Charley Salyers.	H. R. 12145. George H. Leaycraft,	H. R. 13235. Rudolph B. Scheitlin.	H. R. 13642. George G. Denning.
H. R. 10574. Harlem L. Gorham.	alias George H. Wal-	H. R. 13249. William H. Edwards.	H. R. 13645. Carrie Bourret.
H. R. 10575. Millie Cislser.	lace.	H. R. 13269. Jefferson H. Murray.	H. R. 13713. Anna Burke.
H. R. 10580. Conrad C. Kalber.	H. R. 12149. Betty Lentz.	H. R. 13271. Frank H. Bruce.	H. R. 13715. John G. Pearson.
H. R. 10599. Thomas J. Stevens.	H. R. 12173. Virginia H. Welsh.	H. R. 13281. Peter Crosby.	H. R. 13718. Ubert C. Ricker.
H. R. 10729. Bessie Walsh.	H. R. 12177. Clanton Jarrett.	H. R. 13340. John A. Combs.	H. R. 13738. Sarah Sipes.
H. R. 10796. George J. Molloy.	H. R. 12178. William Pace.	H. R. 13341. John Miller.	H. R. 13817. Joseph E. Hayden.
H. R. 10817. Julius A. Nemitz.	H. R. 12186. William T. Conway.	H. R. 13352. Sarah McGhee.	H. R. 13863. Eva Estes.
H. R. 10823. Nicola Depompa.	H. R. 12197. Elizabeth F. McCas-	H. R. 13392. Charles F. Walker.	H. R. 13949. Sarah L. Owen.
H. R. 10855. John A. Lovett.	land.	H. R. 13396. Charles L. Taylor.	H. R. 14013. Stanley S. Stout.
H. R. 10897. Roy C. Murray.	H. R. 12205. Alfred J. Hester.	H. R. 13441. George P. Barker.	
H. R. 10903. Flora B. Warren.	H. R. 12222. John D. Hoskins.		
H. R. 10933. Columbus Brundage.	H. R. 12225. Henry Mason.		
H. R. 10941. Elizabeth Shaw.	H. R. 12224. Charles L. Cook.		
H. R. 11006. Augustus O. Hartel.	H. R. 12227. Howard F. Watters.		
H. R. 11042. Dell W. Stinchcomb.	H. R. 12228. William S. Starnes.		
H. R. 11094. May Lacey.	H. R. 12229. Hugh Sizemore.		
H. R. 11110. Palace Douglas.	H. R. 12233. John H. Lytle.		
H. R. 11135. August H. Knippen-	H. R. 12234. John F. Scott.		
berg.	H. R. 12235. James A. Fullen.		
H. R. 11151. Charley Thomas.	H. R. 12274. William H. Hamble-		
H. R. 11157. Marshall F. Truax.	ton.		
H. R. 11160. James B. Bristow.	H. R. 12289. Mack Hickey.		
H. R. 11169. John J. Boggs.	H. R. 12344. Frederick W. Duden.		
H. R. 11192. Willie E. Vaughan.	H. R. 12346. Thomas F. Moore.		
H. R. 11219. Christina Wylie.	H. R. 12353. George Clark.		
H. R. 11240. Anton Schwarz.	H. R. 12363. Daniel Guthrie.		
H. R. 11268. Alexander Emory.	H. R. 12372. Fannie M. Buchanan.		
H. R. 11290. George F. Smith alias	H. R. 12373. Alfred Kirkpatrick.		
F. G. Kasimir.	H. R. 12388. Joseph Griffin.		
H. R. 11379. Carrie S. Warner.	H. R. 12408. Peter Mariann.		
H. R. 11380. William A. Morris.	H. R. 12410. Lucy C. Strout.		
H. R. 11406. George W. Fariss.	H. R. 12411. John Huff.		
H. R. 11407. Mary M. Durand.	H. R. 12412. William H. Riffey.		
H. R. 11454. Katherine M. Flana-	H. R. 12415. John B. Eakles.		
gan.	H. R. 12440. Frank Bachmeyer.		
H. R. 11463. Knight F. Flanders.	H. R. 12448. Albin D. Schaefer.		
H. R. 11464. Ralph L. Hackett.	H. R. 12450. John F. Lindquist.		
H. R. 11470. John C. Gaskins.	H. R. 12451. Louis S. Harris.		
H. R. 11471. Frank H. Alsapach.	H. R. 12454. Elyza Settles.		
H. R. 11473. Richard L. McGregor.	H. R. 12493. John Salyer.		
H. R. 11481. Priscilla Eggleston.	H. R. 12497. Annie Heston.		
H. R. 11486. Ray W. Burkdoll.	H. R. 12499. Mont Graham.		
H. R. 11504. Oren O. Pound.	H. R. 12515. Mary E. Seifres.		
H. R. 11512. John W. Thompson.	H. R. 12550. Harry L. Evans.		
H. R. 11515. Eliza Brown.	H. R. 12554. Harry Goff.		
H. R. 11519. Mary Gass.	H. R. 12560. Willie Lee.		
H. R. 11528. Paul J. Barr and Roy	H. R. 12562. James Baker.		
S. Barr, minors.	H. R. 12566. James E. Wilson.		
H. R. 11535. Cornelius Conley alias	H. R. 12571. William J. Degnan.		
Cornelius Connelly.	H. R. 12572. Mary Long.		
H. R. 11573. Anson T. Lazier.	H. R. 12575. Ruth Posey.		
H. R. 11574. Charles J. S. Arey.	H. R. 12587. Sarah A. Willingham.		
H. R. 11601. George W. Keith.	H. R. 12590. Robert A. Sweeney.		
H. R. 11611. Mary Reid, now Nich-	H. R. 12591. Michael A. Kilrow.		
ols.	H. R. 12595. Mary C. Hall.		
H. R. 11629. Robert C. Ladd.	H. R. 12596. Mary McJenkins.		
H. R. 11630. Herbert B. Strode.	H. R. 12597. Joshua H. Ervin.		
H. R. 11653. Luke Monroe.	H. R. 12599. Jesse Baird.		
H. R. 11655. John S. Jamison.	H. R. 12617. Emma F. Buchanan.		
H. R. 11685. William A. Foster.	H. R. 12625. Robert A. Edwards.		
H. R. 11691. Abraham M. Reams.	H. R. 12654. Thomas Pope.		
H. R. 11692. Lena Mauter.	H. R. 12656. Harrison Roberts.		
H. R. 11694. Susan Chittenden.	H. R. 12667. March Agard.		
H. R. 11696. Anna Dixon.	H. R. 12673. Robert W. McFarland.		
H. R. 11698. Rose M. Painter.	H. R. 12688. Aolia Lauber.		
H. R. 11706. Patrick Kinny.	H. R. 12694. Austin R. Fite.		
H. R. 11710. Andrew J. Showan.	H. R. 12705. John Lynch.		
H. R. 11711. John F. McNeeley.	H. R. 12731. Alexander Mackenzie.		
H. R. 11713. Benjamin Phillips.	H. R. 12733. Frederick Dupont.		
H. R. 11715. Cora Booram.	H. R. 12741. George Roberts.		
H. R. 11760. Louisa Cary.	H. R. 12744. John T. Hyder.		
H. R. 11762. Tony Jud.	H. R. 12763. Isaac Walmscott.		
H. R. 11781. Mike Kulas.	H. R. 12768. Garrett D. Bailey.		
H. R. 11787. Richard J. Weaver.	H. R. 12783. Anthony D. Mitten.		
H. R. 11794. Nelle T. O'Neill.	H. R. 12815. Jane Jackson.		
H. R. 11799. Edward F. Stewart.	H. R. 12840. Isabella B. Slayter.		
H. R. 11822. Isaac Morris.	H. R. 12865. John W. Ramey.		
H. R. 11829. Frank Risner.	H. R. 12873. Herbert Hill.		
H. R. 11831. William Winn.	H. R. 12877. John S. Robison.		
H. R. 11832. Leck Patrick.	H. R. 12893. James E. Davis.		
H. R. 11837. Julia Tomlin.	H. R. 12894. Albert M. Gordon.		
H. R. 11839. Simpson Hornaday.	H. R. 12897. John Noble, jr.		
H. R. 11854. Joseph E. W. Berg-	H. R. 12900. Adron Duff.		
bower.	H. R. 12902. George S. Nevils.		
H. R. 11856. John Rovinsky.	H. R. 12921. William B. Spencer.		
H. R. 11860. Philip Dieter.	H. R. 12947. Ada Johnston Cowles.		
H. R. 11870. Huse Walker.	H. R. 12958. Ward A. Siebenthal.		
H. R. 11905. Frederick Hattler.	H. R. 12984. Jasper E. Glascock.		
H. R. 11909. Lynn J. Heldreth.	H. R. 12986. George B. Pettys.		
H. R. 11930. Robert A. Herbst.	H. R. 12987. Edward Carter.		
H. R. 11932. Henry N. Wilks.	H. R. 13005. Cevilla Wise.		

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill for amendment.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Clerk is not reading the whole bill. He is reading the name and the amount. There are several lines between, and as we are not doing much to-day I think he should read the whole bill. Has the first reading been dispensed with?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The first reading was dispensed with. Mr. CALDWELL. I did not hear any such request.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Granting a request to consider a bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole dispenses with the first reading of the bill under a ruling by ex-Speaker CLARK.

The Clerk read as follows:
The name of Fred C. Swain, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Illinois Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

With the following committee amendment:
Page 2, line 19, strike out "Swain" and insert "Savin."

The committee amendment was agreed to.
The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Scott Engle, late of the Twenty-second Battalion United States Field Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Where is the report on this bill? I have tried to get a copy of the report, but have been unable to get it.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the gentleman wishes a copy of the report, I will give him mine.

Mr. CALDWELL. If there is a report, all right. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Tom S. Bailey, late of Company F, Third Regiment Tennessee Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, under the ruling of the Speaker this morning, this seems to be very important business before the House, and I think we should have a quorum to do business. I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LONGWORTH). The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-eight Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Democratic side of the House wants to oppose pension bills, I move a call of the House.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CALDWELL) there were 127 ayes and 5 noes.

So the motion was agreed to.

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

Anthony	Campbell, Pa.	Curry, Calif.	Elston
Aswell	Caraway	Darrow	Emerson
Baer	Carew	Dempsy	Esch
Bankhead	Carss	Denison	Ferris
Bell	Carter	Dent	Fess
Blackmon	Casey	Dewalt	Fields
Blanton	Clark, Fla.	Donovan	Focht
Boies	Clark, Mo.	Dooling	Frear
Bowers	Cleary	Drane	Fuller, Mass.
Brinson	Cole	Drewry	Ganly
Britten	Cooper	Dunn	Garrett
Browne	Copley	Eagle	Goldfogle
Burke	Costello	Edmonds	Goodall
Butler	Crago	Ellsworth	Goodwin, Ark.

Gould	Kless	Phelan	Stephens, Ohio
Graham, Pa.	Kitchin	Radcliffe	Stiness
Greene, Vt.	Kreider	Rainey, John W.	Strong, Pa.
Griest	Langley	Ramsey	Sullivan
Hamill	Lankford	Ramseyer	Summers, Tex.
Harrell	Lazaro	Randall, Calif.	Tague
Harrison	Leshner	Reber	Taylor, Colo.
Hastings	McCulloch	Reed, N. Y.	Taylor, Tenn.
Hayden	McFadden	Rhodes	Temple
Heflin	McKiniry	Riddick	Thomas
Hernandez	McKinley	Riordan	Tillman
Hill	McLane	Rodenberg	Tilson
Hoey	McPherson	Rowan	Vare
Huddleston	Madden	Rucker	Venable
Hullings	Maher	Schall	Walters
Husted	Martin	Scully	Webster
Hutchinson	Mason	Sears	Whaley
Jefferis	Merritt	Shreve	Wheeler
Johnston, N. Y.	Moore, Va.	Sinnot	Williams
Jones, Pa.	Morin	Small	Wilson, Ill.
Kelley, Mich.	Nicholls	Smith, N. Y.	Wise
Kelly, Pa.	Nolan	Smithwick	Wood, Ind.
Kendall	O'Connell	Snell	Wright
Kennedy, Iowa	Osborne	Snyder	
Kennedy, R. I.	Parker	Steagall	
Kettner		Steele	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two hundred and sixty-five Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. SELLS. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of William C. Phillips, late of Company I, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and I do that for this purpose: To call attention to the fact that the report accompanying this bill was not available at the time the bill was called up for consideration. I want to protest against that practice. I am opposed to the practice of not having reports on bills of this kind printed in time for Members to examine them before the bill comes up. I do not take it that that is the fault of the committee, but the reports nevertheless were not available and were not made available until after the bill was under consideration. I do not think that practice ought to be indulged in, because the membership of the House is entitled to examine these several claims.

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

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think the Printing Office was short of paper.

Mr. McKEOWN. I am simply protesting against taking up bills of this kind which carry appropriations without an opportunity on the part of Members of the House to examine the report and the cases.

Mr. KNUTSON. As a general thing, it is a very bad practice.

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

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman's point is well taken. I am rather inclined to think that if we had all realized the report was not available we might not have taken this bill up for consideration. I think the House ought to have the reports available before bills are taken up, but there is no controversy over any item in this particular bill, so that I do not know if it is important in this case. I do think it is important as a general proposition.

Mr. McKEOWN. The question of whether or not it might be of consequence would arise out of information contained in the report. I have no objection to the bill, and I am not making any objection. I am simply calling the attention of the House to the practice of taking up a bill carrying appropriations without an opportunity to read the report upon the measure.

Mr. SELLS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Pensions meets on Wednesday of each week. Immediately after the committee meeting the clerk and the examiner of the committee prepare the bills approved for printing. The bills with the reports go to the Public Printer on Wednesday afternoon. That course was pursued in this case and they went to the Public Printer on Wednesday afternoon and they should have been here yesterday morning. That they were delayed is no fault of the Committee on Pensions. We have merely observed the usual practice, heretofore observed in reporting these bills.

Mr. McKEOWN. In that event bills ought not to be called up for consideration, although to-day is pension day, until the House can have opportunity to read the report. I raised this point merely to call the attention of the House to the facts so that in the future we may have opportunity to examine reports.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. SELLS. I have not the floor.

Mr. McKEOWN. I yield.

Mr. BEE. Two weeks ago we passed a special bill for Spanish-American War veterans. Does this bill include individuals who do not come under the operation of that law, for whom it is necessary to pass special legislation, or under what circumstances do these claims arise?

Mr. SELLS. H. R. 2, to which the gentleman refers, is a general bill for the relief of Spanish War veterans, and it has not yet become a law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Conrad C. Kalber, late of Company A, First Regiment Connecticut Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

Mr. SELLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 15 for the purpose of offering an amendment to strike out lines 4, 5, and 6.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to return to page 15 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, strike out all of lines 4, 5, and 6.

Mr. SELLS. Mr. Speaker, in that case the claimant is dead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Appropriations, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12610) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, together with the veto message of the President thereon, having considered the same, reports the bill herewith, with the recommendation that it be passed by the House of Representatives, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Tennessee with regard to time. I assume that I have one hour on this matter. At the end of that time I desire to move the previous question, and at the same time I want to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee such time as he may desire.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman from Iowa have an hour under the rules to discuss the veto message of the President?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would be inclined to think that the gentleman having made a privileged motion would be entitled to the floor for an hour.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, if an hour is not enough, I desire to be entirely fair and I want the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] to have one-half of that time. If that is not sufficient, we will get more time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I do not know who wants to speak on the matter, but from the information that I now have I think 30 minutes will be ample time on this side, and possibly more than we would need.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I suggest that the gentleman take his hour and yield half of it to those on this side or yield it to me for the purpose of yielding to those gentlemen who want to speak, and if additional time—

Mr. GOOD. I will yield at this time 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, and I ask that he consume that time now.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WINGO. As I understand, the House is reconsidering a bill. Now, does the Speaker rule that that allows one hour to the gentleman who brings up the bill and does not allow an hour to each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would think not. The Chair thinks the motion the gentleman from Iowa has

made is under the regular rules of the House, and he is entitled to an hour.

Mr. WINGO. I am not protesting against it, but there is some doubt—

Mr. GOOD. And if additional time is wanted, I shall be very glad to ask unanimous consent to grant a little additional time, the time to be equally divided.

Mr. WINGO. I will state that I was not protesting, but I did not know whether, as the bill came up on reconsideration, it would proceed upon one hour to whoever got the floor. I was possibly in error.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of one hour the previous question be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that at the expiration of one hour the previous question shall be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. CALDWELL. Inasmuch as this is an effort to pass the bill over the President's veto, I think we ought to have a quorum present, and I therefore make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-seven gentlemen are present; not a quorum.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

Anthony	Drewry	Kelley, Mich.	Reed, N. Y.
Aswell	Dunn	Kelly, Pa.	Rhodes
Baer	Eagle	Kendall	Riddick
Bankhead	Echols	Kennedy, Iowa	Riordan
Bell	Edmonds	Kennedy, R. I.	Rodenberg
Blackmon	Ellsworth	Kettner	Rose
Blanton	Elston	Kless	Rowan
Boles	Emerson	Kitchin	Rucker
Booher	Esch	Kreider	Sanders, Ind.
Bowers	Ferris	Langley	Schall
Brinson	Fess	Lankford	Scully
Britten	Fields	Lazaro	Sears
Browne	Focht	Leshner	Shreve
Brumbaugh	Frear	McArthur	Small
Burke	Fuller, Mass.	McCulloch	Smith, N. Y.
Butler	Ganly	McFadden	Smithwick
Campbell, Pa.	Garrett	McKenzie	Snell
Caraway	Godwin, N. C.	McKinley	Snyder
Carew	Goldfogle	McKinley	Steagall
Carss	Goodykoontz	McLane	Steele
Carter	Gould	McPherson	Steenerson
Casey	Graham, Pa.	Madden	Stephens, Miss.
Clark, Fla.	Greene, Vt.	Maher	Stephens, Ohio
Classon	Griest	Martin	Strong, Pa.
Cleary	Hamill	Mason	Sullivan
Cole	Harrell	Mays	Sumners, Tex.
Cooper	Harrison	Merritt	Tague
Copley	Hastings	Moon	Temple
Costello	Haugen	Moore, Va.	Tillman
Curry, Calif.	Hayden	Morin	Tilson
Darrow	Hays	Nelson, Wis.	Vare
Davis, Minn.	Heflin	O'Connell	Walters
Dempsey	Hernandez	Padgett	Webster
Denison	Hill	Parker	Whaley
Dent	Huddleston	Phelan	Wheeler
Dewalt	Hullings	Radcliffe	White, Kans.
Donovan	Husted	Ramsey	Winslow
Dooley	Jeffers	Ramseyer	Wood, Ind.
Doremus	Johnston, N. Y.	Reavis	
Drane	Jones, Pa.	Reber	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 269 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa has one hour.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have yielded 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House is to pass the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, the veto of the President notwithstanding. The objection of the President to the bill as it passed the Congress is based on section 8 of the bill, which I wish to read to the House for its information. It reads as follows:

Sec. 8. That section 11 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," is hereby amended by striking out the first proviso and inserting the following in lieu thereof:

"Provided, That hereafter no journal, magazine, periodical, or similar Government publication shall be printed, issued, or discontinued by any branch or officer of the Government service unless the same shall have been authorized under such regulations as shall be prescribed by the Joint Committee on Printing, and such publications shall not

contain any commercial advertisements: *Provided further*, That the foregoing provisions of this section shall also apply to mimeographing, multigraphing, and other processes used for the duplication of type-written and printed matter, other than official correspondence and office records."

Now, the amendment in the act which was approved March 1, 1919, and which this provision I have just read seeks to amend, reads as follows:

Sec. 11. That the Joint Committee on Printing shall have power to adopt and employ such measures as, in its discretion, may be deemed necessary to remedy any neglect, delay, duplication, or waste in the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications: *Provided*, That hereafter no journal, magazine, periodical, or other similar publication shall be printed and issued by any branch or officer of the Government service unless the same shall have been specifically authorized by Congress, but such publications as are now being printed without specific authority from Congress may, in the discretion of the Joint Committee on Printing, be continued until the close of the next regular session of Congress, when, if authority for their continuance is not then granted by Congress, they shall not thereafter be printed: *Provided further*, That on and after July 1, 1919, all printing, binding, and blank-book work for Congress, the Executive Office, the judiciary, and every executive department, independent office, and establishment of the Government shall be done at the Government Printing Office, except such classes of work as shall be deemed by the Joint Committee on Printing to be urgent or necessary to have done elsewhere than in the District of Columbia for the exclusive use of any field service outside of said District.

Now, if you will analyze the provision which was carried in the current law and the amendment which was adopted, and which I first read, you will see that there is quite a difference.

In other words, on March 1, 1919, Congress undertook to say and did say that after the adjournment of the next regular session no journal, magazine, periodical, and so forth, shall be printed and issued by any branch or officer of the Government unless it is specifically authorized by law. But it provided that in the interim, between that date and the adjournment of the next regular session of Congress, which is the present session, the Joint Committee on Printing should have the power and authority to permit such publications as in its judgment and discretion should be made. The provision which the President has vetoed places the exclusive authority in the Joint Committee on Printing for all time to absolutely determine, regardless of anything that the executive branch may have to say and regardless of anything that Congress may have to say, unless it takes formal action, as to just what publications shall be issued. So I say there is a most material difference between the act as it was passed in March, 1919, and as approved by the President at that time and the provision carried in this bill which he has vetoed.

It is clear that when Congress passed the bill, on March 1, 1919, and when it was approved by the President, it was expected that before the next regular session of Congress should have come to a close Congress would have taken the matter up through its proper legislative committee and adopted some legislation giving authority for the publication of such publications as were deemed necessary. But this Congress has sat here for more than a year and has absolutely failed to consider the matter or to pass any legislation upon the subject as it was expected that it would do when the bill to which I have referred was passed. And it is only another evidence of the fact of the failure of this Congress, although it has been in session more than a year, to grapple with legislative problems and pass legislation needed in order that our Government may properly function.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This session of Congress has already passed the so-called printing reform bill, which would in itself, if passed in the other body, correct 85 per cent, at least, of this overplus of printing matter, would it not?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true; and I am glad the gentleman corrected me in so far as this House is concerned. But it so happens that the Senate is a part of the Congress, and the assent of the Senate is necessary in order that a matter may become a law. The other end of the Capitol is controlled by the same party that controls in this House. So I repeat the very difficulty with which we are confronted to-day is due to the inexcusable inactivity of this Congress and its failure to pass legislation that it was expected it would pass in order to take care of this particular matter.

Now, it will be said by those who favor passing this bill over the veto of the President that if you strike this provision out the Government will find itself in a position where practically no publications can be issued after July 1, because I am informed there are some 150 new publications that are being issued for which there is no specific authority of law. But that is no reason, gentlemen, why Congress should undertake to take from the executive branch of the Government by permanent law authority that properly belongs to it. The President has set

out in his message very fully and elaborately the reasons which prompted him to veto this provision. He has insisted, and in my judgment he has good reason to insist, that when you undertake to say, not that Congress but a joint committee of Congress, shall have the power to absolutely censor all of the publications of the executive branch of this Government, have the power to go into the department and into the independent establishments, and censor what they issue, what they send out to the country, it is a clear, plain encroachment upon the functions of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman was a member of the conference committee, was he not?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; I was not.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Did any gentleman on the gentleman's side who was a member of the conference object to this provision?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Not that I know of. It was a unanimous conference report, but it was a Senate amendment. The provision never did come directly before the House. The House never had an opportunity to pass upon it or consider it, and I dare say that there were very few Members of Congress who knew it was in the bill by way of Senate amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Aside from the question of these publications that are issued by the various departments, does the gentleman propose to discuss the effect this amendment would have upon the phase of it relating to copying, multigraphing, and so forth?

Mr. KNUTSON. And will the gentleman also touch upon the effect that the passage of this bill over the President's veto would have on the paper situation?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will try to come to that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Also in regard to this immense amount of press-agent stuff put out every night?

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. TOWNER. I was going to ask the gentleman if the same reason and principle would not apply to the bill of a year ago that applies now—that it is a usurpation of the Executive authority? I was wondering why the President did not veto that bill but vetoes this.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I tried to give my own views in regard to that matter a moment ago. To repeat, very briefly, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that the provision adopted a year ago is entirely different from the provision that is carried in this particular bill, in that the provision adopted a year ago provided that upon the adjournment of the next regular session of Congress no publication of any kind—bulletin, magazines, or periodicals—should be printed and issued without specific authority of law. But in order to give this Congress at this regular session the time in which to formulate legislation and to determine just what magazines and periodicals and bulletins should be published and issued, it was provided that the Joint Committee on Printing should have authority in the interim to say whether or not a particular magazine or periodical should be issued. It was a temporary measure, looking to the enactment of proper remedial legislation. Now, the gentleman will see clearly, I am sure, that that is an entirely different proposition from the one that is presented now, which proposes to make permanent law the right of the Joint Committee on Printing to absolutely dictate to the executive branches of this Government, and to censor, if it desires to do so, any magazine, publication, or periodical that may be issued by it.

Mr. TOWNER. I certainly understand the gentleman's distinction, which he has made clear; but that is not the proposition that I asked the gentleman to give his attention to. The proposition is that while this is contended to be an encroachment upon the executive branch of the Government, to that extent the gentleman states the other was also an encroachment on the Executive power, and the principle involved is exactly the same. I was wondering if the gentleman could tell us why the President did not veto that a year ago if it was an encroachment on his power?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think anyone would seriously contend that Congress, which has authority to make appropriations and has full control of the purse strings, would not have the authority to say of itself how that money should be expended, whether for a particular magazine or another.

But Congress in this case is undertaking to delegate such authority as it might have as a Congress to a joint committee composed of four or five Senators and Representatives and giving to them the authority which it ought to exercise itself and which it was contemplated it would exercise when that law was passed.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. Again, let me suggest to the gentleman that the same principle would apply to the bill a year ago that applies now.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not agree with the gentleman that the cases are on all fours with each other.

Now, the President set forth very much more clearly than I possibly can his reason for presenting this veto, and I want to read you a portion of what he had to say upon the subject. He said:

Aside from the control over the printing, issuing, or discontinuing of periodicals or similar Government publications by the Congressional Joint Committee on Printing, the obvious effect of this provision would be to give to that committee power to prevent the executive departments from mimeographing, multigraphing, or otherwise duplicating any material which they desire, and, in that way, power to determine what information shall be given to the people of the country by the executive departments. The committee apparently would have power, for example, to prevent even the making of carbon copies of anything other than official correspondence and office records. Without raising any constitutional question, I think that this section, which would give the Congressional Joint Committee on Printing power to exercise censorship over the executive departments, is an encroachment on the functions of the Executive and incompatible with good government. I am in entire sympathy with the efforts of the Congress and the departments to effect economies in printing and in the use of paper and supplies, but I do not believe that such a provision as this should become law. I should also call attention to the fact that by its terms the section in question absolutely forbids mimeographing, multigraphing, and other duplicating processes in the executive departments (except as permitted by regulations established by the Congressional Joint Committee on Printing) and thus imposes a flat prohibition against the exercise of executive functions.

And, answering the inquiry of the gentleman from Iowa, he goes on to say:

In considering bills containing the provisions mentioned above, I was willing to overlook the objectionable features for the time being with the thought that they were designed as exceptional and temporary measures to meet unusual conditions. To permit such expedients to serve as precedents or accepted rules for legislation would, in my judgment, be most unfortunate and destructive of proper principles for the orderly and efficient management of the Government's business. I feel very strongly that the authority carried in section 8 of the bill herewith returned should not be conferred upon a legislative committee and that the entire section should be stricken from the measure.

So I suggest to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] that this provision goes much further than the provision adopted a year ago, because, as the President well said, it would very likely prevent the executive departments from doing anything more than the making of carbon copies of official correspondence and office records in the bureaus, and would permit a joint committee of Congress, after an appropriation was made, to say to the executive branch of the Government just what publications should be made and just what they should contain by denying the right to publish any document which does not happen to suit its views. And certainly it seems to me that the Executive was well within his constitutional prerogatives and within his right in asking that Congress should not seek in this way to encroach upon the functions of the Executive.

Now, I will tell you what, in my opinion, ought to be done. I think this veto ought to be sustained; but no one who knows the facts will deny that there is the gravest sort of abuse in connection with the publications of our Government, and the action a year ago and the action of the committee, in so far as this provision is concerned, was taken because of that great abuse and the great waste of money in sending out such a mass of material of no real value and frequently to people who are not interested in it. It is a great waste of paper, but I think we ought to sustain the veto of the President. Then I think that this bill ought to be sent back to the Committee on Appropriations and let that committee get together and frame a provision which will meet the exigencies of the case and which will cut out a large part, if not all, of this great duplication and waste. And that can be done in this way: A commission can be created consisting of two or three members of the Cabinet, if you please—say, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General and the Attorney General—and let that commission be substituted for the Joint Committee on Printing, so that no new issues, no new publications or magazines, can be issued without their approval.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. I want to ask the gentleman how the committee was divided on this question—whether or not the committee was a unit on reporting this resolution, or whether some of its members favored reporting the bill over again? How did the committee divide on that proposition?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There was a division in the committee.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will say to the gentleman that the Joint Committee on Printing did ask the Cabinet officers to name what publications they wanted to be issued, and even after the Cabinet officers had named what publications they wanted to be issued the committee found it was almost impossible to make anybody who does any printing, bureau chief or otherwise, let go at all.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But, after all, the Joint Committee on Printing would have the power under this bill to veto what is purely an executive function of the Government.

This is not a partisan matter, because it is a matter that involves next year and all years to come until Congress takes affirmative action to the contrary. But I say again that it is not good policy for Congress to undertake to act in a matter of this kind through one of its committees. I am not making an attack on the members of this Joint Committee on Printing. It is composed of most reputable and able Members of the House and Senate. But it is not good policy for Congress to give the power to one of its committees to go down to the departments and say to them, "Now, if you will change this publication as we want you to change it, and cut out here and put in there, we will permit you to send it out; but we propose to stand here and censor that publication, and if it does not conform to our views we do not propose to permit you to place it before the American people."

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to a question before he leaves the floor?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. Do you think this extravagance in printing is confined to the executive departments?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. By no means. I think we might well clean our own skirts up here on the question of extravagance in printing.

Mr. HOWARD. Does the gentleman know that to-day the presses of the Government Printing Office are running almost all night and day printing envelopes to be sent out that are costing this Government \$4.50 a thousand?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not doubt that the gentleman is correct. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE].

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

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, this question goes to the very core of our parliamentary institutions. In essence it involves the greatest question that has come before this Congress. At the beginning parliaments sprang out of a bargain between the commons and the king. Under the Tudors the commons lost influence, and then under James I and Charles I began the great contest out of which came the control of a people by itself.

The question here, of whether the people can attach conditions to their grants of money, was the very center of the battles fought not only in Westminster, but on the fields of Naseby and Marston Moor. This question cost Charles I his head. It was settled for England by the Bill of Rights, and then it was transferred to this country.

In the Province out of which my own State sprang, this very question for two generations was constantly at issue between the general court and the governors. The general court insisted on the right to audit the accounts of the governors. It went even further and stipulated that the general court might direct the expenditure of money appropriated for the use of the speaker. Out of this controversy, in no small part, grew the Revolutionary War.

When our constitutions were written the Montesquieu doctrine had come to public notice, and there followed with us that attempt at separation of powers which should leave sharp lines of demarcation between the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. Notably the great Democratic Presidents have been those who have most overstepped the bounds between the departments of Government.

I want to call your attention to the fact that the present occupant of the Executive Mansion, soon after his election but before his inauguration, delivered himself of this pronouncement:

He—

The President—

must be prime minister, as much concerned with the guidance of legislation as with the just and orderly execution of law.

He came into office announcing that he conceived it to be his duty to be concerned with the guidance of legislation. From that day to this he has overstepped at every possible opportunity he could find the line between the executive and the legislative.

Two wrongs do not make one right. We may not on our part overstep these bounds. We may not wisely thereby approve his policy, a policy proclaimed by him as a writer on political science for more than 30 years, a policy that strangely Providence gave him the power to put into effect. We may not imitate him in transgressing the spirit of the Constitution; but we may recall that our Constitution was written and our Government founded upon the principle so dear to the hearts of Englishmen, among the greatest of democratic principles, the right that we have to demand redress of grievances before supply. That is the very center of all the proceedings of Parliament. That was the basis of our own parliamentary institutions.

We have the right to demand redress of grievances before supply. We have the right to direct how our money shall be spent. We have the right to go to the full extreme that the President in his message indicates would be so audacious. Not one dollar may the executive departments use contrary to our direction, contrary to our law. Even if we should see fit to go to such an extreme as to impose a censorship, that would be no more than exercise of the birthright of men who belong to the English-speaking race. It is a right which we would give up our lives rather than sacrifice, because it is the right upon which the Republic itself rests, the right to say to those who are to enforce the law what the law shall be. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman from Tennessee use some of his time? I have only one more speech.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am going to use what little time I have left.

Mr. GOOD. There will be but one speech on this side.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understand that, but I submit to the gentleman in all fairness that I have used 25 minutes practically, or 26 minutes. How much time have I used, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has four minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have used 26 minutes, and the gentleman has used only 10 minutes. I think the gentleman should use some of his time.

Mr. GOOD. I expect to make but one speech, and I expect to close, being the mover of the question, as is the custom of the House. I will ask the gentleman, following the customary practice, to use the balance of his time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think the gentleman should at least use a portion of his time now. The gentleman from Iowa has made no speech, and there has been no speech made dealing with some of the questions which he will probably raise, and yet the gentleman desires to reserve all of his time and to make the closing speech, permitting no reply whatever.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] has practically made my speech.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman from Mississippi made a very able speech, as he always does, but he did not touch some of the questions which I feel sure the gentleman intends to discuss.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee had the right to use his whole 30 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. After the gentleman from Iowa concludes his speech, will I be permitted to use the four minutes that I have remaining?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the rule of the House is that the one who controls the time has the right to close; the rule is that when there is but one speech left on the side of the one who has control, the other side must use all of its time first. Does not the gentleman from Tennessee recognize that as the regular rule?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I know that never before, at least to my knowledge, has the mover of a motion with 20 minutes at his disposal, and who expects to make an argument, refused to disclose his hand or state the grounds on which he bases his motion in order that the other side may have a fair opportunity to answer such argument as he may present. [Applause.] And I submit that there is no rule, but simply a custom, and it is a question that must appeal to the fairness of a Member as to how he shall treat those who differ with him in such circumstances.

The gentleman from Iowa will undoubtedly say that the President will be responsible if this provision goes out of the bill, because on July 1, unless some legislation is adopted in the meantime, there will be no authority whereby a magazine or

a periodical of the country can be printed. I want to say to you gentlemen on the majority side of this House that you will be responsible if such a result obtains, because you have had more than one year to enact legislation which would give authority for the publication of those periodicals and bulletins in which the people of this country are interested. This, I repeat, is but another evidence of the failure of this Congress to take up important legislative matters during the time it has been in session for more than a year and pass on them in the interest of the people.

The President of the United States has told you in his message that this provision, in his opinion, is an encroachment upon the executive branch of the Government. I do not think any fair-minded man who will look at it in a nonpartisan and fair way will fail to agree with him on that point. I have suggested to you a remedy, or a provision that can be adopted, which will save duplication and which will bring about economy. That is the creation of a commission to pass on these publications as they are issued and cut out duplication, and that commission can be formed without \$1 of expense to the Government.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] has said that Congress should have and does have the right to limit its appropriations and keep its hands on the appropriations made by it. Nobody disputes that proposition. Congress has the right to make an appropriation for publications in just such amount as it desires and to limit the appropriations to the publication of just such documents as it may prescribe, but after it makes that appropriation I deny the right of Congress, acting through a joint committee, to go down to the departments and say to them, "We will censor what you undertake to print; we do not like this paragraph; we do not like this particular clause; we are not in sympathy with the views expressed; cut them out or change them and you shall have our O. K.; but if you insist on keeping that paragraph in then we do not propose to give you authority to issue that publication." [Applause.] Clearly under this provision the committee could take that position if it was so disposed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the membership of the House should approach this question without any spirit of partisanship. It is a business proposition, pure and simple, involving as it does the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars a year. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] who has just taken his seat complains rather bitterly because this provision that brought forth the President's veto finds a place in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. I want to remind the gentleman from Tennessee that the section to which the President has called attention, and to which he objects, is not as drastic as section 11, found in the present law that was approved by the President on March 1, 1919. That measure was reported to this House by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], who has just taken his seat. What does that act contain? Section 11 contains this proviso, and if you will refer to the President's veto you will see that it was the first proviso in section 11 of that act, the act that he approved, which the present bill attempts to amend. That proviso is as follows:

Provided, That hereafter no journal, magazine, periodical, or other similar publication, shall be printed and issued by any branch or officer of the Government service unless the same shall have been specifically authorized by Congress, but such publications as are now being printed without specific authority from Congress may, in the discretion of the Joint Committee on Printing, be continued until the close of the next regular session of Congress, when, if authority for their continuance is not then granted by Congress, they shall not thereafter be printed.

That law is now on the statute books, and was reported by the gentleman from Tennessee and is permanent law. You will observe that it is provided that "hereafter" those publications should not be printed at all, so in that respect this bill does not enlarge existing law. The provision in the bill that has been vetoed provides as follows:

Provided, That hereafter no journal, magazine, periodical, or similar Government publication, shall be printed, issued, or discontinued by any branch or officer of the Government service unless the same shall have been authorized under such regulations as shall be prescribed by the Joint Committee on Printing, and such publications shall not contain any commercial advertisements.

A Committee on Printing was established back in 1846, composed of three Members of the Senate and three Members of the House. In 1852 there was established a Joint Committee on Printing, composed of three Members of the House and three Members of the Senate. That joint committee has existed ever since. When the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] brought his bill in a year ago, the act the President approved, he said by that bill, and the President said by that approval,

that 266 publications not authorized by law could not be printed during this session of Congress unless the Joint Committee on Printing should so direct.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman will remember that it was a Senate amendment a year ago, just as it was this time.

Mr. GOOD. Certainly; and the gentleman accepted it and the President approved it. There were 266 of those publications. This great committee of the two Houses, composed of Republicans and Democrats alike, have done what? They have eliminated 111 of these publications, and there is not a newspaper published in any congressional district in the United States but applauds their act in trying to cut out this useless extravagance and useless waste of paper. [Applause.] One hundred and eleven of those publications have ceased to be printed, and I wonder if that is what the President refers to when he says in his message:

I regard the proviso in question as an invasion of the province of the Executive, and calculated to result in unwarranted interference in the processes of good government, producing confusion, irritation, and distrust.

Yes; it did produce distrust when the Joint Committee on Printing cut out 111 useless publications. No one has heard from a single constituent with regard to that loss. What does this provision that the President refers to do? It simply permits 155 publications, that will have to stop when this session of Congress ends, unless you give somebody somewhere authority to pass on them and permit them to continue. The gentleman from Tennessee says we should give to a commission the power to determine the question of their continuance. The President says, "Keep your hands off." Whom will we follow? Does the gentleman distrust the Members of this body or the Members of the Senate who compose this great Joint Committee on Printing? They have done good work. The public approves it. The only person in the United States that I have heard of who complains about it is the President of the United States. If any bill should have been vetoed as an unwarranted interference by the Congress with the executive departments, it was the bill reported by the gentleman from Tennessee that carried this provision originally. And that was approved by the President. This bill simply permits the present order of things to continue during the next year. That is all.

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

Mr. GOOD. For a brief question.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman has omitted—I do not know whether willfully or not—to read the proviso in the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no, I have not. I am coming to that. The gentleman suggests that there is another item in this amendment which provides that they can not use duplicating machines in doing this work. Let me say to you that there is not a bank in the United States, not a newspaper in the United States, that had been receiving the daily statement from the Secretary of the Treasury that did not receive during the past month a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury to the effect that the daily statement was not printed because Congress had not provided the funds. The Congress provided for those funds. They were used in part in sending out just such publications. I have here a publication put out by a duplicating machine, a letter by a national bank examiner, sent out under the frank of the Comptroller of the Currency, with a publication of the kind that Congress will not permit, with extensive graphic illustrations and the money appropriated for printing in the Treasury Department was used in part in publishing such useless publications, which was simply to explain the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency. No one can read this mimeographed copy sent out by the comptroller and approve of the expense involved. It performs no useful purpose, but it helped deplete the appropriation and make a deficiency appropriation necessary. A great deal has been expended uselessly in using duplicating machines to get around the decision of the Joint Committee on Printing and send out propaganda. Vote to sustain the veto message that was written by somebody who does not apparently understand the provisions of the present law, and you cut off the right to print these publications. You prevent the publication of the Crop Reporter—183,000 copies annually—the sending throughout the country of the agricultural statistics. It will prevent the sending out of 7,000 copies of the Experimental Station Reporter; it will prevent the sending out of the Market Reporter, 30,000 copies; it will prevent the sending out the weather reports and some valuable publications.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I do not yield. It will prevent the sending out of publications of this kind, and, remember this, that when the last Congress, a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate, functioned upon this very subject it said that these publications should not hereafter be published at all, but during the present Congress they might be sent out only to the extent the Joint Committee on Printing would approve. When did your Joint Committee on Printing come in such disfavor? When the last Congress was looking for a commission to pass on this subject, when the last Congress was trying to solve this question, it said that the Joint Committee on Printing had the confidence and respect of the membership of both Houses and of the country, and should pass upon this question. Now, the gentleman from Tennessee says, "Oh, this Congress has been doing nothing; it has not passed legislation." Why did not the last Congress and the Congress before that, which saw millions of dollars expended in this way—why did not that Congress settle the question? It thought that the settlement ought to be to give the Joint Committee on Printing jurisdiction over the subject matter, but now that somebody has called the attention of the President to the item in the pending bill without calling his attention to existing law, which he approved, the gentleman now objects to the provision of the present law that a year ago he asked the House to adopt.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield, the last Congress did function on March 1, 1919, and gave the Joint Committee on Printing only during this session of Congress the right to pass upon the question as to what publications should be made, expecting this Congress to legislate upon the subject.

Mr. CANNON. Can the gentleman prove that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can prove it from the very letter of the law, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, because certainly the last Congress did not expect these publications should absolutely cease at the end of this session.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me, while he was making a law and had charge of it, why did not he make it extend further?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, gentlemen, that is a poor excuse. Read the language of the gentleman's bill; read the language of the great bill reported to this House by the gentleman from Tennessee in that regard and measure the words:

That hereafter no journal, magazine, publication, periodical, or similar publication shall be printed and issued by any branch or officer of the Government unless the same shall have been specifically authorized by Congress.

A clear recognition—

Mr. GRIFFIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I can not yield—a clear recognition of the terrible waste of the administration in the publication of these various periodicals and magazines. That committee and that Congress recognized the terrible extravagance and waste of the people's money in printing these publications. It recognized they were useless, and then it said—as strong as language can say it—that these unauthorized publications shall not be printed at all, except that during the next Congress, if the Joint Committee on Printing finds any merit in any of them, they can permit them during that session alone, and after that they shall not be printed at all. Now, the joint committee of the present Congress felt that some of these publications that had some merit should continue, and so they were simply extended for the next year, under the discretion which the last Congress lodged in this Joint Committee on Printing. Now, what will be the result if we fail to pass this bill? I want that side of the House to understand what it means to vote to support the President's veto. If that side of the House votes to support the President's veto, you will have the bill back, in my opinion, eliminating the objectionable section entirely, and then we will have in full force and effect all the provisions of the gentleman's bill, and that is that these publications will die just as the gentleman's bill provided they should die—at the end of this Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman and his party is in control of the House. Why did not you bring in a provision making possible the publication—

Mr. GOOD. We did bring in a bill. We brought in a bill simply to extend the power the gentleman's law gave—the very idea that the gentleman's law carried out—but because the President objected to it seems to be sufficient reason why practically every Member on that side shall yield their personality, yield their judgment, and vote to sustain the President, when we all know that the provision carried in the bill is a sensible and businesslike proposition and ought to be enacted into law. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote,

The SPEAKER. Under the agreement the previous question is ordered, and the question is, Will the House on reconsideration pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, and on this there is a yeas and nays vote.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 170, nays 127, not voting 130, as follows:

YEAS—170.

Ackerman	Frear	Luce	Sanford
Anderson	Freeman	Lufkin	Scott
Andrews, Md.	French	Luhning	Sells
Andrews, Nebr.	Fuller, Ill.	McKenzie	Siegel
Bacharach	Gallivan	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sinclair
Baer	Garland	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sinnott
Barbour	Glynn	MacCrate	Sisson
Begg	Good	MacGregor	Slemp
Benham	Goodall	Magee	Smith, Idaho
Bland, Ind.	Goodykoontz	Mapes	Smith, Ill.
Boles	Graham, Ill.	Mason	Smith, Mich.
Britten	Green, Iowa	Michener	Snell
Brooks, Ill.	Greene, Mass.	Miller	Steenerson
Brooks, Pa.	Greene, Vt.	Monahan, Wis.	Stiness
Burdick	Hadley	Mondell	Strong, Kans.
Burroughs	Hamilton	Moore, Ohio	Summers, Wash.
Campbell, Kans.	Hardy, Colo.	Moore, Ind.	Sweet
Cannon	Hawley	Morgan	Swope
Chindblom	Hersey	Mott	Taylor, Tenn.
Christopherson	Hickey	Mudd	Thompson
Classon	Hicks	Murphy	Timberlake
Copley	Hoch	Nelson, Wis.	Tincher
Crago	Houghton	Newton, Minn.	Tinkham
Cramton	Hull, Iowa	Newton, Mo.	Towner
Crowther	Hutchinson	Nolan	Treadway
Currie, Mich.	Ireland	Ogden	Vaile
Dale	James	Olney	Vestal
Dallinger	Johnson, S. Dak.	Osborne	Voigt
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, Wash.	Paige	Volstead
Dickinson, Iowa	Juul	Parker	Walsh
Dowell	Kahn	Peters	Ward
Dunbar	Kearns	Platt	Wason
Dunn	Keller	Porter	Watson
Dyer	King	Purnell	White, Kans.
Echols	Kinkaid	Randall, Calif.	White, Me.
Elliott	Klecza	Randall, Wis.	Williams
Esch	Knutson	Reed, W. Va.	Wilson, Ill.
Evans, Nebr.	Kraus	Ricketts	Winslow
Evans, Nev.	Lampert	Robison, Ky.	Yates
Fairfield	Lea, Calif.	Rogers	Young, N. Dak.
Fess	Leibach	Rowe	Zihlman
Fordney	Little	Sanders, Ind.	
Foster	Longworth	Sanders, N. Y.	

NAYS—127.

Almon	Doughton	McAndrews	Romjue
Ashbrook	Dupré	McDuffie	Rouse
Ayres	Eagan	McGlennon	Ruby
Babka	Evans, Mont.	McKeown	Rucker
Bankhead	Fisher	Major	Sabath
Barkley	Flood	Mann, S. C.	Sanders, La.
Bee	Gallagher	Mansfield	Sherwood
Benson	Gandy	Martin	Sims
Black	Gard	Milligan	Stedman
Bland, Mo.	Garner	Minahan, N. J.	Stephens, Miss.
Bland, Va.	Godwin, N. C.	Montague	Stevenson
Booher	Goodwin, Ark.	Mooney	Stoll
Box	Griffin	Moore, Va.	Summers, Tex.
Brand	Hardy, Tex.	Neely	Taylor, Ark.
Briggs	Hersman	Nelson, Mo.	Taylor, Colo.
Buchanan	Hoey	Nicholls	Thomas
Byrnes, S. C.	Holland	O'Connor	Upshaw
Byrns, Tenn.	Howard	Oldfield	Venable
Caldwell	Hudspeth	Oliver	Vinson
Candler	Hull, Tenn.	Overstreet	Watkins
Cantrill	Humphreys	Padgett	Weaver
Clark, Mo.	Igoe	Park	Welling
Coady	Jacoway	Parrish	Welty
Collier	Johnson, Ky.	Pell	Whaley
Connally	Johnson, Miss.	Pou	Wilson, La.
Crisp	Jones, Tex.	Quin	Wilson, Pa.
Cullen	Kincheloe	Rainey, Ala.	Wingo
Davey	Lanham	Rainey, J. W.	Wise
Davis, Tenn.	Larsen	Raker	Woods, Va.
Dickinson, Mo.	Lee, Ga.	Rayburn	Wright
Domnick	Linthicum	Riordan	Young, Tex.
Doremus	Loneragan	Robinson, N. C.	

NOT VOTING—130.

Anthony	Dent	Hayden	McClintic
Aswell	Dewalt	Hays	McCulloch
Bell	Donovan	Heffin	McFadden
Blackmon	Dooling	Hernandez	McKiniry
Blanton	Drane	Hill	McKinley
Bowers	Drewry	Huddleston	McLane
Brinson	Eagle	Hullings	McPherson
Browne	Edmonds	Husted	Madden
Brumbaugh	Ellsworth	Jeffers	Maber
Burke	Elston	Johnson, N. Y.	Mann, Ill.
Butler	Emerson	Jones, Pa.	Mays
Campbell, Pa.	Ferris	Kelley, Mich.	Mead
Caraway	Fields	Kelly, Pa.	Merritt
Carew	Focht	Kendall	Moon
Cars	Fuller, Mass.	Kennedy, Iowa	Morin
Carter	Ganly	Kennedy, R. I.	O'Connell
Casey	Garrett	Kettner	Phelan
Clark, Fla.	Goldfogle	Kiess	Radcliffe
Cleary	Gould	Kitchin	Rainey, H. T.
Cole	Graham, Pa.	Kreider	Ramsey
Cooper	Griest	Langley	Ramseyer
Costello	Hamill	Lankford	Reavis
Curry, Calif.	Harrell	Layton	Reber
Darrow	Harrison	Lazaro	Reed, N. Y.
Dempsey	Hastings	Leshner	Rhodes
Denison	Haugen	McArthur	Riddick

Rodenberg	Small	Strong, Pa.	Walters
Rose	Smith, N. Y.	Sullivan	Webster
Rowan	Smithwick	Tague	Wheeler
Schall	Snyder	Temple	Wood, Ind.
Scully	Stegall	Tillman	Woodyard
Sears	Steele	Tilson	
Shreve	Stephens, Ohio	Vare	

And so, two-thirds not having voted in favor of the bill, the veto of the President was sustained.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. BROWNE and Mr. MANN of Illinois (to override veto) with Mr. DREWRY (to sustain veto).

Mr. DARROW and Mr. KIESS (to override veto) with Mr. SMITH of New York (to sustain veto).

Mr. McPHERSON and Mr. TILSON (to override veto) with Mr. LAZARO (to sustain veto).

Mr. RAMSEY and Mr. WHEELER (to override veto) with Mr. O'CONNELL (to sustain veto).

Mr. GRIEST and Mr. RADCLIFFE (to override veto) with Mr. SCULLY (to sustain veto).

Mr. RODENBERG and Mr. FOCHT (to override veto) with Mr. HAMILL (to sustain veto).

Mr. DENISON and Mr. WOODYARD (to override veto) with Mr. LANKFORD (to sustain veto).

Mr. HARRELD and Mr. HAYS (to override veto) with Mr. SULLIVAN (to sustain veto).

Mr. CURRY of California and Mr. ELSTON (to override veto) with Mr. MAHER (to sustain veto).

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have my name called.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening?

Mr. ANTHONY. I was not. I was on the Senate side engaged at a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. ANTHONY. I would like to answer "present," then.

The SPEAKER. That is permissible.

The name of Mr. ANTHONY was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The bill is referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PENSIONS.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 13944.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13944), 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.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of George W. McDonald, late of Company C, Sixty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard R. Hill, late private unassigned, United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Latta, former widow of John C. Neet, late of Company C, Eighty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Alwilda Smith, late nurse, Medical Department, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Joseph S. Morton, late private unassigned, Tenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret E. Leonard, widow of Edward Leonard, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Brace, widow of Charles W. Brace, late of Company F, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Henrietta I. Machenheimer, former widow of James C. Ecker, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah Amerine, widow of Leander Amerine, late of Company E, Ninetieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Malinda A. Robinson, widow of Thomas Robinson, late of Company I, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Eliza Frederick, former wife of Jacob D. Frederick, late of Company K, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Heavy Artillery,

and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month, with no deductions on account of previous erroneous payments of pension.

The name of Isaac D. Caldwell, late of the Quartermaster Department, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Magdalena O. Shanks, widow of John R. C. Shanks, late colonel Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Ingham, late nurse, Medical Department, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ellen W. Carpenter, widow of Leonard W. Carpenter, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Olive K. Jeffries, widow of William E. Jeffries, late second-class pilot, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Josephine J. Teeter, former widow of Charles A. Teeter, late of Company A, Thirty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry; Company G, Fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry; and Company G, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Provisional Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Minnie K. Martin, former widow of Charles M. Hackett, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of William S. Beachum, late teamster, Quartermaster Department, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Manning, former widow of Alonzo P. Van Epps, alias John Smith, late of Company K, Fifty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Julia A. Marcum, daughter of Hiram C. Marcum, late of the United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hattie Lameroux, widow of Scott T. Crow, known as Scott T. Lameroux, late of Company G, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Freeman, widow of Daniel M. Freeman, late of Company K, Second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and Capt. Ingalls's company A. C. United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Yaple, widow of Jacob Yaple, late of Company C, One hundred and first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Anna L. Yaple, helpless and dependent daughter of said Mary E. and Jacob Yaple, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary E. Yaple the name of said Anna L. Yaple shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary E. Yaple.

The name of Samuel C. Whitwam, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alice Yarnell, helpless and dependent daughter of Daniel F. Yarnell, late of Company C, Sixteenth Regiment, and Company A, One hundred and fourteenth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Susan Hixson, widow of David Hixson, late of Company D, Seventy-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Alice May Lewis, helpless and dependent daughter of Charles M. Lewis, late of the United States Marine Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month through a duly appointed guardian.

The name of Jessie A. Haynes, former widow of John S. McIntyre, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Jennie J. Brown, widow of James Brown, late of Company D, Eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Adaline Peak, widow of Albert Peak, late of Company A, Seventeenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month.

The name of Georgiana Atkinson, widow of Charles R. Atkinson, late of Company C, Ninety-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month, and pay her the soldier's accrued pension.

The name of Martha J. Holden, widow of Richard Holden, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Alice J. Goebel, widow of Christian H. Goebel, late of Company D, Seventy-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Edith H. Arnold, widow of James L. Arnold, late of Company E, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Burket, widow of Joseph Burket, late of Company E, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Daniel Burket, helpless and dependent son of said Elizabeth and Joseph Burket, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Elizabeth Burket, the name of said Daniel Burket shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Elizabeth Burket.

The name of Rhoda Beeler, widow of Henry Beeler, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ezra P. Pratt, helpless and dependent son of James P. Pratt, late of Company L, Third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Ella C. Wolfe, widow of Henry C. Wolfe, late of Company E, Twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Hannah B. Gibbs, widow of Joseph P. Gibbs, late of Company D, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her

a pension at the rate of \$35 per month and pay her the soldier's accrued pension.

The name of Lucinda Welch, former widow of Hartland L. Kellogg, late of Company F, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary P. Green, former widow of James R. Rice, late of Company B, Sixty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Myra Scranton, former widow of Charles Scranton, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Harriet Aymar, helpless and dependent daughter of Adolphus Aymar, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Alice V. Cook, widow of John R. Cook, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Rose A. Woods, widow of John H. Woods, late of Company E, Forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Matilda M. Howard, widow of James E. Howard, late of Company M, Second Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Thomas Skaggs, helpless and dependent son of James M. Skaggs, late of Company B, Sixty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Presima W. Plummer, widow of Henry C. Plummer, late of Company I, Forty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sadie L. Runyan, widow of Clay C. Runyan, late of Company D, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Delos Burke, late of Company D, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company L, Fourth Regiment New York Provisional Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month.

The name of Hulda J. Chapman, widow of Pleasant M. Chapman, late of Company A, Third Regiment East Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Martha J. Duddleson, widow of Albert L. Duddleson, late of Company A, One hundred and eighty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Smith, widow of John Smith, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Indiana Cavalry (One hundred and twenty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteers), and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Pearl Smith, helpless and dependent daughter of said Mary and John Smith, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary Smith, the name of said Pearl Smith shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary Smith.

The name of William A. Anderson, helpless and dependent son of Johnson Anderson, late of Company H, One hundred and tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Cora J. Cromwell, helpless and dependent daughter of George F. Cromwell, late of Company I, Thirty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary F. Douglas, former widow of George V. Wells, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Yeates, widow of David C. Yeates, alias David C. Cass, late of Company E, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Twenty-fourth Independent Battery Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of William Vollrath, alias William Walworth, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Benson, widow of Joel Benson, late of Company F, One hundred and eighty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month.

The name of Andrew Goddard, late of Companies M and H, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Carrie E. Brown, widow of Alvan A. Savage, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Samuel S. Coldwell, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month.

The name of Mary T. Tupper, widow of James T. Tupper, late captain of Engineers, United States Revenue-Cutter Service, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret Lloyd, widow of John Lloyd, late of Company 6, First Battalion New York Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennie Barker, widow of John Wesley Barker, late of Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of John Frederick Pellhauer, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month.

The name of James Wheeler, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marshall M. Sayre, late of Quartermaster Department, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary J. Herbert, widow of Peter Herbert, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Erastus A. Buck, late of Capt. Graham's company, Fourteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month.

The name of Annie B. Kenyon, former widow of George D. Woodward, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Carrie Hanks, helpless and dependent daughter of Joseph A. Hanks, late of Companies A and E, Twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Bessie B. Johnson, former widow of John N. Foster, late of Company G, Twenty-sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Abraham Hess, helpless and dependent son of Frederick D. Hess, late of Company A, Ninetieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Delia P. Smith, widow of Frank W. Smith, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Charles L. Kent, helpless and dependent son of Abraham Kent, late of Company D, Forty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Susan E. Lime, widow of Martin L. Lime, late of Company H, Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, Mechanics and Fusiliers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Richard E. Edwards, widow of William M. Edwards, late landsman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Anna Eschbach, helpless and dependent daughter of David A. Eschbach, late of Company F, Fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. McClelland, former widow of Samuel McClelland, late of Company B, Seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Susan Fackler, former widow of Alfred Weaver, late of Company I, Fortieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ella Williamson, helpless and dependent daughter of James H. Williamson, late of Company I, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Wessel, widow of Conrad Wessel, late of Company C, Twenty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lydia Ann Purviance, helpless and dependent daughter of Samuel Purviance, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Elizabeth Purviance, helpless and dependent daughter of said Lydia Ann and Samuel Purviance, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Lydia Ann Purviance, the name of said Elizabeth Purviance shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Lydia Ann Purviance.

The name of William Rosenbarger, helpless and dependent son of Philip Rosenbarger, late of Company A, Eighty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rosella King, widow of Albert King, late of Company C, Thirtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Helen Eugenie King, helpless and dependent daughter of said Rosella and Albert King, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Rosella King, the name of said Helen Eugenie King shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Rosella King.

The name of George M. Mitchell, helpless and dependent son of Benjamin T. Mitchell, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Muhleder, helpless and dependent daughter of Leonhard Muhleder, late of Battery E, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Sarah Ella Weidner, helpless and dependent daughter of James F. Weidner, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Companies E and K, Seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Theresa Bruner, former widow of Harvy Reddick, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Malinda Nulph, widow of James O. Nulph, late of Company H, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and the Thirty-fourth Company, Second Battalion Pennsylvania Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Eunice A. Smith, widow of Frederick R. Smith, late commander, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Patrick Hughes, alias Patrick Keagan, late of Company F, Thirty-fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Carrie Lourenia Briney, helpless and dependent daughter of Simon P. Briney, late of Company G, One hundred and first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Carrie M. Booher, helpless and dependent daughter of Joshua M. Booher, late of Company K, Two hundred and second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. Farrar, widow of Charles A. Farrar, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elmina Dutcher, widow of Charles H. Dutcher, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Maria T. Smyth, widow of Wayland R. Smyth, late of Company A, Forty-third Regiment Massachusetts Militia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Austin, widow of Eli Austin, late of Company H, One hundred and first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Carl L.

Austin, helpless and dependent son of said Mary A. and Eli Austin, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary A. Austin the name of said Carl L. Austin shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary A. Austin.

The name of Mary L. Sterling, widow of Charles D. Sterling, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-first Regiment, and Company H, Fifty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month.

The name of Mary S. Davis, widow of Marquis D. Davis, late of Company B, Eighty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Bain, widow of John Bain, late of Company A, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Claud I. Bain, helpless and dependent son of said Mary E. and John Bain, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary E. Bain, the name of said Claud I. Bain shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary E. Bain.

The name of Della Williams, widow of Rancellaer J. Williams, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and of band, Second Brigade, Third Division, Sixth Army Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Eugene Williams, helpless and dependent son of said Della and Rancellaer J. Williams, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Della Williams, the name of said Eugene Williams shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Della Williams.

The name of Edwin E. Chick, helpless and dependent son of Sylvester T. Chick, late of Company K, One hundred and seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Mary Field, former widow of Zumette Couchay, late of Company F, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment, and Company E, Ninety-sixth Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah O. German, former widow of Joseph C. Fry, late of Company A, Fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lena Griswold, helpless and dependent daughter of Oscar C. Griswold, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Joanna L. Dixon, helpless and dependent daughter of Barton S. Dixon, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Stapleton, helpless and dependent daughter of Isaac Stapleton, late of Company F, Nineteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month through a duly appointed guardian.

The name of James S. Henry, helpless and dependent son of Samuel B. Henry, late of Company A, Thirty-fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna Gottwald, widow of Herman Gottwald, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month.

The name of Mary E. Snyder, former widow of Simon A. Snyder, late of Company K, Eighty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Kate Young, widow of Alexander Young, late of Company H, Nineteenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of David F. Benson, alias John Bliss, late of Company D, Thirty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ruth C. Peterson, widow of Halvor Peterson, alias Nicholas H. Paulson, late of Company H, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Cavalry, and Company D, Third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Philo L. Kelsey, helpless and dependent son of Philo Kelsey, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Ella G. Burt, former widow of Charles F. Grenell, late of Company C, One hundred and eighty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret Smallwood, helpless and dependent daughter of James I. Smallwood, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment, and Company I, Forty-seventh Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Charlotte F. Perrin, widow of Frank Perrin, late of Company H, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lennie Anne Shunk, helpless and dependent daughter of George Shunk, late of Company D, Fifty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara A. Collins, widow of Henry P. Collins, late of Company L, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry Gregg, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment, and Company K, Eighth Regiment, Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Lynch, helpless and dependent son of William W. Lynch, Jr., late of Companies L and D, Ninth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Martha McFarland, former widow of David H. Thacker, late of Company M, Ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of William S. Denius, helpless and dependent son of Charles E. Denius, late of Company D, One hundred and eighty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Emma B. Showalter, helpless and dependent daughter of James H. Showalter, late of Company F, Seventeenth Regiment, and Company C, Forty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annette J. Shipley, widow of Everhart Shipley, late of Company F, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Provisional Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$65 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Catherine Shipley, helpless and dependent daughter of said Annette J. and Everhart Shipley, \$20 of the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary Shipley, helpless and dependent daughter of said Annette J. and Everhart Shipley, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Annette J. Shipley the names of said Catherine Shipley and Mary Shipley shall each be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Annette J. Shipley.

The name of Edwin M. Brainard, late private unassigned, Twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Jonathan W. Watts, late of Company K, Eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company B, Two hundred and eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Emma Lucinda Davidson, helpless and dependent daughter of David Davidson, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Ruth A. Burris, former widow of Stinson H. Burris, late of Company G, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ruth Ann Porter, dependent sister of George H. Porter, late of Company D, Third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rufus C. Williams, helpless and dependent son of Joseph Williams, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Millie Kennedy, widow of John Kennedy, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Etta Hall, widow of Peter A. Hall, alias William Conley, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Nannie L. Baker, former widow of James M. Price, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lucy Whitmore, now Whitmore, former widow of Henry Whitmore, late of Company H, Ninetieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Albina Van Meter Pearse, helpless and dependent daughter of John Van Pearse, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Malinda R. Cranmer, widow of Alfred S. Cranmer, late of Company G, Twenty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, First Regiment New York Veteran Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Charles Cranmer, helpless and dependent son of said Malinda R. and Alfred S. Cranmer, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Malinda R. Cranmer, the name of said Charles Cranmer shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Malinda R. Cranmer.

The name of George W. Dille, late private, unassigned, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harriet M. O. Williams, widow of John F. Williams, late colonel Ninth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William Martin, helpless and dependent son of Clay Martin, late of Company B, First Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Rebecca Greenawalt, widow of Jacob W. Greenawalt, late lieutenant colonel One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucinda Rickards, widow of John D. Rickards, late of Company A, Sixty-ninth Regiment Missouri Enrolled Volunteer Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Cole, late of Company D, Twenty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Militia, and first-class fireman, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Clara C. Biernbaumer, former widow of Edward Wilhelm, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary L. Point, former widow of Chancey A. Brown, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Cornelia K. Smith, former widow of John W. Davey, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary C. Brandyberry, widow of Jesse Brandyberry, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah R. Gibson, widow of George A. Gibson, late deputy provost marshal, fifth Ohio district, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Martha A. Burdick, widow of William H. Burdick, late of Company H, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Emma Piles, widow of John W. Piles, late of Company D, Second Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Ann McLaughlin, widow of John P. McLaughlin, late of Company C, Ninety-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Earl Kelley, helpless and dependent son of Jerome Kelley, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sullivan W. Buck, late of Company E, One hundred and thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Estella Rearick, helpless and dependent daughter of Joseph W. Rearick, late of Company K, One hundred and sixty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Caroline Leasure, widow of William H. Leasure, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month.

The name of Samuel T. Haynes, helpless and dependent son of Sheldon H. Haynes, late of Company I, Second Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Myron H. McMullen, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment, and Company C, Fifty-second Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Caroline Strobel, widow of Jacob Strobel, late of Battery A, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of William Strobel, helpless and dependent son of said Caroline and Jacob Strobel, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Caroline Strobel, the name of said William Strobel shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Caroline Strobel.

The name of Duracy E. Ash, former widow of George W. Durand, alias George W. Porter, late of Company H, One hundred and eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Persilla Plummer, widow of Amos Plummer, late of Company H, Thirty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Albrow, widow of James S. Albrow, late of Company M, Eleventh Regiment, and Company M, Eighth Regiment, Michigan, Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Maria Hadden, widow of William J. Hadden, late of Company G, Fifty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nellie G. Burrus, helpless and dependent daughter of John W. Burrus, late of Company B, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Holton, widow of Noble Holton, late of Company B, Fifty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriet C. Garber, widow of John H. Garber, late of Company C, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and the soldier's accrued pension.

The name of Anna E. Thomas, widow of George W. Thomas, late of Company G, One hundred and second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thomas B. McClane, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna E. Headland, former widow of Jeremiah W. Brinkley, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ida Stanley, helpless and dependent daughter of William H. Stanley, late of Company A, Sixty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Gustave C. Wernecke, helpless and dependent son of Henry Wernecke, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment United States Reserve Corps, Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Mary L. Helm, widow of William Helm, late of Company H, One hundred and fourteenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Rebecca Reinbold, former widow of Peter Getz, late of Company A, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Alice Hingson, widow of Thomas J. Hingson, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, with \$2 per month additional to each of four minor children of soldier whose names are now on pension roll, to date each attains the age of 16 years.

The name of Martha A. Harris, widow of James H. Harris, late of Company I, Fortieth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cora Gurley, helpless and dependent daughter of William T. Gurley, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Provisional En-

rolled Missouri Volunteer Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving through a duly appointed guardian.

The name of Elizabeth C. Martin, widow of George W. Martin, late of Company E, Nineteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry Ellis, late seaman, United States ship *Nyack*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Minnie E. Cook, helpless and dependent daughter of William H. Cook, late of Company B, One hundred and eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Sallie Justis, widow of Lewis Justis, late of Company C, Thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eleanor Young, widow of William C. Young, late of Company H, Twenty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month.

The name of Edward F. Davis, late of Company A, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Michel, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving, with no deductions on account of any former alleged erroneous payments of pension.

The name of Jane Letcher, widow of Benjamin Letcher, late assistant surgeon, Thirty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles Herbst, helpless and dependent son of Michael Herbst, late of Companies I and G, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Engineers of the West, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of William F. Cummins, helpless and dependent son of Vincent Cummins, late of Company H, Seventy-second Regiment Enrolled Missouri Volunteer Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Laura A. McCormick, widow of James T. McCormick, late of Company C, Sixty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, One hundred and sixtieth Regiment Ohio National Guard, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. Carey, widow of Benjamin Carey, late of Company B, One hundred and seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Hiram Strayer, by guardian, Kate E. Sauer, helpless and dependent son of Hiram Strayer, late of Company C, One hundred and seventy-third Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret T. Rust, widow of Charles A. Rust, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Eighteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Esther Adele Williams, helpless and dependent daughter of Francis Williams, late of Company B, One hundred and sixty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Venning, widow of Henry Venning, late of Company C, Seventy-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rebecca Ann Bradshaw, helpless and dependent daughter of Thomas W. Bradshaw, late of Company H, Sixty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Creighton Bradshaw, helpless and dependent son of Thomas W. Bradshaw, late of Company H, Sixty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of George R. Tuttle, helpless and dependent son of Edmund B. Tuttle, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Palmer, widow of Robert Palmer, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, One hundred and eighty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Lucy Palmer, helpless and dependent daughter of said Sarah E. and Robert Palmer, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Sarah E. Palmer the name of said Lucy Palmer shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Sarah E. Palmer.

The name of Betty White, widow of Alonzo White, who was pensioned as Andrew White, late of Company K, First Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Josephine Bennett, widow of Alva Bennett, late of Company D, One hundred and seventy-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucinda Davis, widow of Reuben A. Davis, late lieutenant colonel Eleventh Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jessie F. Harris, helpless and dependent daughter of Thomas S. Harris, late of Company C, Third Battalion Eighteenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Bertha E. Jones, helpless and dependent daughter of Edwin Jones, late of the Third Battery, Vermont Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Amanda M. Selleck, former widow of Harrison Cary, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth A. Whitehurst, widow of Ransford R. Whitehurst, late musician, band, First Brigade, Fourth Division, Sixteenth Army Corps, and First Brigade, First Division, Seventeenth Army Corps, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$85 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara H. Farnsworth, widow of John A. Farnsworth, late of Company H, Thirty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Norah E. Billstein, widow of Marcus Billstein, late of Company A, Fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Maria S. Newman, widow of William H. Newman, late surgeon, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Matilda K. Baldwin, former widow of Norman King, late of Company C, Twenty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month.

The name of Abbie J. Geuthner, helpless and dependent daughter of Isaiah Geuthner, late of Battery 3, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Light Artillery, and Company G, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Melissa Groves, widow of Daniel T. Groves, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment, and Company A, Second Regiment, Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Arminia Lary, helpless and dependent daughter of James M. Lary, late of Company F, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Effie M. Stradley, helpless and dependent daughter of Samuel Stradley, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Mary McNally, widow of Patrick McNally, late major Second Regiment Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Letitia R. Whitehouse, widow of James L. Whitehouse, late of Company D, Ninety-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martin Hunt, late of Company D, Twenty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of James Flanagan, alias James Fitzgerald, late of Company I, Forty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and coal heaver, U. S. S. *North Carolina*, *Shamrock*, *Louisiana*, and *Tacony*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Agnes Crawford, helpless and dependent daughter of George W. Crawford, late of Company B, Ninety-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Twelfth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Rebecca G. Foot, widow of Patrick M. Foot, late of Company A, Eighteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Sarah Jane Foot, helpless and dependent daughter of said Rebecca G. and Patrick M. Foot, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Rebecca G. Foot the name of said Sarah Jane Foot shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Rebecca G. Foot.

The name of Patient Wilder, widow of Nel Wilder, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Eleventh Regiment, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Henrietta Fowler, former widow of Joseph R. B. Tait, alias Joseph Tait, late of Captain King's company, District of Columbia Militia, later Sixth Battalion, District of Columbia Volunteer Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Zanle Trent, widow of Madison T. Trent, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment, and Company E, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary M. Frantz, former widow of Peter Gimer, late of Company E, Fifty-third Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month.

The name of Mary B. Houk, widow of Leonidas C. Houk, late colonel Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria Rice, widow of Richard Rice, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The foregoing bill was a substitute for the following House bills referred to the said committee:

H. R. 820. George W. McDonald.	H. R. 8139. Mary E. Yapple.
H. R. 1008. Richard R. Hill.	H. R. 8457. Samuel C. Whitwam.
H. R. 1729. Sarah J. Latta.	H. R. 8460. Alice Yarnell.
H. R. 1770. Alwilda Smith.	H. R. 8594. Susan Hixson.
H. R. 1809. Joseph S. Morton.	H. R. 8634. Alice May Lewis.
H. R. 1840. Margaret E. Leonard.	H. R. 9002. Jessie A. Haynes.
H. R. 2808. Mary A. Brace.	H. R. 9243. Jennie J. Brown.
H. R. 3236. Henrietta I. Machenheimer.	H. R. 9589. Adaline Peak.
H. R. 3557. Sarah Amerine.	H. R. 9704. Georgiava Atkinson.
H. R. 4314. Malinda A. Robinson.	H. R. 9712. Martha J. Holden.
H. R. 5236. Eliza Frederick.	H. R. 9845. Alice J. Goebel.
H. R. 5454. Isaac D. Caldwell.	H. R. 10096. Edith H. Arnold.
H. R. 5795. Magdalena O. Shanks.	H. R. 10282. Elizabeth Burket.
H. R. 6082. Sarah E. Ingham.	H. R. 10304. Rhoda Beeler.
H. R. 6187. Ellen W. Carpenter.	H. R. 10353. Ezra P. Pratt.
H. R. 6205. Olive K. Jeffries.	H. R. 10488. Ella C. Wolfe.
H. R. 6527. Josephine J. Teeter.	H. R. 10549. Hannah B. Gibbs.
H. R. 6899. Minnie K. Martin.	H. R. 10604. Lucinda Welch.
H. R. 7149. William S. Beachum.	H. R. 10800. Mary F. Green.
H. R. 7214. Mary Manning.	H. R. 10819. Myra Seranton.
H. R. 7324. Julia A. Marcum.	H. R. 10868. Harriet Aymar.
H. R. 7378. Hattie Lameroux.	H. R. 10912. Alice V. Cook.
H. R. 7736. Elizabeth Freeman.	H. R. 10976. Rose A. Woods.
	H. R. 11072. Matilda M. Howard.

H. R. 11143. Thomas Skaggs.	H. R. 12767. Albina Van Meter.
H. R. 11164. Presima W. Plummer.	H. R. 12804. Malinda R. Cranmer.
H. R. 11217. Sadie L. Runyan.	H. R. 12834. George W. Dille.
H. R. 11250. Delos Burke.	H. R. 12835. Harriet M. O. Williams.
H. R. 11267. Hulda J. Chapman.	H. R. 12839. William Martin.
H. R. 11324. Martha J. Duddleson.	H. R. 12841. Rebecca Greenawalt.
H. R. 11478. Mary Smith.	H. R. 12874. Lucinda Richards.
H. R. 11511. William A. Anderson.	H. R. 12882. Charles W. Cole.
H. R. 11513. Cora J. Cromwell.	H. R. 12919. Clara C. Biernbaumer.
H. R. 11565. Mary F. Douglas.	H. R. 12920. Mary L. Point.
H. R. 11567. Elizabeth Yeates.	H. R. 12930. Cornelia K. Smith.
H. R. 11588. William Vollrath, alias William Walworth.	H. R. 12937. Mary C. Brandyberry.
H. R. 11592. Mary Benson.	H. R. 12939. Sarah R. Gibson.
H. R. 11628. Andrew Goddard.	H. R. 12944. Martha A. Burdick.
H. R. 11646. Carrie E. Brown.	H. R. 12964. Emma Piles.
H. R. 11712. Samuel S. Coldwell.	H. R. 12968. Mary Ann McLaughlin.
H. R. 11765. Mary T. Tupper.	H. R. 12983. Earl Kelley.
H. R. 11793. Margaret Lloyd.	H. R. 12985. Sullivan W. Buck.
H. R. 11819. Jennie Barker.	H. R. 12991. Estella Rearick.
H. R. 11825. John Frederick Fella-hauer.	H. R. 12992. Caroline Leasure.
H. R. 11833. James Wheeler.	H. R. 12993. Samuel T. Haynes.
H. R. 11853. Marshall M. Sayre.	H. R. 12999. Myron H. McMullen.
H. R. 11901. Mary J. Herbert.	H. R. 13008. Caroline Strobel.
H. R. 11993. Erastus A. Buck.	H. R. 13011. Duracy E. Ash.
H. R. 11907. Annie B. Kenyon.	H. R. 13018. Persillia Plummer.
H. R. 11912. Carrie Hanks.	H. R. 13021. Mary E. Albro.
H. R. 11941. Bessie B. Johnson.	H. R. 13022. Maria Hadden.
H. R. 11943. Abraham Hess.	H. R. 13061. Nellie G. Burrus.
H. R. 11968. Delia P. Smith.	H. R. 13067. Sarah E. Holton.
H. R. 12020. Charles L. Kent.	H. R. 13070. Harriet C. Garber.
H. R. 12048. Susan E. Lime.	H. R. 13075. Anna E. Thomas.
H. R. 12050. Rachel E. Edwards.	H. R. 13077. Thomas B. McClane.
H. R. 12051. Anna Eschbach.	H. R. 13086. Anna E. Headland.
H. R. 12061. Mary A. McClelland.	H. R. 13087. Ida Stanley.
H. R. 12073. Susan Fackler.	H. R. 13103. Gustave C. Wernecke.
H. R. 12074. Ella Williamson.	H. R. 13112. Mary L. Helm.
H. R. 12086. Mary Wessel.	H. R. 13113. Rebecca Reinhold.
H. R. 12117. Lydia Ann Purviance.	H. R. 13114. Alice Hingson.
H. R. 12138. William Rosenberger.	H. R. 13121. Martha A. Harris.
H. R. 12150. Rosella King.	H. R. 13123. Cora Gurley.
H. R. 12152. George M. Mitchell.	H. R. 13126. Elizabeth C. Martin.
H. R. 12169. Mary Muhleder.	H. R. 13131. Henry Ellis.
H. R. 12182. Sarah Ella Weldner.	H. R. 13145. Minnie E. Cook.
H. R. 12183. Theresa Bruner.	H. R. 13151. Sallie Justis.
H. R. 12184. Malinda Nulph.	H. R. 13163. Elenor Young.
H. R. 12215. Eunice A. Smith.	H. R. 13169. Edward F. Davis.
H. R. 12216. Patrick Hughes, alias Patrick Keagan.	H. R. 13210. Peter Michel.
H. R. 12232. Carrie Lourenia Briney.	H. R. 13218. Jane Letcher.
H. R. 12279. Carrie M. Booher.	H. R. 13240. Charles Herbst.
H. R. 12285. Mary L. Farrar.	H. R. 13241. William F. Cummins.
H. R. 12286. Elmina Dutcher.	H. R. 13282. Laura A. McCormick.
H. R. 12291. Maria T. Smyth.	H. R. 13285. Mary I. Carey.
H. R. 12338. Mary A. Austin.	H. R. 13286. Hiram Strayer, by guardian, Kate E. Sauer.
H. R. 12381. Mary L. Sterling.	H. R. 13299. Margaret T. Rust.
H. R. 12383. Mary S. Davis.	H. R. 13318. Esther Adele Williams.
H. R. 12400. Mary E. Bain.	H. R. 13321. Elizabeth Venning.
H. R. 12402. Delia Williams.	H. R. 13322. Rebecca Ann Bradshaw.
H. R. 12403. Edwin E. Chick.	H. R. 13323. Creighton Bradshaw.
H. R. 12422. Mary Field.	H. R. 13349. George R. Tuttle.
H. R. 12439. Sarah O. German.	H. R. 13362. Sarah E. Palmer.
H. R. 12445. Lena Griswold.	H. R. 13363. Betty White.
H. R. 12452. Joanna L. Dixon.	H. R. 13371. Josephine Bennett.
H. R. 12455. Sarah J. Stapleton.	H. R. 13373. Lucinda Davis.
H. R. 12468. James S. Henry.	H. R. 13377. Jessie F. Harris.
H. R. 12491. Anna Gottwald.	H. R. 13382. Bertha E. Jones.
H. R. 12514. Mary E. Snyder.	H. R. 13383. Amanda M. Selleck.
H. R. 12525. Kate Young.	H. R. 13394. Elizabeth A. Whitehurst.
H. R. 12542. David F. Benson, alias John Bliss.	H. R. 13413. Clara H. Farnsworth.
H. R. 12544. Ruth C. Peterson.	H. R. 13440. Nora E. Billstein.
H. R. 12545. Philo L. Kelsey.	H. R. 13444. Maria S. Newman.
H. R. 12546. Ella G. Burt.	H. R. 13491. Matilda K. Baldwin.
H. R. 12561. Margaret Smallwood.	H. R. 13513. Abbie J. Geuthner.
H. R. 12567. Charlotte F. Perrin.	H. R. 13520. Melissa Groves.
H. R. 12568. Lennie Anne Shunk.	H. R. 13543. Arminia Lary.
H. R. 12569. Clara A. Collins.	H. R. 13584. Effie M. Stradley.
H. R. 12576. Henry Gregg.	H. R. 13603. Mary McNally.
H. R. 12577. James Lynch.	H. R. 13632. Letitia R. Whitehouse.
H. R. 12583. Martha McFarland.	H. R. 13687. Martin Hunt.
H. R. 12584. William S. Denius.	H. R. 13691. James Flanagan, alias James Fitzgerald.
H. R. 12612. Emma B. Showalter.	H. R. 13694. Agnes Crawford.
H. R. 12620. Annette J. Shipley.	H. R. 13740. Rebecca G. Foot.
H. R. 12624. Edwin M. Brainard.	H. R. 13796. Petient Wilder.
H. R. 12639. Jonathan W. Watts.	H. R. 13834. Henrietta Fowler.
H. R. 12644. Emma Lucinda Davidson.	H. R. 13844. Zanle Trent.
H. R. 12668. Ruth A. Burris.	H. R. 13857. Mary M. Frantz.
H. R. 12686. Ruth Ann Porter.	H. R. 13868. Mary B. Houk.
H. R. 12702. Rufus C. Williams.	H. R. 14668. Maria Rice.
H. R. 12719. Millie Kennedy.	
H. R. 12730. Etta Hall.	
H. R. 12737. Nannie L. Baker.	
H. R. 12765. Lucy Whitmore.	

During the reading the following occurred:

The SPEAKER. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois that on page 42, line 4, there seems to be a word lacking, giving the number of the regiment.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. I ask unanimous consent that we may return to that paragraph.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to return to the paragraph mentioned at the completion of the reading of the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend, on page 42, line 4, pension of Abbie J. Geuthner, by striking out "Battery 3" and inserting in lieu thereof "Third Battery Maine Light Artillery," so that it will read, in lines 4 and 5:

Late of the Third Battery Maine Light Artillery.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Page 42, line 4, strike out "Battery 3, Regiment Maine Volunteer," and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Third Battery Maine Light Artillery."

Mr. CANNON. Will my friend allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I am always for the bills the gentleman's committee reports, but does not the general legislation do better by these people than the special bill?

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. This bill is supposed to include only those that are not covered by the general bill that became a law on the 1st day of May.

Mr. CANNON. Are there many exceptions?

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. There are quite a number that are not covered.

Mr. CANNON. And as to those who would get more under the general law, they could not get this in addition?

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. We have undertaken to strike out the names of those who will get an increase under the general law that we passed recently and which became the law on the 1st day of May.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Speaker, on page 34, line 10, there is a pension allowed to Thomas B. McClane of \$30 per month. Thomas B. McClane at the present time is on the pension roll and is a veteran of the Civil War. The general bill which we passed had a provision in it in which it said that all those upon the roll at that time as veterans of the Civil War should have a pension of \$50 a month.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. This should be stricken out then.

Mr. CANDLER. He is already on the roll at the present time.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend, on page 34—

The SPEAKER. The other amendment is not yet agreed to. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, I would like to discuss the first amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is recognized.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he is sure that in the Pension Bureau there has been any official recognition given to such an organization as the Third Battery of Maine Light Artillery? There may have been more than one regiment having three batteries of light artillery.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. That is the description given in the proof before the committee, and the examiner is supposed to examine the files from the Pension Bureau, and I presume that designation in the report is given correctly.

Mr. WALSH. How does it then appear so in the bill?

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. That is evidently a misprint.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman is sure that this will give rise to no complication? It is not customary to so describe it.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. I suppose from the report of the examiner that he gave the correct designation.

Mr. WALSH. It is rather an unusual designation.

Mr. CANDLER. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois another question: I think under the general bill the case of Thomas B. McClane would be covered. There may be some question about it. He was on the rolls under a special bill passed by Congress that placed him on the roll.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. There is no question but that, under the ruling of the Pension Bureau, if he is on the rolls he is covered by the general bill.

Mr. CANDLER. He is on the rolls at the present time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois wish to return to page 34?

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to return to page 34 to offer an amendment. Is there any objection to returning?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the motion is to strike out, on page 34, lines 10, 11, 12, and 13.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULLER of Illinois: On page 34, strike out lines 10 to 13, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

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

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

On motion of Mr. FULLER of Illinois, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ARMY TENTS FOR STATE ENCAMPMENT, BLOOMINGTON, IND.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House joint resolution 354.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of House joint resolution 354, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 354) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to Paul E. Slocumb Post, No. 85, Grand Army of the Republic, Bloomington, Ind., necessary tents, cots, mattresses, pillows, and blankets for use at the State encampment to be held at said city May 25, 26, and 27, 1920.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. What is the post that the gentleman refers to?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. That is the Grand Army Post of Bloomington, Ind.

Mr. GARD. It is for an encampment of the Grand Army of the State of Indiana?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what are the provisions of this bill, and whether the Treasury is guarded, as is usual in bills of this character. I would like to know the nature of it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have examined this bill, and I find it saves the Government from any expense whatever.

Mr. GARNER. Very well.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to loan, in his discretion, to the Paul E. Slocumb Post, No. 85, Grand Army of the Republic, Bloomington, Ind., the State encampment to be held at Bloomington, Ind., May 25, 26, and 27, 1920, the necessary tents, cots, mattresses, pillows, and blankets, as may be agreed upon by said post and the War Department: *Provided*, That no expense shall be caused the United States Government by the delivery and return of said property, the same to be delivered to the commander of said Paul E. Slocumb Post at such time as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of War and the commander of said post: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War, before delivering said equipment, shall take from the commander of said post a good and sufficient security for the safe return of said property in good order and condition, and the whole to be without expense to the United States Government.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 1, line 8, strike out the words "mattresses, pillows."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the resolution as amended.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended to accord with the text.

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. BLAND of Indiana, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. PORTER, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported for printing, under the rule, the conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 11960) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Dudley, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11927) to increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Coast Guard through the temporary provision of bonuses or increased compensation.

SECTION 32 OF THE FARM LOAN ACT.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas submits a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to which was referred House resolution 553, providing for the consideration of House joint resolution 351, having considered the same, beg to report in lieu thereof the following substitute and recommend that it be adopted:

"Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House joint resolution 351, extending the provisions of the act amending section 32 of the Federal farm loan act to June 30, 1921; that there shall be not to exceed one hour's debate, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] and one-half by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHELAN]; that at the conclusion of the general debate the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule, and at the conclusion of such reading the committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House, together with amendments, if any, whereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommitt."

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be amended so that the name of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] be substituted for that of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHELAN] in the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to substitute the name of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] for that of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHELAN]. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, does this take care of anybody who is opposed to the resolution, if there is opposition to it?

Mr. WINGO. There will not be any trouble about that. One gentleman wants to offer an amendment, but we will be in Committee of the Whole, and there will be no effort to cut off that gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. In offering the amendment there could not be any way to cut him off, but suppose the gentleman needed time in general debate?

Mr. WINGO. There will be no question about that. There is one gentleman who has been given the assurance that he will be cared for.

Mr. MADDEN. There may be others. I want to reserve the right to object, because I am not at all sure that I am going to be for this resolution, or for the bill when it is reported.

Mr. WINGO. If it is going to take up any time, I suggest to the gentleman that he withdraw his request.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I withdraw my request in order to save time.

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. There is nothing to object to. I withdraw the request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. MADDEN. But if I may be permitted—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Does the gentleman want some time on the rule?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I just want to ask a question.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. All right.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to know whether all the time is going to be allotted to those in favor of the bill when the bill is up for consideration, or whether those who may be opposed to it are going to have any consideration whatever. This seems to allot the time to those who are in favor of the bill and to take no account of those who are opposed to it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The report that came to the Committee on Rules was that the bill was unanimously reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MADDEN. But that does not bind other Members of the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. And the resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on Rules. One Member of the House has indicated a desire to offer an amendment, and he is protected under the rule.

Mr. MADDEN. There may be others.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KING. I do not know whether I caught the full import of this, but it seems as though the Committee on Banking and Currency—without criticizing those gentlemen—are frequently before the Rules Committee asking for rules, and when they do get a rule it always divides the time among those who favor the proposition. So far as I am concerned, I am for the proposition contained in this joint resolution and voted for it, but I know that there are Members in this House

who probably will want to question the advisability of passing this resolution. Many of them have spoken to me, and they may want time. It seems to me that it is a bad practice to bring in a resolution limiting the discussion to the affirmative side of a bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. This does not limit the discussion to the affirmative side of the bill. The rule makes no provision whatever for that, and the practice of the House has always been to divide the time between those for and those against the proposition.

Mr. KING. Both the gentlemen who are to monopolize the control of the time under this resolution are for the joint resolution.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Is the gentleman for or against the joint resolution?

Mr. KING. I am for it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is what everybody says. Then why this talk? Everybody is for the joint resolution. Why raise a moot question on a matter of this kind?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this kind of a squabble comes up nearly every time that we have a bill up and try to divide the time. The gentleman from Arkansas, I know, will be perfectly willing to give some of his time to gentlemen opposed to the bill. Now, I want to ask the chairman, does this rule provide for amendment?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It does.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to say that the Committee on Rules is improving.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I do not recollect of bringing in a rule for a long time that prohibited amendment. This rule provides for amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Is it to be considered in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. And the five-minute rule will prevail?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes; the five-minute rule will prevail. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, when this measure was up before the House in 1918 I voted against it. I interrupted Mr. GLASS, who had charge of it, to ask him whether he was in favor of this sort of legislation and he said he was not except in an emergency. I asked him whether he expected that this would become permanent after the emergency had passed and we would be called upon to continue it. He said no, that would not be the case.

This resolution now before the House is on its face not to make it permanent, since it is still considered as an emergency and is to carry the emergency until the clarification by the Supreme Court decision has been made. Consequently I am still in the same position I was in when it was up before.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. As I understand, this only carries the emergency until the 1st of next March.

Mr. FESS. That is all.

Mr. MORGAN. I thought the gentleman said until the emergency passes.

Mr. FESS. It is still an emergency measure and not permanent law. I did not resist it in the Committee on Rules because it had been recommended and represented by those who appeared as being necessary, owing to the court decision which can not come in the immediate future.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Is it not a fact that the Treasury already has \$136,000,000 in these bonds which they have purchased?

Mr. FESS. I understand that is the case.

Mr. MADDEN. And notwithstanding the advance information they had as to what the Supreme Court is to do, they still incur obligations that create this condition.

Mr. FESS. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of Congress to the policy of the Federal Reserve Board. I want the attention of Members of the House, as I regard this quite a serious situation too often overlooked by the country. We passed the Federal reserve act for which I voted in 1913, but at the time there were certain fears that we entertained which we thought might materialize. One of the fears was the inflation that was made possible in the system. Some of us called attention to that feature. They claimed that the inflation would be saved by virtue of the requirements of the reserve which was fixed in gold and in sufficient amount to guard against undue expansion. Twice since the war began we have amended this bill making greater freedom in the use

of the reserve, cutting down the amount necessary, until it permits a paper basis which is already dangerously close to realization.

I have noticed that there has been a gradual reduction of the reserve requirement in the administration of the law, and if you note these figures from the central reserve city banks you will see what that reduction has been. The reduction has been from 25 per cent to 4.18 per cent in the central reserve city banks, and from 15.6 to 3.34 in the reserve city banks, and from 7.4 to 2.5 in the country banks. That is a gradual reduction under the operation of the amendment of the reserve requirement which is significant of the dangers of inflation and loss of purchasing power.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman is talking about one set of banks and we are legislating for another.

Mr. FESS. I am talking about what the requirements of the Federal Reserve System permits and the actual practice. There has been an enlarged capacity under the administration of the law for the expansion of credit, and this country, under the stress of war, always suggesting inflation of the credit system, has kept pace with the countries of Europe on the expansion of credit. Let me cite you some figures: The cash reserve has declined from 1913 to 1920 over 40 per cent. The reserve notes which have taken place of the circulating medium, much of it either coin, metal, or its equivalent, have increased in a tremendous volume.

Let me give you briefly the figures of the Treasury: For example, take the gold certificate. In 1913 the amount was \$994,000,000, or 29.7 per cent of our circulation. The amount in 1920, March 1, was \$387,000,000, or 6½ per cent, less than a fourth of what it was seven years ago.

Silver certificates from \$461,000,000, which is 13.8 per cent, to \$128,000,000, which is but 2.1 per cent.

United States notes or greenbacks from \$339,000,000 in 1913 to \$328,000,000 in 1920. National bank notes, from \$711,000,000, which is 21.3 per cent, to \$657,000,000, which is 11 per cent. Federal Reserve notes, in 1913, nothing, naturally, but in March, 1920, \$2,999,700,000, or 50 per cent. On the first of this present month it was \$3,065,935,013. Take the total circulation in 1913, and it amounted to \$3,343,000,000, while in March of this year the total circulation was \$5,999,000,000, which would be a per capita circulation, if you count 100,000,000 population, of something like \$59, while prior to the war, in 1913, when we adopted the reserve system, it was but \$34. The stock of money amounts to \$7,755,953,906, or about \$77 per capita. Note again the gold-reserve problem. Owing to the balance of trade prior to our entering the war being in our favor by many billions, we had an increase of gold shipments from Europe of over \$1,109,000,000, making the largest collection of gold of any country on earth, which amounted in all to over \$3,000,000,000. The increase was from our fund of \$1,887,000,000 to \$3,089,000,000. With that amount of gold here, a great proportion of it brought here during the war and kept here under an embargo in order to prevent its flowing back to Europe, we have enormously increased our reserve possibilities, which have stimulated the board to enlarge our circulation of Federal reserve notes until we have a paper circulation of over \$30 per capita if we call our population 100,000,000. This gold fund is bound to be depleted, and I want to know what is to be the outcome of the reserve upon which this tremendously expanded paper money has been issued here in our own Government. We can not definitely insure against the inevitable depletion. Our stock of gold of \$3,080,000,000 at the time of the armistice decreased to \$2,721,000,000 by March 1, 1920.

We can not hope to hold this stock upon which this vast circulation has been constructed. With the loss of gold in the process of trade, what will be the effect upon the stupendous circulation? If not reduced, the gold standard is gone; if reduced, it must be in obedience to the demands of contraction, which is always a delicate problem.

During the war the necessity of floating billions of Government obligations, such as bonds, invited, if not demanded, a campaign of Government borrowing, in which the entire Nation joined. The whole country became a loaning propaganda. Patriotism was appealed to, loyalty was enlisted, and every passion was resorted to for the sale of bonds. They were presented as the very best securities upon the basis of profitable investment. The buyer was induced to go to the bank, borrow the money with which to buy bonds as a national duty. The banks were expected to loan the money at the rate allowed on the bonds. Consequently, the country, or a good part of its people, instead of purchasing out of its savings, to deposit again as an investment to be held for future reward,

went to the banks, borrowed the funds, purchased the bonds, which were deposited with the banks as collateral security.

The banks could afford to do it if the Government allowed the money represented by the bonds to remain with the bank at a small rate of interest, which was done in many cases.

A procedure was allowed which served as a basis for issuing reserve notes released against the bonds held by the banks. The amendments to the act to reduce the reserve requirements were asked and granted in order to carry out this process. It will be seen that this procedure did not invite the buyer to take up his note to the bank, which operated as so much inflation. There was no inducement to save, but rather an invitation to continue expenditure until the country has entered upon a scale of extravagance never before experienced. We are plunging along totally unaware that the day of settlement must come in time. This policy can have but one effect, namely, an upward tendency of the price current. It is not an increase of value, but rather an increase of price. The very virtue of the Federal Reserve System is its greatest danger. It readily responds to the demands of expansion, but it will not respond to the requirement of contraction. We boast that there can be no money crisis under the Reserve System. That is based upon the statement that when money becomes tight we expand to the point of a liquefying of all our industrial wealth. In other words, the country's wealth may be put in circulation in the form of reserve notes, to be retired when the crisis is past.

We have noted the increase, but no decrease. Expansion is easy, contraction dangerous. Inflation comes without effort, deflation is the problem. The true measure of the necessity of increased circulation is the increase of business from 1914 to 1919. That increase for the country, measured in currency, was about 20 per cent, but, measured by bushels, yards, pounds, and so forth, it is only 10 per cent.

The latter would be a measure of the necessity of note increase. Instead of that we have an increase of 71 per cent, or seven times the real measure.

The inevitable result of this policy is the loss of purchasing power of our money. That is why we buy from 30 to 50 cents on the dollar. This has vastly increased the cost of war. All materials and labor must cost proportionately more. To-day the cost of government is four to five times what it was before the war. Labor demands higher wages to meet higher costs of living. If granted, the cost of living in that degree again goes up, and the wage earner gets more, but pays more and is not the gainer, while the salaried people, whose remuneration does not expand with the cost scale, find their salaries cut in two by virtue of the loss of purchasing power of an inflated measure of value.

The powers of the Federal Reserve Board are almost plenary over suspension of reserve requirements within a certain period of time, also to issue and retire reserve notes, also over suspension of any officer of the system, also over the rediscount of notes of reserve banks, to control the rates of discount, the power to control exchange, and to exercise general supervision over the banks within the system.

Hearings before the Rules Committee last week show the efforts to compel all banks to come within the system, where one group of men shall have complete power over the purse of the Nation. If this power should ever be abused, the fears of Jackson back in the thirties of the last century would be but a ripple compared with the current of fiscal power.

If prices are the result of control, the Federal Reserve Board has all the power men could demand. The men who are administering this law and who have permitted a policy of expansion until we are in danger of a paper basis must be sobered by the tremendous responsibility now upon them to take the proper steps to reach a normal status. Of all the explanations of the abnormal price current, the expanded credit due to the war and the expanded currency permitted by the Federal board has most to do with it.

Mr. Speaker, that is the explanation of your high cost level, and that is the greatest problem of the country to-day, and it is in the hands of the Federal Reserve Board, and it must be solved. Let us approach these emergency measures with caution. It is always dangerous to increase the ease for borrowing. Let us stimulate the habits of saving. Speculation is inviting, borrowing is common, but the best national trait, both for the individual and the Government, is produce and save. This is the real solution of our greatest problem.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] raises a very interesting question, but it has nothing to

do with the pending legislation, and to that I desire first to direct my attention. I call attention first to the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. He asks the question why it is that these banks and the Federal Land Bank Board, with the advance information as to what the Supreme Court was going to do, continued to incur obligations? That is an astounding question to ask. In the first place, neither the Federal Land Bank Board nor the Committee on Banking and Currency received any advance information from the Supreme Court, and it is the first intimation that I have had that the Supreme Court gave out any advance information to anyone.

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

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The Supreme Court did render a decision long enough ago to enable the land banks to trim their sails to meet the conditions instead of continuing to create obligations that make this legislation necessary.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman please tell me when the Supreme Court rendered that decision?

Mr. MADDEN. Whenever they rendered it; it is not so long ago.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman undertakes to speak about something on which he has no information. There has been no decision by the Supreme Court. I will call the attention of the House to the facts. As soon as the Federal farm-loan act was passed the private mortgage bankers of this country immediately had to reduce their rates about 1 per cent. That is conceded. They immediately started a campaign of misrepresentation and threatened to test the constitutionality of the act. They dragged the matter along, while the land banks prospered. Some time about a year ago they brought suit—a man did in Kansas City—to test the constitutionality of the act. After a very able argument, after full hearing, the Federal court at Kansas City upheld the constitutionality of the act upon every point that was challenged. Some of the ablest counsel in the United States appeared. Ex-Associate Justice Hughes at first rendered his opinion that the act was constitutional, and he is one of the attorneys who argued the case. Finally, the people who were attacking the act appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, and Mr. Hughes and other able counsel appeared before the Supreme Court and upheld the decision of the Federal court at Kansas City in very able arguments. It dragged along in the Supreme Court for some time, but in the meantime the Federal land banks ceased doing business by not receiving new applications, but confined their operations to applications pending, though they felt sure the Supreme Court would affirm the decision of the lower court, and do so by the 1st of April.

Now, a few days ago the Supreme Court of the United States set the case down for reargument. That indicated that the court was equally divided, one member having been absent and not participating, and, as we know the Supreme Court is going to adjourn, the reargument can not be had until next fall. What happens? What is the situation sought to be met by this legislation in a practical way? Even though the banks stop operating they had a lot of business pending, they had loans to be completed, mortgages actually given prior to March 1, prior to the time we had any intimation the matter was being held up in the Supreme Court. As I say, mortgages were given and put upon record throughout the country by farmers who relied upon the decision of the lower court, upon the opinion of Mr. Hughes, and to-day they are without their money, although their mortgages are of record.

Mr. MADDEN. How much do they amount to—\$8,000,000?

Mr. WINGO. I will tell the gentleman something else if he will wait.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to hear it.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman says it amounts to \$8,000,000. In addition, there were other commitments on loans closed amounting to several million dollars. In addition to those two classes, there is another class of commitments, illustrated by the methods of the bank doing business in Indiana and Ohio. Headed by a practical banker, instead of issuing bonds in advance of needs he arranged a line of credit with commercial banks in those States, on which it now owes \$5,000,000 upon 60 and 90 day paper, and that paper is going to come due pretty soon, the money having been used to meet loans closed. Now, what do we do? We find the \$35,000,000 or \$40,000,000 will clean it all up, the commitments of the land banks made when they felt sure there would be no question but that the Supreme Court would uphold the lower court, and I deny the land banks have shown lack of business judgment. I deny that they went ahead and made loans and commitments as charged by the gentleman, but, as a matter of fact, they closed

down, and every Member of this House, except the gentleman from Illinois, had protests for months from people in their districts against these land banks refusing any new business.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. WINGO. Yes; certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, will the gentleman tell the House what justice there is in legislation that seeks to enable a banker in Indiana or any other State to pay a \$5,000,000 obligation that they have created without any authority of law?

Mr. WINGO. For the same reason that the gentleman from Illinois has legislated here when we passed a bill that made it possible to take from the United States Treasury \$3,000,000,000 to settle the informal war contracts, for which they had no legal obligation. Now it is for the same reason.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, I deny that statement.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman can not deny it; it is a matter of common knowledge. The gentleman himself and this Congress, under a moral obligation, without any legal obligation, passed the measure for the relief of informal war contracts under which \$3,000,000 of claims are being adjusted, and millions have been allowed, including profits made during the war and prospective profits to be made upon war contracts. Now, what has the committee done as practical men? They bring in this bill which authorized the Secretary of the Treasury "under that war-time emergency act, to buy bonds ad libitum and continue in the business." The committee has reported a limitation that goes further than I would go, but as responsible agents of the House, knowing the temper of the House, the committee put a limit that the Treasury shall not purchase any bonds issued against any loans approved subsequent to March 1. We are undertaking to put a check on the situation and to meet these commitments and to clean up the business. In the meantime these banks will remain idle, their forces being disrupted; their employees are now being discharged, waiting for the Supreme Court of the United States to render their decision; and, I take it, it is a matter of common public interest. Certainly Congress having provided for adjustment of \$3,000,000,000 of war contracts, which unadjusted, it was said, would bankrupt the banks which held the paper, which would bankrupt the manufacturer—Congress having recognized that certainly can put up a paltry thirty or forty million dollars to be expended in the purchase of the best bonds that ever floated in order to maintain and tide over the farm-loan system in this emergency, when we know every dollar will be paid.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. I will yield.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman does not mean to say that it was this Congress?

Mr. WINGO. Last Congress. The gentleman, I guess, voted for it.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to have the gentleman tell us what contract obligation exists between the Government of the United States and this banker that went and borrowed money on his own paper, and what obligation we have on us to pass legislation to enable him to pay it?

Mr. WINGO. None whatever. The money was not borrowed on his own paper. The gentleman asked me what was outstanding, and I told him. In other words, as a member of the committee, I have made a clean breast to the House. That is the condition that exists. And does any gentleman say it is not a proper public business interest? Is there any sane man here who believes that the United States will ever lose a dollar? Did we not ask these banks not to go out and market their bonds during the Liberty loan campaign? Yes; we did. Why? Because we thought there were many investors in this country who thought them better than the restricted bonds we issued at that time. And we asked them to keep off the market, and the Treasury did buy \$136,000,000 of them. We are facing a practical condition now. Are we going to clean up their commitments and let the farmers have the money for which they mortgaged their lands and which mortgages are now on record? Would you think it good policy to not meet this emergency?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the rule properly protects the consideration of the bill and provides for debate and amendment in the usual way. I therefore move the previous question on the rule.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the rule.

The rule was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the work of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum. The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman reserve it for a moment? Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the work of the Joint Committee on Printing. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman withhold it?

Mr. MONDELL. I will withhold it.

Mr. MADDEN. I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, to-morrow, I think at 2 o'clock, there is to be a dedication of the memorial over at Arlington. I do not know, but as one Member of the House I hate to leave the House when it is in session, especially if any considerable number of Members have left. I am always here to try to make a quorum, but it seems to me that the dedication of that memorial to-morrow would justify an adjournment.

Mr. MONDELL. There is a special order for to-morrow, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. CANNON. What is it?

Mr. MONDELL. A special order for the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPshaw] to address the House for one hour.

Mr. CANNON. Then, could we not have some agreement that at the end of that address we might go over to Arlington?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know how many gentlemen will want to go to Arlington, Mr. Speaker. I think we can better determine that to-morrow than to-night.

Mr. CANNON. All right.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 9944. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to accept on behalf of the United States the donation by Sedgwick Post, No. 10, Grand Army of the Republic, of its memorial hall property in Bedford, Taylor County, Iowa, for Federal building purposes.

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

S. 2448. An act for the relief of certain officers of the United States Army, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Saturday, May 15, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. STEENERSON, from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13998) to fix second-class postage rates, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 980), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEWALT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 4212) to authorize the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey to construct a bridge across the waters of the Delaware River, between the city of Easton, in the State of Pennsylvania, and the city of Phillipsburg, in the State of New Jersey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 981), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10004) to authorize the widening of Georgia Avenue between Fairmont Street and Gresham Place NW., reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 982), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROWE, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5003) to amend section 4414, Revised Statutes of the United States, to classify and provide salaries for clerks in the Steamboat-Inspection Service, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 983), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CRAGO, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13001) for the relief of Rock of the Marne Post, No. 138, Veterans of Foreign Wars, composed of men who served in the Thirty-eighth Infantry, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 984), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 14072) to provide for the care of certain insane citizens of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 14073) to repeal section 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide relief in cases of contracts connected with the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1919; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 14074) to amend the shipping act of 1916 as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A resolution (H. Res. 558) to appoint a committee to investigate the investigating committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VESTAL: A resolution (H. Res. 559) providing for the consideration of House bill 12350; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENSON: A bill (H. R. 14075) for the relief of George F. Jones; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: A bill (H. R. 14076) granting a pension to Dennis Ryng; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 14077) granting an increase of pension to Robert T. Rowland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODALL: A bill (H. R. 14078) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Murren; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 14079) granting a pension to Mrs. A. M. Hughes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 14080) granting a pension to Alice M. Knox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 14081) granting a pension to Mary Irvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 14082) authorizing the President of the United States to restore to the active list of the Navy Thomas Smith, formerly chief gunner, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 14083) granting a pension to Marie Schneider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 14084) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint William E. Shaw a captain of Infantry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 14085) granting a pension to James L. Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14086) granting a pension to Bessie Wood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14087) for the relief of Augusta R. Tuell; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3620. By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: Petition of postal employees of York County, Pa., for remedial postal legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3621. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of Rochester Typothetæ, of Rochester, N. Y., protesting against the proposed tax on advertising; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3622. By Mr. DYER: Petition of board of directors of the Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the proposed tax on stock-exchange transactions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3623. Also, petition of F. J. Wade and 17 other residents and corporations of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the tax legislation connected with the soldier bonus legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3624. Also, petition of H. J. Mohler, general chairman of the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, favoring release of so-called political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3625. Also, petition of Charles F. Bates, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of House bill 13201; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

3626. Also, petition of William H. C. D'Antignac, of New York, favoring increase in postal employees' salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3627. Also, petition of director of experiment station of University of Missouri, protesting against passage of legislation for Federal regulation of sale of commercial fertilizer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3628. Also, petitions of S. S. Kresge Co., of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the soldier bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3629. Also, petition of J. R. Leary, of St. Louis, Mo., urging action on soldier bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3630. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Northwestern Association of General Contractors, St. Paul, Minn., protesting against the construction of nonessential work, both public and private, urging its postponement at this time; to the Committee on Labor.

3631. By Mr. FESS: Petition in opposition to compulsory military training as provided in House bill 12632, by 23 citizens of Bryan, Ohio; to the Committee on Education.

3632. By Mr. FOCHT: Evidence in support of House bill 13917, granting an increase of pension to Clarence R. Solomon; to the Committee on Pensions.

3633. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Wilson Shoe Co., of La Salle, Ill., opposing the McNary bill for the branding of the manufacturer's cost price on each pair of shoes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3634. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of registry division, post office, postal employees, clerk's letter room, John W. Galligan, Thomas J. Martin, P. O. Nugent, Mrs. James F. Barry, John H. Tyler, and Arthur McCann, all of Boston, Mass., urging passage of legislation increasing salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3635. Also, petition of P. J. Uagle, of Roxbury, Mass., favoring the passage of the Mason bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3636. Also, petition of M. C. Tuttle, of Boston, Mass., favoring the passage of the Volstead-Overman bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3637. Also, petition of Alexander Pope, of Boston, Mass., protesting against the passage of House bill 12446; to the Committee on Claims.

3638. Also, petition of Charles F. Hammond, Junior, Post, No. 78, American Legion, of Dorchester, Mass., and Brockton Post, No. 35, American Legion, Brockton, Mass., favoring compensation for ex-service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3639. Also, petition of Boston Typothetæ Board of Trade, Boston, Mass., protesting against the passage of House bill 12976; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3640. By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of Board of Aldermen of New York City, favoring increase in pay for post-office employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3641. By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of World War Veterans' League, of New York, urging cash bonus for ex-service men, payable from taxes on high incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3642. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of World War Veterans' League, of New York, urging cash bonus for ex-service men, payable from taxes on high incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3643. By Mr. McGLENNON: Petition of James Connolly Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, Jersey City, N. J., urging the passage of the Mason bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3644. Also, petition of Patrick Henry Branch, Bloomfield, N. J., Friends of Irish Freedom, urging the passage of the Mason bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3645. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Merrill Bros., New York City, opposing House bill 12379, legalizing exchange charge; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3646. Also, petition of McGlave & Co., Harry Bress, Harry A. Champion, Springs & Co., Gertrude Krause, and John Hopeditz, of New York City, protesting against proposed taxation on stock sales; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3647. Also, petition of World War Veterans' League, New York, urging cash bonus for ex-service men payable from taxes on high incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3648. By Mr. OSBORNE: Petition of 500 ex-service men of Los Angeles, Calif., and neighboring cities of southern Califor-

nia, urging the passage of legislation to provide a \$500 cash bonus for World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3649. By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of Lowell Post, No. 87, American Legion, Lowell, Mass., favoring the bonus for soldiers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3650. By Mr. SHERWOOD: Petition of Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion, Washington, D. C., favoring a bonus of \$500 for all ex-service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3651. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of John Mitchell Branch of the Friends of Irish Freedom, Jenkintown, Pa., favoring freedom of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3652. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Yates & Co., San Francisco, Calif., urging the early passage of House bill 263; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3653. Also, petition of Peoria Advertising and Selling Club, Peoria, Ill., protesting against a tax on advertising; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3654. Also, petition of Walter H. Kirk, Peoria, Ill., urging the passage of legislation which will establish house-to-house mail delivery in Peoria Heights, Bartonville, Averyville, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3655. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Amidon Woman's Club, Amidon, Current Events Club, of Bismarck, N. Dak., indorsing the Smith-Towner education bill; to the Committee on Education.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, May 15, 1920.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 11, 1920.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

TERMINATION OF WAR WITH GERMANY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) terminating the state of war declared to exist April 6, 1917, between the Imperial German Government and the United States, permitting on conditions the resumption of reciprocal trade with Germany, and for other purposes.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The roll will be called.

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

Ashurst	Gronna	McNary	Simmons
Ball	Hale	Moses	Smith, Md.
Borah	Harris	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Brandeggee	Harrison	Nelson	Smoot
Calder	Henderson	New	Spencer
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sterling
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Swanson
Colt	Kellogg	Pago	Thomas
Comer	Kendrick	Phelan	Townsend
Culberson	Kenyon	Phipps	Trammell
Curtis	Keyes	Pittman	Underwood
Dial	King	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Knox	Randall	Warren
Edge	Lodge	Reed	Williams
Elkins	McCormick	Robinson	Wolcott
Gay	McCumber	Sheppard	
Gerry	McKellar	Sherman	
Glass	McLean	Shields	

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] are absent on official business.

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], due to illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

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

Mr. POMERENE obtained the floor.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. POMERENE. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

PRICE OF SILVER.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I have asked the Senator from Ohio to yield to me for a few moments only for the purpose of placing in the RECORD some important telegrams dealing with the price of silver. The price of silver has fallen below \$1 an ounce, notwithstanding an act which was passed by Congress, generally known as the Pittman Act, providing that the Government shall buy American silver at \$1 per ounce any time that it is presented for sale to the Government. This falling price is threatening the silver production of the country, and I think that publicity should be given with regard to it.